

“A House Undivided: Slavery and The Restoration Movement”

By Jeffrey M. Herbener

Grove City College

Presented at the Austrian Scholars Conference

March 15-16, 2002

jmherbener@gcc.edu

Any one of much sagacity must see that the controversy between the North and the South has commenced. As certain, too, as that no one can live in Rome and strive against the Pope, must the whole Northern and Southern institutions come before the whole American family. Already, indeed, has it come into our American ecclesiastical courts, and distracted the councils of one of the most imposing communities in our Protestant ranks. Most unfortunately, too, have the same political metes and boundaries that separate the slave states from the free, been proposed as the termini of all ecclesiastical communions—as the *Ultima Thule* of the Christian charities and ministerial communion of Northern and Southern Methodists....Nor does this state of things appear to be exclusively conferred to any one of the Protestant sects of our country: other denominations, because of the politico-ecclesiastic character of their association, must be constrained to take the same ground.

We are the only religious community in the civilized world whose principles (unless we abandon them) can preserve us from such an unfortunate predicament. This I feel able to demonstrate to the entire satisfaction of every intelligent brother and candid citizen at the South or at the North.¹

So wrote Alexander Campbell as he surveyed the American scene in February of 1845. By then the spirit of division, which arose years before, was bearing fruit. The revivals of the 1820s and 1830s had stimulated an abolitionist impulse within Northern evangelical traditions when the striving for personal piety, so forcefully felt during the revivals, was extended to society at large. As the greatest social sin, slavery then became the focal point of the revivalist zeal to immediately save and radically purify society. By 1833, abolitionists in the North had formed the American Antislavery Society to propagandize for the moral condemnation of slavery and immediate emancipation. Lack of success in changing Northern opinions on slavery from apathy to opposition led to a crisis in the abolitionist movement in 1835. In response, abolitionists began aiming their rhetoric at the South itself through an unprecedented mass-mailing campaign. Predictably, this brought forth an increasingly vociferous defense by Southerners of the South and their way of life. Religious division was the inevitable result. Many groups splintered from the prominent denominations, even before the main fault lines began to appear. Then, as early as 1837, the Presbyterians divided along sectional lines in part over slavery. The Methodist divided North and South in 1844 as did the Baptists late in the year 1845. Episcopalians, Lutherans, and Catholics maintained unity until hostilities

¹ Alexander Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 1,” *The Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Feb. 1845), p. 51.

broke out in 1861 and then split, as a consequence of supporting their respective sectional governments, until after the war.²

Campbell prophetically saw that a Biblical treatment of slavery, coupled with the Restoration Movement's goal of the unity of Christians in the true church, could prevent religious division among churches of Christ. To explicate the Biblical position on slavery with the goal of preventing division among Christians was the task he set for himself in 1845.

Nothing but the threat to Christian unity was sufficient to inspire Campbell to write about slavery in earnest. His objectives in launching a new publication, *The Millennial Harbinger*, in 1830 included addressing "The *injustice* which yet remains in many of the political regulations under the best political governments, which contrasted with the *justice* which Christianity proposes, and which the millennial order of society promises," and "Disquisition upon the treatment of African slaves, as preparatory to their emancipation, and exaltation from their present degraded condition."³ And yet, he wrote only one article on slavery in 1830, in which he urged Christians to oppose state laws prohibiting whites from teaching Negroes to read.⁴ And this was inspired not by a desire to treat the general issue of slavery, but from the outcome of the 1828 Virginia Convention in which Campbell was a delegate from his western district. In seeking to receive equal representation in the Virginia Assembly for the western part of the state, Campbell had argued for wider suffrage based on the universal claim of natural rights, which he thought extended to Negroes. Instead, the Convention voted to restrict the franchise to freeholders. Then in 1830, the Virginia Legislature passed a law forbidding meetings to teach Negroes to read and write or to conduct plantation schools for these ends.⁵ Even when Southern fears for personal safety were aroused after the Nat Turner Rebellion in Southampton County, Virginia in 1831, he only wrote one article on slavery in 1832, in which he urged Virginia to find a practical method of emancipation.⁶ As early as 1835, he saw the potential for social disruption that slavery entailed; predicting that

² *Dictionary of Christianity in America*, Daniel G. Reid, ed. (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1990), pp. 23-24 and 284-289. On religion and the abolitionist movement, see Gilbert Hobbs Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse, 1930-1844* (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1957 [1933]). On denominational division, see C.C. Goen, *Broken Churches, Broken Nation: Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the American Civil War* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1985). On the crisis of the abolitionist movement, see Mitchell Snay, *Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1997). Campbell cites the splits in Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist fellowships as cause for alarm. Because also, "in our [religious] communities there are persons of different opinions and theories on this subject," Campbell wrote, "it becomes us to recur to first and fundamental principles, to anticipate any unfavorable issue of views and feelings, and to fix our minds upon the profession of allegiance to the Lord, and the ground of union, communion, and co-operation which we have assumed before the universe in our ecclesiastical relations and duties." See A. Campbell, "Our Position to American Slavery—No. 6," *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), pp. 233-234.

³ A. Campbell, "Prospectus," *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (January 4, 1830), p. 1. Emphasis Original.

⁴ A. Campbell, "Emancipation of White Slaves," *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (March 1830), pp. 128-132.

⁵ Earl Irvin West, *Elder Ben Franklin: Eye of the Storm* (Indianapolis: Religious Book Service, 1983), p. 132.

⁶ A. Campbell, "Slavery in Virginia," *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (January 1832), pp. 14-15. He also printed four letters by other authors on the subject, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-20.

“on the solution [to the slavery question] the temporal destiny of this nation and the eternal destiny of millions of human beings hang in awful uncertainty...”⁷ And yet, he wrote only one article that year on slavery, in which he advocated using the National budget surplus (at the time between \$10 and \$12 million) to establish a fund to colonize Negroes and pay compensation to slave owners.⁸ Only in 1845, when he had come to believe that disputes over slavery had the potential to rent asunder Christian unity did he write extensively about it, producing twelve articles that year on slavery and related issues.

Christians in the Restoration Movement were eager to read his views on the subject, especially anti-slavery advocates who anticipated that Campbell would be their powerful ally. Their expectations were not at all unreasonable. Campbell’s defense of natural law and natural rights and his love of the American Republic and its liberties was well-known and predisposed him to be against the institution of slavery. The tenor of his writings on the subject prior to 1845 was so clearly anti-slavery that as early as 1830 some opposition arose to circulating the *Millennial Harbinger* in the South.⁹ Campbell did nothing to dissuade readers of their impression of his anti-slavery leanings when, in 1832, he wrote, “we have millions of *miserable human beings* held in involuntary bondage, in *ignorance, degradation, and vice*; by a Republican system of slave-holding” and “when we look...upon the wretched slave, sunk in ignorance and chains, degraded by his more knavish fellow to a beast of burthen...well may we exclaim, *What is man!*”¹⁰

Another factor adding to his anti-slavery temper was his opinion that slavery was uneconomic and destined to be supplanted by free labor. He wrote:

That a time may come when, in the judgment of the slaveholding states, free labor will appear incomparably more honorable, more profitable, and more favorable to domestic and state prosperity and happiness, I think is almost certain. Two censuses like the two last, will not, in my opinion, leave a pin in all the South on which to hang a doubt. That our state wealth would increase more in twenty years under a free labor system than it will in forty, under a slave labor system, *taking into account the increased value of lands and products*, is, to my mind, speaking after the manner of political economists, as clear as any other problem connected with the whole subject of national wealth and prosperity.¹¹

Additionally, Barton W. Stone, a successful Kentucky preacher and the man who merged his own movement, begun in 1801, with Campbell’s to form the American Restoration Movement, was anti-slavery. Stone turned against slavery in 1797 while visiting Charleston, South Carolina on a tour of the South. He became distraught over the condition and treatment of the slaves, especially after witnessing a slave auction. He came to favor the plan of the American Colonization Society, which formed in 1816, for using free will offerings to buy slaves and return them to Africa. Stone organized a

⁷ A. Campbell, “Slavery and Anti-Slavery,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 6, No. 12 (December 1835), p. 587.

⁸ A. Campbell, “Slavery and Anti-Slavery,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 6, No. 12 (December 1835), pp. 587-590.

⁹ A. Campbell, “The Removal of the Indians,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 1, No. 6 (June 1830), p. 258.

¹⁰ A. Campbell, “The Crisis,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (February 1832), p. 88 and ““What is Man?”” *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 3, No. 6 (June 1832), pp. 281-282. Emphasis Original.

¹¹ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 5,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), pp. 194-195. Emphasis Original.

Chapter of the ACS in Georgetown, Kentucky in 1830 and was elected its first president. In the 1830s, he regularly spoke out against slavery, teaching that the Biblical examples of it did not justify African slavery in America, and pointed to the fact that his famous Cane Ridge meetings broke the bonds of many slaves as justification for the meetings being from God.¹²

Another influence tending Campbell to an anti-slavery view was his family's experience with it. Thomas Campbell's first brush with slavery came after he relocated from Western Pennsylvania in the fall of 1817 to Burlington, Kentucky, the seat of Boone County, to establish an academy. As the school prospered, its building began to be used as a Christian meeting house with Campbell as the preacher. In the summer of 1819, he saw a group of slaves wasting away the time on a Sunday afternoon and, wanting to mitigate their difficulties, invited them into his schoolhouse to listen to him read Scripture and to sing hymns together. Their enthusiastic response inspired him to continue the meetings, but his intentions were cut short by a friend who told him that he had broken the law of the state by addressing Negroes without the presence of one or more whites. He determined to never again to reside where the law prevented openly preaching the Scripture or where the culture pressured his family to accept such a restriction. When he informed Alexander of his resolve, his son invited him to join his work at the Buffalo Seminary near his home in Bethany, Virginia. Even though the practice of slavery was as mild as possible in the Northern neck of Virginia, surrounded as it was by two large free states, Thomas Campbell settled near West Middletown, Pennsylvania, a seven-mile trip from Bethany, to avoid any taint of slavery.

Finally, Campbell believed that Christ had given Christians liberty in matters of opinion. He wrote:

As American citizens, the members of our churches have the same political rights with the members of all other communities. They may become "Whigs" or "Democrats," "Liberty" or "Pro Slavery Men," according to the views of political expediency and propriety. On these views we all have opinions....As a political economist, and as a philanthropist, I have many reasons for preferring the prospects and condition of the Free to the Slave states; but especially as a Christian, I sympathize much more with the owners of slaves, their heirs, and successors, than with the slaves which they possess and bequeath. These opinions I express as freely in Georgia as in Ohio and Pennsylvania, and frequently hear them expressed by the masters themselves.¹³

Campbell, however, considered these opinions on economic, political, and philanthropic views, which Christ gave Christians the liberty to hold, subordinate to the teaching of Scripture. He wrote:

The faith, the precepts, the ordinances, and the promises of the gospel, are public property; while our own reasonings, inferences, and opinions are private property, and are so to be regarded by all. The precepts of the gospel are to be

¹² Earl Irvin West, *Elder Ben Franklin: Eye of the Storm* (Indianapolis: Religious Book Service, 1983), p. 131.

¹³ A. Campbell, "Our Position to American Slavery—No. 6," *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 233.

obeyed, its models to be imitated, its spirit to be cherished, cultivated, and displayed in all the acts of justice, brotherly kindness, and charity. Opinions as to the policy or impolicy, the prudence or the imprudence of any set of measures, or of what other persons ought to do in certain circumstances, whether similar or dissimilar to our own, not being matters of revelation, or of express precept, are not to be causes of alienation and schism among the members of the household of faith. To remind our brethren of this peculiarity of our Christian profession, and to demonstrate, if necessary, its bearing upon our position relative to American slavery, is the sole reason of our introducing this subject to their consideration at this time.¹⁴

Despite being predisposed against slavery and believing that Christ has given us liberty of opinion on political and economic matters, Campbell purposed to address the moral question of slavery from the Scripture alone. “The cardinal question affecting us, then, is—*What does the Bible teach on this subject?*—not what natural reason, natural conscience, or the opinions of men may dictate, or what human prudence and expediency may allow.”¹⁵

As the 1830s wore on, correspondents put increasing pressure on Campbell to publicly disclose his views. Coupled with the huge growth of the Restoration Movement in the 1840s, this pressure led Campbell to write a series of articles on the “Morality of Christians,” in which he discussed the moral duties of masters and slaves and criticized Southern plantation owners for neglecting the “moral culture” on their estates. These positions only fueled the controversy and convinced Campbell for the need to set out his views on the matter in full, which he did in 1845.¹⁶

The 1845 series on American slavery in *Millennial Harbinger* led off with a reprint of a letter written by Thomas Campbell to a Southern author of an address on slavery criticizing him for straying from the Biblical teaching about slavery. Campbell begins with an exhaustive listing the Biblical passages relating to slavery. He notes that in several cases God sanctioned owning and trading slaves and permitted children to be born into slavery. This implies, he concluded, that men are not “‘born free and equal:’ consequently, are not the subject of equal rights.” Yet, the Bible also teaches by example and from its “universal tenor” that “all possess natural rights, of which they cannot be deprived upon any pretence, without a manifest violation of the express laws of God:-- namely, a competent portion of the necessities of life for their bodily health and comfort, with the full enjoyment of the religious privileges with which God has graciously favored their masters.” Masters owe these privileges to their slaves as a duty to God. Moreover, Scripture forbids enslaving free men, save for victory in divinely authorized war, or encouraging involuntary servitude. Campbell claimed that slavery is not sinful, but a “consequence and a punishment of sin” and slavery has been the “occasion of much evil” as well as the “occasion of much good” especially in the patriarchal and Jewish ages of

¹⁴ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 6,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 234.

¹⁵ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 2,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 2 (February 1845), p. 53. Emphasis Original.

¹⁶ Earl Irvin West, *Elder Ben Franklin: Eye of the Storm* (Indianapolis: Religious Book Service, 1983), p. 133.

which he cites several examples. Appeals to the U.S. Constitution have no weight for a Christian, Campbell argued, since he takes the Bible for his guide in moral matters. Moreover, one may grant inalienable rights to all men and yet, uphold slavery as long as masters do not deny these rights to their slaves, including religious instruction in preparation for heavenly bliss. To the extent that the system of American slavery denies these rights to slaves, it stands condemned by God and will be destroyed by Him, which is all the more reason for Christians to “discharge their duties, both civil and religious, for the amelioration and ultimate abolition of slavery.”¹⁷

Following the text of this letter, Alexander Campbell remarked: “It is the calm, considerate, and candid reasonings and conclusions” of a man of impartial and sound mind and “as pure a philanthropist as breathes.”

He began his own series of articles by reiterating a principle he laid down in 1842 that he would not print extreme party views on either abolition or slavery in the *Millennial Harbinger*. Campbell thought such articles had sufficient outlet in the political press and legislative halls.¹⁸ While the main parties wish to debate “the alleged *political* and *moral* evils of American slavery,” Campbell counseled Christians to attend to the moral question since it can be definitely decided on the Bible. Polemically, he set out his own position, i.e., the Scriptural teaching on slavery, as establishing a middle ground between the “*Liberty Men*” and the “*Non-Liberty Men*.”¹⁹ He began, rhetorically, by playing the part of the moderator between authors representing the abolitionist and pro-slavery positions with commentary on the writings of who he considered to be the most able and judicious representatives of the two positions: Dr. Francis Wayland, president of Brown University, to represent the former, and Dr. Richard Fuller of South Carolina to represent the later.

For Campbell, to base one’s view of something on the Bible required an inductive, or Baconian, method of searching out everything that the Bible says on the issue and then come to an understanding of it. One example of the fruit born by this method was his calling attention to the fact that in his letters Dr. Wayland omitted mention of II Corinthians 7:20-24: “Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called, being a slave, care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather...” And yet, Campbell pointed out this passage bears directly on the duty of Christian slaves.

As noted above, he also insisted on accepting the Bible as absolute authority. “I am not one of those who have so much confidence in their own reasonings, and so little faith in revelation, as to say,--that if the Bible, especially the New Testament, sanctioned involuntary servitude or slavery, they would throw it away as a vile imposter,” he wrote. This stand, however, was, seemingly, problematic for Campbell because it implied an eclipse of his well-known defense of natural rights and love of the American Republican system and its liberties. His views were especially galling to anti-slavery Christians who

¹⁷ Thomas Campbell, “Elder Thomas Campbell’s Views of Slavery,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 1 (January 1845), pp. 3-8. Thomas Campbell followed up this letter with another in which he clarified and amplified several points. See, *item.*, “Reply to ‘a Disciple’ on the Subject of Slavery,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), pp. 196-200.

¹⁸ A. Campbell, “Abolition Address,” *Millennial Harbinger*, New Series, Vol. 6, No. 7 (August 1842), p. 375.

¹⁹ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 1,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 2 (February 1845), p. 52. Emphasis Original.

anticipated that Campbell would join them as an abolitionist. But he took his stand on the Bible alone. Wishing, however, to show that a middle ground position could be established from the Bible, he added, “Still less would I affirm that slavery being found in our statute books, and, being established in our country, and practiced by many good men, is any evidence whatever that it is pleasing to God or good for soul, body, or estate.”²⁰ He wrote:

Our position is not that of a politician, an economist, a mere moralist; but that of a Christian. Our premises are not the Declaration of American Independence, the bills of political rights or wrongs, natural religion natural conscience, natural liberty; but the Christian Oracles...Hence my position, and the reasons of it, can be clearly state, amply sustained, and satisfactorily demonstrated from the New Testament, and to those who admit its divine authority...When I affirm that the New Testament recognizes *without censure* the *relation* of master and slave, I do not say that it sanctions the *legalized treatment* of either masters or slaves according to the American or any other code.²¹

Campbell’s starting point for his disquisition on American slavery, as for all moral questions, was the Bible. “I am no believer in the infallibility of the dictates of natural religion, natural reason, natural conscience, natural liberty, natural law,” Campbell wrote, “I stand or fall by super-natural religion or revelation.” He scorned Christians “who candidly aver the resolution to abandon the Bible *so soon as it is made evident that it sanctions the relation of master and slave*. Such is their faith in their own reason, and such their preference for natural law, consciences, and religion, that...they will sacrifice the Bible to their theory rather than their theory to the Bible.”²² In part, it was his devotion founding all his views on Scripture that inspired widespread admiration for and consent to them in the Restoration Movement; thus, squelching division.²³

Campbell offered three propositions about slavery to begin: (1) Roman slavery was the system to which the gospel writers refer, a system no better than American slavery; (2) The Apostolic church contained masters and slaves whose behavior was regulated by the apostles’ teaching; and (3) No Scripture claims that slavery is contrary to God’s law. Neither Christ nor the apostles condemned slavery, but instead acknowledged and regulated it. Moreover, while binding Christians to faith, precept, and ordinances, Jesus gave to every man liberty in matters of opinion and thus, no such matter can be made a test of fellowship or inclusion in a congregation of the church.²⁴

From this starting point, the moral question of slavery could easily be answered. To the question, “Is the simple relation of master and slave necessarily and essentially

²⁰ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 2,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 2 (February 1845), pp. 70-71.

²¹ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 7,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 236-237. Emphasis Original.

²² A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 7,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 236-237. Emphasis Original.

²³ A letter written by a Bethany college alumnus to Alexander Campbell illustrates this point. See, H.C., “Friendly Notice of Our Articles on the Fugitive Slave Law,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 11 (November 1851), pp. 656-658.

²⁴ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 6,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 232-234.

immoral and unchristian—as that, for example, of the adulterer and adultress,” Campbell answered, “we are clearly and satisfactorily convinced that it is not.” Because of this he inferred that no Christian who is a master can be debarred from fellowship simply because he is a master.²⁵ Moreover, although God sanctions slavery, He is against all injustice. God’s sanction of slavery is no license for its abuse, which the American system permits, nor is the American practice of slavery an excuse to ignore Christian duties. He wrote:

I have shown that while the *relation* of master and servant has existed since the days of Abraham till now, amongst the Patriarchs, Jews, and Christians, Greeks, Romans, and Barbarians, it is one thing in the hands of those who fear God, and another in the hands of them that fear him not. I have affirmed that while the face of God is set against all injustice, oppression, and tyranny, he has authorized by his providence and by his laws all the inequalities of condition set forth under the names and relations of masters and servants.

I have also affirmed that in American slavery, as it exists both on the statute book and in practice, there are, in numerous instances, that which no Christian man can justify or approve. I have also affirmed that no Christian man is obliged to do those things which are repugnant to Christian morality standing in these relations; and that if he were to be compelled, he ought to sacrifice everything,—life itself,—rather than do them; that masters and servants are to be compelled to discharge their duties to each other by those in authority in all Christian churches, or to be excommunicated from them; and that no man is to be anathematized [by] or expelled [from] the church simply because he is either a master or a slave.²⁶

Somewhat to his surprise, and pleasure, Campbell discovered that his position on slavery was assented to by both Drs. Wayland and Fuller, even though he himself was “neither [abolitionist] nor [pro-slavery].”²⁷ In the seventh and final letter of their debate on slavery, which Campbell received after stating his own position in *Millennial Harbinger*, Dr. Wayland summed up the points of agreement between his position and that of Dr. Fuller. Wayland wrote:

In the first place, we both affirm that to hold slaves is not of necessity a guilt, and under peculiar circumstances it may not be a wrong; it is, therefore, *in itself*, no scripture ground for ecclesiastical excommunication. In the second place, you affirm that a slave is entitled to the same privileges, intellectual, moral, and domestic, as any other man; and of course, that all that part of the system which interferes with those privileges, is wrong, and ought to be abolished. In the third place, you give us, in your own case, an example of what you believe to be the duty of masters. You teach your servants to read, you instruct them in the gospel of Christ, and by every means in your power are laboring to improve their intellectual, moral, social, and domestic condition. I do not here allude to your

²⁵ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 4,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 4 (April 1845), p. 145.

²⁶ A. Campbell, “American Slavery,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 7 (August 1845), p. 356. Emphasis Original.

²⁷ A. Campbell, “American Slavery,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 8 (August 1845), p. 356.

care of their physical comforts, for you could never be a selfish or unkind man. We can both unite in the effort to render all slaveholders in this country just such masters as you. Thirdly, you believe it neither *possible* nor *proper* to perpetuate this institution. It must, then, in your view, cease. In my judgment, it would be a great calamity were it to terminate by violence, or without previous moral and social preparation. In the efforts to prepare both the masters and slaves for this event, we can cordially co-operate. I neither ask you, nor any other man, to do any more. In the effort to accomplish these results, I pledge you my services to any extent that you are willing to accept of them.²⁸

Commenting on the “very remarkable agreement between Dr. Wayland and myself, as well as between Dr. Fuller and myself, on the great practical result of the whole investigation and discussion,” Campbell wrote, “we have, then, all been led to the same conclusions from the same Book, and from, as I believe, a candid and impartial examination of the subject.”²⁹

Having successfully established the middle ground position as correct, Campbell turned his attention to the outlining the Christian program for reforming, and eventually abolishing, slavery. That the practice of slavery in America was unchristian and in need of reform was the basis for genuine abolitionism. Campbell wrote:

I do not say that the New Testament authorizes a master to treat his servants as he treats his mules or his oxen; that if he feed, clothe, and house them well, find them abundance of wholesome food in health, medicine, and medical attendance in sickness that then he has ‘rendered unto them that which is *just* and *equal*. They have souls as well as bodies; they have powers of reason; they have conscience, moral instincts, moral feelings, and are susceptible of spiritual enjoyments, of immortality, and eternal life. They have the rights of husbands and of wives—of parents and of children; and any code that takes these away from them is not of God, but of men. Moral training, religious and moral instruction, they must have among their inalienable rights and privileges. These cannot be withholden by Christian masters without the forfeiture of Christian character and Christian privilege, no matter under what code of laws such injustice be perpetrated.³⁰

But the work of genuine abolition was for Christians in the church. “Now a Christian can exact, and is in duty bound to exact from *Christian* masters and servants the full performance of all those correlate duties and obligations,” Campbell wrote, “but over those without the church has no such power.”³¹ A Christian can be an abolitionist provided he is a genuine one, a person opposed to slavery and in favor of a Christian

²⁸ Letter from F. Wayland to Fuller reprinted in A. Campbell, “American Slavery: End of the Controversy Between Drs. Wayland and Fuller,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 7 (July 1845), p. 307. Emphasis Original

²⁹ A. Campbell, “American Slavery: End of the Controversy Between Drs. Wayland and Fuller,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 7 (July 1845), p. 307.

³⁰ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 7,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 237. Emphasis Original.

³¹ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 7,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 237. Emphasis Original.

manner of eliminating it. And, in fact, abolition can come only through Christian means, viz., evangelism, Campbell wrote:

The gospel is not a system of morality for the moral improvement of any nation or state. It contemplates something more sublime and salutary. It gives life to the 'dead in trespasses and sins.' It 'creates men anew in Christ Jesus.' Its legitimate product is 'a new creature.' The heart being 'purified by faith,' all its streams are pure....Pure morality, that is, truth, righteousness, and mercy are its genuine fruit....He that cannot cordially recognize the person and the claims of the Messiah, can never practice his heaven-originated morality....[no one] who seeks by arguments on the moral obligations of an American citizen, merely as such, to become a genuine philanthropist [will succeed]....[And] should you succeed in persuading any mere citizen of this nation to become an abolitionist...you have only deluded him...into the belief of a most injurious, if not a soul-ruining fallacy. No motive, not derived from the belief of the gospel and personal devotion to its author and finisher, can sanctify any action of enterprise attempted by man.³²

"But the technically denominated abolitionist is quite a different personage," Campbell wrote, "he regards slavery as morally wrong in its very essence."³³ Campbell wrote:

The slaveholder is, with him, a man-stealer, and the avails of his slave-labor robbery. He thinks it morally right to make use of all the powers of association with Turk, Jew, or Infidel, to put it down—peaceably if he can, forcibly if he must. He is one who would dismember the church and dissolve the union for the sake of annihilating the immoral and unholy relation. This is that definition of an abolitionist in reference to whom I have said, *as a Christian*, no man could be an abolitionist; I might, perhaps, also have added, *nor as an American citizen*.³⁴

Campbell "always abjured the two most prominent tenets of abolitionists...the first, *that the relationship of master and slave is morally wrong*; and the second, that *immediate emancipation is the imperious duty of every master*."³⁵ Campbell placed abolitionism in the same category as moral societies. These extra-ecclesiastical associations are not sanctioned by God, who has given mankind the family, the church, and the state for its reclamation. The only "moral society" Christians can rightly join is the church. Moreover, abolitionists and moral societies, by seeking to use the violence of

³² A. Campbell, "Our Position to American Slavery—No. 7," *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 238-239.

³³ A. Campbell, "Our Position to American Slavery—No. 7," *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 238.

³⁴ A. Campbell, "Our Position to American Slavery—No. 7," *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 238. Emphasis Original.

³⁵ A. Campbell, "Our Position to American Slavery—No. 8," *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 6 (June 1845), p. 258. Emphasis Original.

the state to reform society, make themselves anathema to Christians.³⁶ Scripture itself strikes at the heart of the abolitionist program of social reform. Paul points out that Christians have no authority to judge those outside the church, but only those within the church. From this doctrine, Campbell inferred a general principle, that the “Church cannot constitutionally undertake to reform the state.” Christians cannot be political party men, yoking themselves together with heathens to violently rebel against the laws of the state or a God-ordained institution. Christians can vote and take peaceful actions against injustice, but their obligations to Christ supercede their opinions and political leanings. “I am neither an apologist for American slavery, a reformer, nor an abolitionists of American slavery,” Campbell wrote, “the laws sustain it; and so long as the laws sustain it, abstractly right or wrong, it is the duty of every *Christian* man to respect it and offer it no violence whatever.”³⁷ As a civil affair, slavery can be kept, reformed, or destroyed, “but only in a lawful and honorable way—not by violence, intrigue or disrespect of either persons or law.”³⁸ Northern, abolitionist Christians who produce discontent and insubordination of slaves or outrage of masters in the South are “not only indiscreet and highly unchristian,” Campbell wrote, “but also in direct conflict with the objects sought to be accomplished by the truly benevolent and intelligent abolitionist.” Anyone who promotes religious division is a fanatic and fails to understand that religious unity is the underpinning of the Union and the successful emancipation of the slaves.³⁹ He wrote:

To preserve unity of spirit among Christians of the South and of the North is my grand object, and for that purpose I am endeavoring to show that the New Testament does not authorize any interference or legislation upon the relation of master and slave, nor does it either in letter or spirit authorize Christians to make it a term of communion. *While it prescribes the duties of both parties, masters and slaves, it sanctions the relation,* and only requires that these duties be faithfully discharged by the parties; making it the duty of all Christian churches to enforce these duties and to exact them under all the pains of Christian discipline, both from the master and the slave—leaving it to the Lord to judge, correct, and avenge those that are without.⁴⁰

Abolitionists, however, desire division and do what they can to promote it, in league with infidels, by political power. “There are, indeed, Liberty Men and Abolitionists who regard the dismemberment of every church in the Union as a desideratum,” Campbell wrote, that for these men “the immolation of the Church and the American Union at the shrine of the genius of universal emancipation are matters of no

³⁶ A. Campbell, “Abolitionism, Masonic, and Odd Fellow Intolerance,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 7 (July 1845), p. 313-318. Campbell wrote a ten-article series on Moral Societies in *Millennial Harbinger* from April 1848 to January 1849 in which he developed these views in fine detail.

³⁷ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 3,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 3 (March 1845), p. 108. Emphasis Original.

³⁸ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 5,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 194.

³⁹ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 5,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 195.

⁴⁰ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 5,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1845), p. 195. Emphasis Original.

importance whatever.” In contrast, there are Liberty Men “who love Christ and Christianity more” than “their theory of human rights and wrongs.” They resolve to guard unity and peace, refuse to make alliances with non-Christians in political parties, and punish masters and slaves alike who fail in their Christian duties.⁴¹ Campbell wrote:

I have always been anti-slavery, but never an abolitionist...All men of good sense and of humanity contemplate an end of slavery in all its obnoxious attributes; but no one expects a sudden, an immediate termination of it, except at the point of the bayonet. *Christians can never be reformers in any system which uses violence, recommends, or expects it.* I have already suggested both political, economical, and moral reasons why this institution should ultimately yield to the genius of the age, and the spirit of our institutions. But, as members of Christ’s church, our duties have already and repeatedly been pointed out; and to these we must all conform if we either desire or expect the plaudits of the great Master and Judge of all.⁴²

Moreover, abolitionists’ obsession with their “one idea” to the exclusion of all others has actually hindered the progress of emancipation by diverting energy away from practical plans for emancipation to questions of foreign interference with state sovereignty. Campbell wrote:

I know of no class of men who stand so much in the way of the abolition of slavery as the abolitionists of the present day...for all the States that once thought or talked of some practicable system of emancipation, immediately laid the matter upon the table on the first extrinsic and foreign interference with the subject; and there it will lie until the Abolitionists learn more wisdom and display more discretion than has yet appeared in their movements.⁴³

Campbell agreed with the author of a letter who pointed out that such “foreign” interference is decidedly unchristian given the independence of each congregation of every other. God ordains elders in each congregation to have authority over and responsibility for its operation. Christians are to tend to the affairs of their own congregations and not meddle in those of another. Moreover, Jesus will hold each congregation accountable for its own sins, not the sins of another.⁴⁴

Despite the Scriptural sanction of slavery, Campbell thought emancipation, if properly done, was desirable in the American context. “While then I affirm the conviction that the relationship of master and slave by the providence and law of God, is, in certain cases and conditions, morally right, I also affirm the conviction that *in this age and in this country, it is not expedient.*” With Paul he claimed that all things are lawful but not all are profitable. Campbell thought slavery out of harmony with the “spirit and

⁴¹ A. Campbell, “American Slavery,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 7 (August 1845), pp. 357-358.

⁴² A. Campbell, “American Slavery,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 7 (August 1845), p. 358. Emphasis Original.

⁴³ A. Campbell, “Abolitionism” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 11 (November 1845), pp. 505-506.

⁴⁴ A. Campbell, “Abolitionism” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 11 (November 1845), pp. 505 and 507.

genius of this age” and with “the particular genius of our American population and political institutions,” and he was “by my education strongly prejudiced against it.” Not only do philosophy, politics, and patriotism argue for emancipation, but also pecuniary interests. Masters, themselves, would gain in wealth as emancipation would increase land prices, compensating landholders for the lost value of slaves, and free labor markets would unleash greater productivity. But emancipation, in Christian charity, had to be done in proper social conditions.⁴⁵ He wrote:

I have been so much opposed to American Slavery *because of its abuses and liabilities to abuse—because of its demoralizing influence upon society through these abuses—because of its impoverishing operations upon the states and communities that tolerate its continuance*, that I am a candid and fearless advocate, in my political relations, of a state constitutional termination of it by a gradual approach...predestinating some ultimate day, when both the master and the slave would be prepared for it.⁴⁶

Specifically, he proposed adoption of laws in the upper south, Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky, giving freedom to any slave born in the state when he or she reached age 21 and then everyone born in the state 21 years after passage of the laws. Such a proposal was politically viable, Campbell thought, because it appealed to all of the reasons favoring emancipation, including the pecuniary interests of the landholders, mentioned above. Because he lived in the northern neck of (West) Virginia where the practice of slavery was milder, he personally found it expedient to free every slave that came under his power, some by inheritance and some by purchase. And although he counseled masters to free their slaves, in similar circumstances, he never withdrew Christian fellowship from those who did not. In states where unchristian treatment of slaves was proscribed by law, he counseled Christians to work peacefully to change the laws and failing that to move or emancipate their slaves elsewhere. “There should not be a statute in the archives of any American state,” Campbell wrote, “at war with religion, morality, or the spirit of the age.” Regardless of the laws, he counseled Christian masters to always fulfill every Christian duty to their slaves, including teaching them to read and write since these skills are necessary for human development.⁴⁷

The general reception of Campbell’s views on slavery and emancipation, as stated in his 1845 series, were very favorable and had the tendency to moderate extremism and to isolate the extremists in the Restoration Movement. Even outside the Movement, Campbell’s views were widely respected. Jefferson Davis, while a Senator from Mississippi, was so impressed with them that he personally delivered his nephew to Campbell to enroll him in Bethany College. And when his public speeches touched on the issue of slavery, Jefferson used Campbell’s arguments.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 8,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 6 (June 1845), p. 257-259.

⁴⁶ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 8,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 6 (June 1845), p. 258. Emphasis Original.

⁴⁷ A. Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. 8,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 6 (June 1845), p. 258-261.

⁴⁸ Earl Irvin West, *The Trials of the Ancient Order* (Germantown, Tenn.: Religious Book Service, 1993), p. 178.

From 1845 on, however, abolitionists considered him a bitter enemy, denounced him as pro-slavery, worked against him, and harried him. One example is James Garfield, future Union General and President of the United States but at the time an Ohio preacher, who refused to enroll in Bethany College because he judged it pro-slavery and worked to dissuade Christians from supporting Campbell.⁴⁹

Campbell tasted the bitterness of abolitionist opposition firsthand during a trip to Great Britain in 1847. He was invited to visit by the leaders of the British Restoration Movement to witness and give encouragement to the burgeoning movement in Great Britain. His friend Henry Clay wrote a letter of introduction for his use during the tour, which gained him access to a session of the House of Lords through George Bancroft, an American minister in London. He also met many of the prominent citizens of England at Bancroft's home. After arriving in England late in May of 1847, Campbell spent most of the summer preaching and visiting with the brethren there. He encountered large and enthusiastic crowds and found many Christians familiar with his religious writings. Early in August, he moved on to Scotland where he planned to spend the month and then travel to Ireland for the month of September before starting for home early in October. While in Scotland, he discovered that not only had his writings on religious matters been widely read, so had those on slavery and that abolitionists bitterly opposed the latter as much as brethren warmly embraced the former. Halfway through the month of August, Campbell was approached by a delegation from the Scotch Anti-Slavery Society who quizzed him about his views on slavery and asked him whether he would preach on the subject while in Scotland. Campbell replied that he came to preach the gospel and the doctrines concerning the church, not slavery or abolition. Within hours of the meeting the Society posted placards about Edinburgh accusing Campbell of being a slaveholder and a defender of man-stealing. John Robertson, the Society's secretary, challenged Campbell to a debate on slavery, promising to prove that his views were "ungodly, unchristian, and inhuman." Everywhere Campbell preached from then on in Scotland, members of the Society disrupted his sermons. Campbell finally agreed to a debate on his only remaining open date, September 24-27, provided that John Robertson was a recognized representative of the abolitionist side. While investigating this matter, Campbell discovered that there were three prominent men named John Robertson one of whom had been found guilty of abusing his mother and was excommunicated from the Baptist church. Campbell agreed, in a letter to the *Edinburgh Journal*, to debate under the condition that his opponent was not the criminal John Robertson. This response led Robertson to threaten Campbell with a lawsuit for defamation. Because Campbell had the means and intention to leave the jurisdiction of Scottish courts, he was jailed, after refusing to put up bail, until the matter could be settled. After nine days, his imprisonment was declared illegal and he left for Ireland on September 16, two weeks behind schedule. Thus, Campbell learned firsthand of the fanaticism of the abolitionist and, in turn, his opposition to them hardened.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Earl Irvin West, *Elder Ben Franklin: Eye of the Storm* (Indianapolis: Religious Book Service, 1983), p. 129.

⁵⁰ Earl Irvin West, *The Trials of the Ancient Order* (Germantown, Tenn.: Religious Book Service, 1993), pp. 149-187.

Even though the victim in this episode, Campbell was forced to defend his conduct in Ireland from his abolitionist detractors in America upon his return.⁵¹ In 1849, he reprinted, in *Millennial Harbinger*, a letter he wrote to the editor of the *Glasgow Examiner* while in prison. By his own account, not only was he stalked and harried by members of the Scotch Anti-Slavery Society, but slandered and defamed by their accusations that he beat his slaves and imposed a graceless religion on people. It was no surprise then that he failed to impress abolitionists with his position that American slavery is “a great and manifold evil, injurious to both parties” yet more to the master than the slave for it corrupts him and his children both physically and spiritually. Contrary to those who have no experience with American slavery, he noted, it is not voluntary for the masters either and many would run away from it if they could.⁵²

Despite the ferocity of their attacks, abolitionists in the Restoration Movement did not create religious division, as those in other religious traditions had done. In part, their failure was due to the absence of ecclesiastical structure. One of the distinctive marks of the Restoration Movement from its inception was the return to an Apostolic church governance with each congregation independent of every other one and under the oversight of its own elders. The lack of ecclesiastical organization had a tendency to defuse the tension over slavery. No position on the matter in one congregation could be forced upon other congregations through an overarching, centralized organizational structure. Abolitionists could not work to seize control of central, decision-making bodies or split conventions along sectional or ideological lines. In the 1840s, however, there was a push in the Restoration Movement to adopt extra-congregational ecclesiastical organizations similar to those of orthodox denominations. Campbell himself came to believe it expeditious to have coordinated efforts to support preacher training and missionary work on the Convention Model of the Baptist Association, changing his mind from his earlier strictly-scriptural views because of his belief in the Providential role of America in ushering in the millennial era on earth by world evangelism. But the main force behind this push was D.S. Burnet who aimed to transform the Restoration Movement into a mainstream denomination. He was instrumental in the formation of the American Christian Bible Society in 1845 and the American Christian Missionary Society in 1849. Campbell disapproved of both and lived to see them become fault lines of division in the Restoration Movement in the 1850s.⁵³

Another factor taking the wind out of the abolitionists’ sails was the power of Campbell’s views on the separation of church and state and pacifism. Passage of the fugitive slave law in 1851 gave Campbell the opportunity to expose the unchristian character of the abolitionists’ strategy; for they began counseling Christians to openly rebel against the civil authorities and violate the law, and a law promulgated among “Christianized American citizens, under the men of their own choice.” If the law is unconstitutional, Campbell thought, then Christians should wait for the Supreme Court to so rule and if unpopular then Christians should vote out Congress and have it repealed. The Fugitive Slave Law, Campbell believed, found sanction in Article 4, Section 2 (and

⁵¹ A. Campbell, “Remarks on Milton Short’s ‘Abolitionism,’” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 5, No. 3 (March 1848), pp. 177-178.

⁵² A. Campbell, “Slavery,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Third Series, Vol. 6, No. 7 (August 1849), pp. 472-474.

⁵³ Earl Irvin West, *The Trials of the Ancient Order* (Germantown, Tenn.: Religious Book Service, 1993), pp. 116-142.

was supported by implication from Article 4, Section 1) of the U. S. Constitution. Moreover, America is a republic, Campbell argued, in which the sovereign people transfer limited sovereign legislative powers to Congress and vest it with making laws; thus, the people cannot annul law only Congress can. But even if Americans suffered under despotism, like that of the Roman Empire, God does not sanction rebellion against authority that he himself establishes (Rom 13:1-7). “God having prescribed no one form of political government,” Campbell wrote, “has equally sanctioned every form which society chooses to assume.” It brings no glory to God to dishonor that authority (I Pet 2:13-17). “In the affairs of this life—in all temporal and earthly matters—the civil law, the social compact, is our rule of action,” Campbell wrote, “in religion, in faith, in piety, God alone is Lord of the conscience.”⁵⁴ He wrote:

But that the Christian pulpit, *so called*, should preach up rebellion and violence, and seek to generate or increase a spirit of resistance to the powers that be—to the *ordinance of God*—is what I never expected to hear from men at the north, so long declaiming against the south for its doctrines of nullification and secession, and denouncing the unpatriotic and profane hand that would offer an act of violence to the ark of the covenant of our great and mighty nation.⁵⁵

On the Scriptural teaching of the treatment of fugitive slaves, Campbell cited Hagar, who after running away from her mistress Sarah was told by an angel of God to return and be in submission to her, and Onesimus, a runaway slave who Paul converted to Christianity and famously returned to his master, Philemon. This latter example, Campbell thought, overturns the Mosaic code forbidding the return of slaves (Deut 23:15-16) which was, in any case, restricted to non-Hebrews for the purpose of not defiling the temple and to grant the opportunity for non-Hebrews to join, and receive the benefits of living, with the people of God.⁵⁶

By 1851, Campbell sensed a growing awareness among Christians on both sides of the debate that America was headed down the road to disunion.⁵⁷ He recognized that his goal of preventing division in the church could be furthered by appealing not only to Christian duty to the civil authority and non-violence but also to the many benefits of American union. He made his case in a series of six articles on “Slavery and the Fugitive Slave Law” in 1851.

He began by asserting that God authored all proper human relationships and prescribed the duties of them. Among these are husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant, and magistrate and subject. These relationships, including “the idea of master and servant,” are as “old as the Bible” and “the idea of servitude is coeval with society, antediluvian and postdiluvian.” Whether voluntary or not, the relationship of master and servant is necessary for society to exist and thus, will and must always be. Moreover, this relationship is sanctioned in the tenth commandment instructing men not

⁵⁴ A. Campbell, “The Fugitive Slave Law,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 1 (January 1851), pp. 27-30.

⁵⁵ A. Campbell, “The Fugitive Slave Law,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 1 (January 1851), p. 32. Emphasis Original.

⁵⁶ A. Campbell, “The Fugitive Slave Law,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 1 (January 1851), pp. 29 and 31.

⁵⁷ In 1851, Campbell printed several letters from readers of *Millennial Harbinger* expressing this sentiment.

to covet their neighbor's "man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox nor his ass nor anything that is your neighbor's property. (Ex 20:17)." The Bible uses the Hebrew word for bondservant, Campbell pointed out, implying property ownership, and not the different Hebrew word for hired servant. This distinction is made again in the Mosaic Law (Lev 25 and Deut 15) and the first precept of the Jewish Judicial Code, Campbell stated, concerns the regulation of slavery (Ex 21:1-11). The same distinction between bondservant and hired servant is also made, and sanction given to it, in the New Testament, which uses the Greek word for bondservant in the critical passages and not the Greek word for hired servant. In no passage of Scripture, Campbell noted, is a slave commanded or permitted to run away. The closest case is the requirement, under the Jewish Judicial Code, that masters offer freedom to adult, male, Jewish slaves in the year of Jubilee, but not to women and children slaves. If the slave felt mistreated or exploited, he could choose to leave at that time (making compensation to his master); but if he found a home with his master, he could choose to be bound to him for life. But in no case was he to do what abolitionists counsel him to do and flee from his master.⁵⁸

In history there have been many instances of slavery and many manifestations of the master-servant relationship. The Bible documents the vast slave holdings of Abraham and Job, who were both righteous before God; a fact from which Campbell concluded, "Need we more clear, more striking, more invincible proof, that the holding of property for life in man, or the owning of man, or the relation of master and slave, is neither immoral nor irreligious in itself." Against this, abolitionists offer their own "bible," Campbell claimed, written by Voltaire and baptized by Jefferson, which reads "all men are born free and equal."⁵⁹ The practice of slavery to which the New Testament authors declared the Christian principles of slavery was the Greek and Roman models. The extent of slavery and the cruelty of its practice in those societies, Campbell noted, far exceeded that of the American experience. And yet, the New Testament instructs slaves to submit to their masters and masters to render to their slaves what is just and equal. The "invariable and immutable standard" of what is right and expedient is the Golden Rule, whose application, dictating the particular treatment that satisfies the rule, depends on time and place.⁶⁰ American slavery has no uniform system, Campbell pointed out, but varies from state to state and place to place both in law and practice, but its essential attributes conform to Scriptural guidelines while its practice must be made to conform to the Golden Rule.⁶¹

In defending the relationship between master and slave, Campbell considered himself as a defender, not of any existing or historical institution of slavery, but "the Bible from the assaults of infidels, skeptics, visionary theorists, and political demagogues." He was not against reform of American slavery, if and where it needed reform, but "annihilation is not reformation, nor reformation annihilation" as the abolitionists seemed to believe. Nor are abuses of slavery any more a justification for its

⁵⁸ A. Campbell, "Slavery and the Fugitive Slave Law—No. 1," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 4 (April 1851), pp. 201-206.

⁵⁹ A. Campbell, "The Fugitive Slave Law—No. 2," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 5 (May 1851), pp. 249-252.

⁶⁰ A. Campbell, "The Fugitive Slave Law—No. 3," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 6 (June 1851), pp. 309-315.

⁶¹ A. Campbell, "The Fugitive Slave Law—No. 2," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 5 (May 1851), p. 248.

abolition than abuses of marriage are for the abolition of marriage.⁶² The possibility of abuse justifies the regulation of slavery by “civil, moral, and religious statutes” that, to be efficacious, must be adapted to the relevant circumstances. The Fugitive Slave Law is one of these, Campbell thought. It makes it a crime to resist the due execution of the law, say in hiding a slave and attempting to prevent his arrest, but it does not forbid humane treatment of a runaway slave. The 1851 law differs from the 1793 Fugitive Slave Law, Campbell noted, only in the enlarged size of its penalties. Abolitionist resistance to this law demonstrates that they aim at disunion; for they did not counsel resistance to or call into question the constitutionality of the 1793 law. In doing so they ask Christians to do what they cannot without Heavenly censure do, Campbell claimed, which is rebel against the powers God established to secure no benefit in reforming the system. Christ does not sanction Christians sowing the seeds of disunion, creating discord, or exciting civil war on such grounds. Christians should shun even political association with demagogues bent on achieving such goals. Campbell found it particularly distressing that they sought to pull down the government of a country “so blessed by God and such a blessing to mankind” indeed “the greatest nation on earth which rose under God.”⁶³

Campbell thought that the abolitionists’ strategy had no chance of attaining its ostensible goal because it was based on an obsession with a single idea that has choked all others out of their heads and hearts. “Both the theory and the practice of American abolitionists is based upon a grand delusion—a radical mistake of human nature, as developed in these United States,” Campbell wrote, “which will ultimate in their mortification and defeat.” Moreover, they resist the law, fabricate and distort the practice of slavery in the South, and meddle in its affairs all the while demanding immediate emancipation without preparing either the slaves or the freemen for it. In Campbell’s judgment, the likelihood of the South reforming or abolishing slavery was greater before any abolitionist society began than it was in 1851. “And exactly in the inverse ratio of Northern interference, has that disposition diminished,” he wrote. Men’s minds can only be changed, Campbell concluded, by gentle persuasion and setting a fine example.⁶⁴

As an example of the difficulty of reconciling abolitionism with Christianity, Campbell offered Nathaniel Colver a Boston preacher who took place in the Boston riot over the Fugitive Slave Law. Colver was a vocal abolitionist and delivered a well-known sermon on the Christian duty to disobey this law. He began with two premises: a Christian has a duty to disobey any civil law that requires disobedience to God’s will and the Fugitive Slave Law is hostile to the law of God. Campbell heartily agreed with the first premise, but demurred to the second. Colver claimed that sending a slave back to his master sanctions all the evils of slavery. To which Campbell replied that a person cannot annul a law or institution by his own decree and that a person cannot judge the case without knowing the facts. The person who aids a runaway slave to freedom knows only the testimony of one party, which is never sufficient to judge any case. Colver cited the Old Testament law requiring Jews not to return to their masters non-Jewish slaves who

⁶² A. Campbell, “The Fugitive Slave Law—No. 3,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 6 (June 1851), pp. 316-317.

⁶³ A. Campbell, “The Fugitive Slave Law—No. 4,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 7 (July 1851), pp. 386-390.

⁶⁴ A. Campbell, “The Fugitive Slave Law—No. 4,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 7 (July 1851), pp. 390-391.

ran away from non-Jewish masters. Campbell responded that Christians live under the New Testament, in which Paul returned Onesimus to Philemon, and that the Mosaic Law in question referred only to Gentiles, not Jews. Finally, To Colver's claim that the Fugitive Slave Law legalized man-stealing, since every master was a man-stealer, Campbell reiterated that God Himself sanctioned slavery in every dispensation.⁶⁵ Concluding, Campbell wrote:

It is well know at the South, and at the North, that I am no advocate of American Slavery; that the only thing in our American institutions that I regret, as an incubus on our national prosperity, and as a shade on our national character, it this great political evil, which is a misfortune entailed upon us, rather than a crime perpetrated by us.

While, then, I conscientiously and benevolently sympathize with both extremes of our confederacy...I cannot but profoundly regret to witness the bad feelings and the development of a spirit of violence and insubordination, constantly indicating its fierce temper and fixed purpose to sow the seeds of disunion of intestine strife and commotion.⁶⁶

Campbell's critique of the abolitionists' strategy was challenged by Ovid Butler, a prominent abolitionist Christian from Indianapolis, Indiana and then attacked by Isaac Errett, a popular preacher in the Western Reserve of Ohio. Like Campbell, Butler feared division over the issue of slavery; but protested against the characterization of abolitionists as violently resisting the Fugitive Slave Law and stirring up or practicing war. He argued that the proper course for Christians was passive resistance in disobeying the law. "The central idea of Christian revelation," Butler claimed, was the brotherhood of man; it is "the radiating point of all Christian faith and Christian duty." And from this idea, he claimed that Christians had a duty to aid slaves in running away. Yet, he agreed with Campbell that Christians could not violently resist the civil law. From these two propositions, he derived his appeal to passive resistance. Campbell offered no rebuttal to Butler, presumably because he thought his letter promoted moderation and unity. He called it "a very sensible letter from a very sensible brother" who "speaks like a man and a Christian of good understanding and of good feelings."⁶⁷

Errett was the antipode of Campbell: abolitionist and pro-war. He set out his views in a famous article, "The Design of Civil Government" which Campbell reacted to in *Millennial Harbinger*. When the war broke out, Errett sought a military commission and failing to obtain one worked to encourage the Northern troops.⁶⁸ Unlike Butler's writings, Campbell saw Errett's attack as divisive and he gave it a strong rebuttal. Errett chided Campbell for using Hagar as an example justifying the return of runaway slaves on the grounds that she was Abraham's wife and not Sarah's slave and Onesimus on the grounds that Paul would have been convicted under the Fugitive Slave Law for harboring

⁶⁵ A. Campbell, "The Fugitive Slave Law—No. 5," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 8 (August 1851), pp. 425-430.

⁶⁶ A. Campbell, "The Fugitive Slave Law—No. 5," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 8 (August 1851), p. 429.

⁶⁷ A. Campbell, "Slavery and the Fugitive Slave Law—No. 5," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 8 (August 1851), pp. 430-434.

⁶⁸ Earl Irvin West, *The Trials of the Ancient Order* (Germantown, Tenn.: Religious Book Service, 1993), pp. 69-71.

a runaway slave. Campbell responded that Paul did not harbor Onesimus or keep him from capture, but treated him humanely, as any Christian can do under the American law and that the New Testament calls Hagar a bondwoman while the Old Testament says that an angel told her to return to her mistress and submit to her. Campbell denied Errett's premise that all runaway slaves have been mistreated and reiterated his view that a tribunal was necessary to determine the facts of each case.⁶⁹ Errett shot back with a letter recounting the terrible plight of the slaves followed by a 1832 quotation from Campbell himself on their bleak condition. He pointed out that no tribunals exist to determine the facts of each case. Campbell retorted that even if no tribunals existed this would not justify making each man his own tribunal. Furthermore, only a master can free his slave. To assist a runaway is not to set him free but merely aiding his flight. He pointed out that Errett simply assumes, instead of proving, that slavery itself is unjust and therefore, that every runaway is fleeing injustice instead of slavery. But this is the very point to be proved and to this point Campbell thought he had shown that slavery itself was sanctioned by God.⁷⁰

After visiting the Western Reserve in Northern Ohio Campbell was relieved to find brethren in compliance with the law and striving to prevent bad feelings between the North and the South. He concluded that all Christians agree on the following points:

1. That Christians must submit to every ordinance of man *for the Lord's sake*; as free, and not using their liberty for an excuse or cloak of wickedness and insubordination.

2. That Christians are not required to combine, in order to judge or punish them out of the church, or to unite in any political coalition or combination against the laws of the land.

3. That in the independence of the Christian congregations, they are not called upon to carry their resolutions and enactments beyond their own immediate congregation, or to make laws religious, or even economical, for other communities.

4. They are generally of opinion that slavery, as it is practiced in some States of this confederacy, is incompatible with human happiness, as respects both masters and servants, and sympathize equally with both.

5. That it cannot, in anyway, be abolished by the North.

6. That it cannot be abolished at the South, by any Abolition movement at the North.

7. That it cannot be abolished at the South, or any where, by professional Abolitionists.

8. That it never can be abolished at the South, on any premises that will locate the African race amongst the whites, or in the slave States.

9. That according to some suggestions which we have already uttered, it can be abolished only by one of two ways: by amalgamation or colonization abroad, or in some portion of our own country, exclusively given to them.

⁶⁹ A. Campbell, "The Design of Civil Government and the Extent of Its Authority," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 8 (August 1851), pp. 456-460.

⁷⁰ A. Campbell, "The Fugitive Slave Law—Once More," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 11 (November 1851), pp. 621-625.

10. That the only reasonable, plausible, or practicable way of abolishing slavery, is that proposed by the African Colonization Society.

11. That we, as a nation, have the means, and ought to apply them to send them back to Africa, with our language, our civilization, and religion.

12. And that this must be left to the discretion of their owners; but that it ought to be encouraged by the concurrence of the North, and through the General Government countenanced and aided in every practicable and generous way.⁷¹

Campbell called these his “deep and settled convictions.” Concluding, he wrote:

And although, I am constitutionally, religiously, and economically anti-slavery, in view of all my premises; yet, with the Bible in my hand, heaven in my eye, and humanity in my heart, I verily believe that our wisdom, our duty, and our privileges, all combine in treating our brethren at the South with all good feeling, with all sympathy and brotherly kindness, as they are worthy of it; and in leaving the issue to the openings of Divine Providence, and to the developments of time, that greatest of teachers—that most assiduous, most potent, and most successful of revolutionists.⁷²

Campbell’s views gained adherents, most notably the Cincinnati preacher Benjamin Franklin, but seemed unlikely to carry the day as the few vociferous abolitionists in the Restoration Movement began their counter attack. Yet, there was hope that the controversy among Christians would subside after Campbell’s 1851 discourse. This hope was voiced by a distinguished graduate of Bethany College and anti-slavery man who wrote that Campbell’s views were “unanswerable.” He thanked him for standing up for the “two greatest blessings ever vouchsafed to mankind—*Christianity as taught in the Bible, and Liberty as guaranteed by our Constitution*” and encouraged him to speak out even more to prevent Christians from becoming partisans in the destruction of the country. “Nothing has preserved us from division but our principles,” he wrote, “let them be inculcated anew” for the preservation of the Union and its blessings.⁷³

Abolitionist opposition to Campbell came mainly from Butler, who established a college in Northern Indiana as an anti-slavery counterpart to Bethany College, which was viewed by abolitionists as pro-slavery. Northwestern Christian University clashed almost immediately with Campbell’s school over fundraising. Campbell had solicited Christians in each state to endow a professorship at Bethany. Illinois agreed and Campbell was invited to attend the State Convention in 1853. Upon arrival, he discovered that an agent from NWCU had also come to Illinois for the same purpose and had asserted to the Convention that no Christian in free states could cooperate with Christian education in slave states. Campbell denounced NWCU, and by implication Butler, in the *Millennial Harbinger* for basing its plea on such grounds. The Board of NWCU shot back denying his charge and accusing Campbell of lying. After defending himself from the accusation, Campbell decided to visit Butler in Indiana and the matter was cleared up as a

⁷¹ A. Campbell, “The Fugitive Slave Law—Once More,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 11 (November 1851), pp. 631-632. Emphasis Original.

⁷² A. Campbell, “The Fugitive Slave Law—Once More,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 11 (November 1851), p. 632.

⁷³ H.C., “Friendly Notice of Our Articles on the Fugitive Slave Law,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 1, No. 11 (November 1851), pp. 655-657. Emphasis original.

misunderstanding. But the schools clashed again in 1855, when several students entered Bethany College with an anti-slavery agenda. They agitated against slavery on campus, delivering inflammatory sermons and set in motion a campus debate on free speech. Five students were expelled as a result and went to NWCU to enroll. When NWCU accepted them Bethany accused the school of a breach of the scholarly code, which if extended would break down college discipline.⁷⁴

Also in the 1850s, abolitionists sowed the seeds of division in the Restoration Movement's Missionary efforts. James Barclay helped form the American Christian Missionary Society in 1849 and applied to be selected as its first missionary to Jerusalem. But his Virginia lineage led an abolitionist, John Kirk of Ohio, to ask him for written responses to questions about his slaveholding. When Barclay left for Jerusalem without replying, Kirk contacted his congregation and John Tyler, an Elder, replied that Barclay had inherited a few slaves 12 or 15 years previously to whom he offered freedom upon leaving for his missionary work in Jerusalem. Only one accepted. Of the other four Tyler bought three, for a nominal fee, and took the other, an elderly women, into his care at home. Upon learning that Barclay still owned one slave, Kirk wrote to Isaac Errett demanding to know how he could support the ACMS under this condition. Errett saw that the issue came before the Ohio State Convention in May of 1852. Meanwhile, John Boggs of Ohio, one of the most active abolitionists in the Restoration Movement, attacked Barclay for not freeing his slaves outright before leaving. Barclay was also accused, by D. S. Burnett, of wanting to come back to America because he "had some servants hired out in Virginia." When the ACMS "with one voice" agreed to his return, abolitionists concluded that the Society was pro-slavery and pushed to create their own Missionary Society. Butler put out the call for a meeting in November of 1859 and Jonas Hartzell, next to Boggs the most active abolitionist in the Restoration Movement, delivered an address. The Christian Missionary Society was formed that year as an anti-slavery counterpart to the ACMS.⁷⁵

In addition to a counterpart university and missionary society, the abolitionists created an anti-slavery journal. Boggs founded the *Northwestern Christian Magazine* in 1854, which became *The Christian Luminary* in 1858, as a brotherhood version of William Lloyd Garrison's *The Liberator*. The journal had some success in raising abolitionist concerns in the North during the decade before the war.⁷⁶

Finally, abolitionists in the Restoration Movement clashed with its pro-slavery men in Kansas and Missouri. In the 1850s, Christians who had settled in these states to further the gospel were simply caught up in the turmoil. But the agitation itself was stepped up after passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which pro-slavery forces took to be a victory for their side. Abolitionists backlash descended into violence and polarized the two sides. The leader of the pro-slavery position in the Restoration Movement was James Shannon, who owned 10 slaves and authored *The Philosophy of Slavery, As Identified with the Philosophy of Human Happiness*. Before moving to Missouri,

⁷⁴ Earl Irvin West, *Elder Ben Franklin: Eye of the Storm* (Indianapolis: Religious Book Service, 1983), pp. 137-139.

⁷⁵ Earl Irvin West, *Elder Ben Franklin: Eye of the Storm* (Indianapolis: Religious Book Service, 1983), pp. 139-141.

⁷⁶ Earl Irvin West, *Elder Ben Franklin: Eye of the Storm* (Indianapolis: Religious Book Service, 1983), pp. 141-142.

Shannon was president of Bacon College in Kentucky and worked against an amendment to the state's Constitution to forbid slavery in Kentucky during a Constitutional Convention in 1849. In that year he became the second president of the University of Missouri, only 10 years after its founding in 1839. Shannon was denounced by Whigs in the Missouri legislature as early as 1852. When violence erupted in 1855-56, Shannon, who greatly admired J.C. Calhoun and favored secession, called for an invasion of Kansas and toured Missouri delivering speeches defending slavery, which he peppered with divisive anti-abolitionist rhetoric. He was even able to establish a pro-slavery line at the University of Missouri until he was dismissed, under pressure from anti-slavery forces, in 1856. His dismissal became inevitable when his views were rejected by his more moderate pro-slavery friends, including T.M. Allen who, as a board member of the University of Missouri, was influential in bringing Shannon there. But in the Restoration Movement, Shannon was a lone pro-slavery extremist. Most of the agitation came from the abolitionist side.⁷⁷

Campbell helped stem the tide of the surging abolitionist sentiment in the 1850s by reasserting his views on the separation of church and state and Christian pacifism, which were widely assented to in the Restoration Movement, as seen in Butler's acceptance of the principle of non-violence. The impetus for Campbell's restatement of his views was the controversy over the Kansas-Nebraska Act. He chided a group of Protestant Clergymen for petitioning Congress, as clergymen, against the bill. As citizens they have the same rights and privileges as all, Campbell claimed, but to have civil authority recognize them as clergymen is a Roman idea of an official church that Protestants should not embrace. The government in Washington was right to reject the petition on the grounds of separation of church and state. This principle was exhibited by Jesus Himself, Campbell stated, as He never embroiled Himself in political matters, refusing even to interfere in a family argument about inheritance. And, like Him, clergy would be neglecting their religious duties to be active in politics. It is especially troubling for them to be involved in a question that has "strong arguments on both sides," one that "only Providence, in time, will settle."⁷⁸ Campbell wrote:

Our *Magna Charta* guarantees to every man the right, and protection in that right, to think, believe, vote, and act in perfect harmony with the last and best dictate of his own reason and conscience. This is all that sound political prudence can ask or award and it is all that any true patriot, philanthropist or Christian, can ask for himself, his family, and the human race.⁷⁹

When war came, Campbell denounced it in no uncertain terms. War is never civil, he pointed out, but is always barbaric. James teaches that wars and disputes come from our lusts and failure to depend on God. The first war occurred in heaven and was led by Satan in rebellion to God. Sectarian wars and political wars are always unprofitable and avoidable if the disputants will only humble themselves and submit their

⁷⁷ Earl Irvin West, *The Trials of the Ancient Order* (Germantown, Tenn.: Religious Book Service, 1993), pp. 280-313.

⁷⁸ A. Campbell, "The Protestant Clergy of New England and Chicago v. the Nebraska Bill," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 4, No. 6 (June 1854), pp. 349-351.

⁷⁹ A. Campbell, "The Protestant Clergy of New England and Chicago v. the Nebraska Bill," *Millennial Harbinger*, Fourth Series, Vol. 4, No. 6 (June 1854), p. 350. Emphasis original.

dispute to arbitration. Christian nations have a special obligation to pursue pacific means to resolve conflicts. Christians slaughtering each other, Campbell wrote, “caps the climax of human folly and gratuitous wickedness.” And to witness civilized America “boasting of a humane and Christian paternity and fraternity” while also “boasting of your heathen brutality” and “satiating your furious appetites for fraternal blood, caps the climax of all human inconsistencies.”⁸⁰

Campbell thought that her tremendous prosperity has caused America to become puffed up and “enslaved to mammon.” The God that treated the children of Abraham to harsh conditions to awaken them to reformation will not spare America for “we are no better than they.” We should be grateful for God’s rebuke, Campbell thought, provided that we repent for our disobedience and division.⁸¹

His devotion to religious unity, and his belief in the millennial role of America, led Campbell to favor political unity. Union, Campbell wrote, means “being one” and has its climax in Paul’s statement that “you are all one in Christ Jesus.” Christian union, Campbell wrote, is based on seven facts: “one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.” The church is built on the fact confessed by Peter that Jesus “is the Christ, the son of the living God.” “Union and communion on this foundation are *practicable*,” Campbell wrote, “*on any other foundation, they are impracticable.*”⁸² To illustrate the importance of Christian unity, he pointed to political secession as an analogy. Campbell wrote:

Secessionism once instituted is not our union dissolved! Secessionism is only another name for disunion. “*United we stand, divided we fall*,” is a sort of self-evident proposition—it finds a response in every head and in every heart...Union has always peace and prosperity in its import. Disunion has discord and war in its bosom, latent or active. Unpleasant incidents will and must accrue, in spite of all theory, in spite of all confederacy! States may divide—the South against the North, or the West against the East. Discord and secession, once inaugurated, have no limit. Is not cannon the *ultima ratio regum*? Must it, too, be the last argument of these United States? Alas, then, wherein do we excel the despotism of absolute monarchies!⁸³

The widespread commitment in the Restoration Movement to Campbell’s views on peace eclipsed abolitionist agitation and maintained religious unity after the war broke out. As Campbell went into decline in old age, Franklin spearheaded the effort to further Campbell’s views in his own publication, *The American Christian Review*. Years before the war, in 1850 when Franklin first moved to Cincinnati he found the Christians there divided about slavery and caught up in the citywide turmoil over the issue. His personal experience with slavery was in its mild form as practiced in northern Kentucky. He came

⁸⁰ A. Campbell, “Wars and Rumors of Wars,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fifth Series, Vol. 4, No. 6 (June 1861), pp. 346-348.

⁸¹ A. Campbell, “Our National Troubles,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fifth Series, Vol. 4, No. 7 (July 1861), pp. 412-413.

⁸² A. Campbell, “Union, Union, Union,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fifth Series, Vol. 5, No. 1 (February 1862), pp. 49-50.

⁸³ A. Campbell, “Union, Union, Union,” *Millennial Harbinger*, Fifth Series, Vol. 5, No. 1 (February 1862), p. 50.

to deplore the injustice of slavery but realized that great wisdom would be necessary to design a workable plan of emancipation. Even though anti-slavery, Franklin was put on the defensive by abolitionists in the 1850s because he refused to put his views into print. Boggs accused Franklin of backing out of funding a abolitionist journal on the grounds that it would not make money. Franklin denied the charge and pressed by this treatment to defend himself went on the attack. In 1851 he wrote a series of eight articles in *The American Christian Review* on slavery and abolition. He wrote against the fanatical “one-idea” men who ruined the unity of Christians, the progress of the gospel, and the dream of restoring New Testament Christianity just to achieve their goal. He argued for a strict separation of church and state, concerned that abolitionists would subordinate the church to the state. Slavery was a political issue, Franklin thought, not a moral one and thus, no pulpit should be given over to discourses on slavery. Moreover, the political realm was adverse to the church because as Christians’ political activity waxed their involvement in the church waned and because political participation corrupted Christian character. When the war broke out, Franklin chastised Christians for swelling the ranks of the Republican party, thereby empowering it to bring disaster on the country. He considered such loyalty to and reliance on the state a betrayal of Christ. For Franklin, the church transcended all states and thus, the church is not a political voice, but belongs to God and must be true only to Him and His mission. These views not only helped to hold the Restoration Movement together during the war, but had a great influence on David Lipscomb in the development of his views on civil government.⁸⁴

Although rocked with dissent, the Restoration Movement did not divide over slavery or war, in large part because of Campbell’s views. As they were taken up by a new generation, of Lipscomb and others, instead of dividing the movement simply grew in the South, where Campbell’s vision dominated, and atrophied in the North, where Burnett’s vision dominated. The seeds of “division” planted in the 1840s by Burnett’s program of abandoning the Movement’s commitment to restoring the one, true church and instead creating merely another denomination among the rest would not show their fruit for another 60 years, when Burnett’s followers, the Disciples of Christ, were officially recognized as a separate religious body from Campbell’s followers in the churches of Christ.

⁸⁴ Earl Irvin West, *Elder Ben Franklin: Eye of the Storm* (Indianapolis: Religious Book Service, 1983), pp. 142-149.