

December 1972

## North Carolina Churches Face Emancipation and the Freedmen: An Analysis of the Role of Religion During Presidential Reconstruction, 1865-1867

Roberta Sue Alexander  
*University of Dayton*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr>

---

### Recommended Citation

Alexander, Roberta Sue (1972) "North Carolina Churches Face Emancipation and the Freedmen: An Analysis of the Role of Religion During Presidential Reconstruction, 1865-1867," *University of Dayton Review*. Vol. 9: No. 3, Article 6.

Available at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr/vol9/iss3/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Dayton Review by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu), [ecommons@udayton.edu](mailto:ecommons@udayton.edu).

# **North Carolina Churches Face Emancipation And The Freedmen: An Analysis Of The Role Of Religion During Presidential Reconstruction, 1865-1867**

Roberta Sue Alexander

After the Civil War, whites and blacks in the South faced the difficult problem of adjusting to emancipation. From 1865 to 1867, in that period known as Presidential Reconstruction, the North generally left Southern whites and blacks alone to solve this problem themselves. But in every area—politics, economics, education, social relations, and religion—the two races proposed different solutions. Blacks wanted true freedom; whites felt that blacks were unable to handle the responsibilities of freedom.

Religious groups played a significant role in this struggle. In the white churches, religious leaders helped develop rationales for the prevailing attitudes of white superiority and its corresponding paternalism toward blacks. In the black churches, religious leaders became community and political leaders, demanding true freedom and equality. Because of the different views of whites and blacks, churches began to divide along racial lines during this period. Indeed, the religious developments which took place during the two years immediately after the Civil War set the pattern for the South for the next one hundred years.

Despite the significance of religious factors in Presidential Reconstruction, there are few in-depth studies of the ways Southern blacks and whites adapted to the end of slavery in the area of religion. In order to undertake such an in-depth study of these developments as well as an analysis of the attitudes of the Southern white and black churches toward emancipation, this author has chosen North Carolina for a case study. Developments in the Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and Episcopal churches will be explored. These were the most influential churches, not only in North Carolina, but throughout the South, for the vast majority of Southerners—both black and white—belonged to one of these religious groups.

After the war, Southern white churchmen maintained, as they had before the war, that blacks were inferior to whites. Like most white Southerners, they felt blacks had to be kept "in their place." They believed that religion was one excellent means by which blacks could be controlled. Therefore, they generally proposed two approaches to accomplish this end. First, blacks were to be given religious education which would teach them their "proper place" in society. And second, blacks had to be kept in an inferior position if they stayed in the white churches.

Obviously, most North Carolina whites did not bluntly state that religion could be an instrument for social control. Instead, they subtly used "code words" or "code phrases." For example, most white North Carolina clergymen and North Carolina churches, as well as the North Carolina lay press, issued calls for the religious instruction of the freedmen. But that instruction, they insisted, had to be done by white Southerners. And in explaining why Southerners should control the freedmen's religious education, they revealed their paternalistic, racist attitudes as well as their fear that Northern or black teachers would urge Southern blacks to insist on their full rights as citizens. The Reverend C. H. Wiley's comments were typical. Wiley, a political as well as a religious leader in North Carolina, felt that "the only effectual way to shut out foreign interference, and to arrest dangerous political agitations" was for Southern whites to educate blacks.<sup>1</sup> The *Newbern Commercial* noted that "the question is not whether the negro shall be taught, but by whom he shall be taught." It argued that it was in the interests of whites "to take the entire education of the negro in hand, and direct and control it . . . The Southern people who have been brought up with the negro and thoroughly understands his nature and peculiarities are the proper teachers for the negro."<sup>2</sup>

White North Carolinians of the Baptist faith also felt they had an obligation to give religious instruction to blacks. In November of 1865 at the Baptist State Convention, the committee "appointed to suggest some plan of instruction for colored people" reported that the "religious instruction of our Colored people" was "a special duty imposed by the Providence of God on Southern Christians." The Convention urged all its member churches to establish Sunday schools for black children.<sup>3</sup>

While this call was couched in noble terms, the Pee Dee Baptist Association clearly showed that religious instruction for blacks was tied more to a desire for social control than to humanitarian concerns. The Association adopted the report of its Committee on Religious Instruction of our Colored Population, which argued that the religious instruction of blacks was a "work of vast importance." The report maintained that blacks, "ignorant and credulous, and possessing lively emotions and strong passions, may easily become a dangerous and baneful element in every community." But it contended that "the same characteristics that render them so dangerous if left to themselves or to be moulded by unprincipled men, will make them harmless and useful if surrounded by proper influences." Thus the way to "secure the peace of our own neighborhoods and the prosperity and well-being of the State at large" was "to instruct and guide the negro into paths of quiet and honest industry." The report also pointed out that if Southerners did not do this work, Northerners, "who . . . are not so well qualified for the task, will go in among them and mould them according to their own will."<sup>4</sup>

Most other North Carolinians were not as explicit as was the Pee Dee Association in stating why religious education for the freedmen by Southern whites was necessary. But implicitly the message was the same. The *North Carolina Presbyterian* attacked those Northern Presbyterians who came to the South to preach to and to teach blacks.<sup>5</sup> It felt that Northern teachers did not understand "either their



nature or their wants." Instead, Southerners, because they were "brought up" with blacks, were "the best fitted to impart instruction both as regard their temporal and spiritual affairs."<sup>6</sup> The 1866 meeting of the North Carolina Presbyterian Synod, after proclaiming "that, at no previous period of our history, has there been a deeper, a more generous, or a more wide-spread concern for the religious instruction of the African race among us than at present," explained that it "regard[ed] this work as peculiarly our own."<sup>7</sup>

J. P. McPherson, a Presbyterian from Shoe Hill, North Carolina, wrote in the *North Carolina Presbyterian* that it was the duty of white North Carolinians to "raise" the black man up "to the dignity and blessedness of a child of God." But he added that "this obligation presses" on Southerners "with peculiar force— . . . because in this way we can best prevent a war of races . . ." He felt that by "Preach[ing] Christ . . . to the colored man," blacks would see that Southern whites had an "earnest desire to compass his highest good . . . In this way, then, we take the best means for allaying the prejudice which so many of his race have against us." Then he argued that Southerners could best teach blacks because they "know the negro, his character, his style of thought, his manner of expressing himself, and the best method of presenting truth in such a way that he may comprehend it."<sup>8</sup> One might wonder what "truth" McPherson intended to impart to the freedmen.

North Carolina's white Methodists similarly urged local churches to give blacks religious training. But they too did so less out of humanitarian concerns than out of a fear of Northern teachers and their equalitarian ideals. The *Episcopal Methodist* recognized that there was a "strong prejudice" in North Carolina against those who taught blacks. But it argued that "it is our duty to take hold of them and educate them morally and intellectually." It pointed out that the Methodist General Conference had adopted a resolution recommending " 'to our people the establishment of day-schools under proper regulations and trustworthy teachers, for the [black] children.' " It also noted that North Carolina Methodist bishops had endorsed this resolution. But most important, it explained that "somebody will teach them if we do not. If Northern teachers, or if Southern teachers with Northern sympathies, are left alone to do the work it is not difficult to see that sentiments hurtful to our interests as a population, both white and colored, will be inculcated."<sup>9</sup>

The *Episcopal Methodist* openly voiced the fears and the beliefs of most white North Carolinians when it contended that Northerners coming to the South to teach blacks were "not . . . apt to teach them doctrines calculated to promote harmony and good will between the two races." Only Southern whites could teach blacks "their true relation." It concluded by asserting that "the negro knows he is not equal to the white man and he will not attempt to assume it, if properly taught." Thus the "proper" education of the freedmen was the "greatest safe-guard" against social equality.<sup>10</sup>

The same attitudes which motivated white Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist Churches to call for the education of the freedmen can also be seen in the organization of the churches themselves. The church structure was designed to be a con-

stant reminder to blacks that, although they were free, they were still inferior. Sections of the churches were set apart, usually in the galleries, for blacks. The only exception to this was that in some large churches in urban areas one service on each Sunday was held for the benefit of blacks, "when the whites take the galleries, if they choose to attend, and the colored people occupy the body of the church." At these services, however, the white minister would usually deliver a sermon "particularly suited" for his black congregation. He would remind the freedmen of such things as the necessity to work diligently and faithfully and to abstain from political activities.<sup>11</sup>

Partly because of these segregation policies, many blacks wanted to form their own churches. And while North Carolina Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists agreed that blacks were inferior and that they had to be controlled, they disagreed as to whether efforts should be made to keep the freedmen within the white churches. The Southern Presbyterian Church, in 1865, resolved that the "ecclesiastical separation of the races would 'threaten evil to both races, and especially to the colored.' " It urged local churches " 'to dissuade the freed people from severing their connexion with our churches, and to retain them with us as of old.' "<sup>12</sup> In an attempt to carry out these instructions, the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of North Carolina, at its October, 1865 meeting in Fayetteville, adopted several resolutions calling for "unintermitted labor on the part of the church" to keep blacks in the church and to attract new black members.<sup>13</sup> A year later, the Southern Presbytery again claimed that "it is inexpedient that there should be an ecclesiastical separation of white and colored races." And again it urged "ministers and churches . . . to exert themselves to give the Gospel" to blacks.<sup>14</sup>

Unlike the Presbyterians, North Carolina Baptists encouraged blacks to form their own churches. The State Baptist Convention and many of the regional Associations issued reports and passed resolutions recommending that black Baptists be allowed to withdraw from white churches and be encouraged to form their own churches if they wished. At an October 1865 meeting of the Eastern Baptist Association, for example, the report proposed by the Committee on Colored Membership was adopted. This report "commend[ed] to imitation the example of the church at Wilmington in organizing into a separate church her colored members when it is practicable." But the report also pointed out that in "most, if not all of our country churches" such a separation would not be practicable. Therefore, it recommended that blacks "who have and still prove worthy, be retained by the churches." But blacks "who have proved unfaithful to the relations they sustain to their church and to their former masters while that relation existed" were to be "promptly" excluded from the church.<sup>15</sup> Clearly, these Baptists feared that "unfaithful" blacks would indoctrinate the better-behaved freedmen with thoughts of racial equality.

The Pee Dee Association generally agreed with the Eastern Association. It felt that churches had to decide for themselves whether to "retain in their fellowship their colored members," or to encourage them "to form separate and independent organizations." However, the Association recommended that, "for the present, . . .

where they [blacks] are disposed to remain and submit to the regulations . . . , they be allowed to do so, and that every effort which the circumstances of the case will justify be made to render them intelligent and active church members." On the other hand, if blacks wished to withdraw, the Association urged whites to give them "such aid and encouragement . . . as may be compatible with the interests and duties of each body."<sup>16</sup>

Many blacks took the latter option and formed separate Baptist churches. This separatist movement was one of many ways in which blacks asserted their newly-acquired freedom. Blacks early saw that emancipation had not altered the inferior position they held within the white Baptist churches. They were still required to sit in the galleries or in the back of the church. They were not allowed to participate in church government. It was also clear that they were expected "to observe all the social barriers that existed between slave and master." These factors, combined with the whites' encouragement of the formation of black churches, led to separation.<sup>17</sup> In November of 1865 black Baptists in Chapel Hill formed their own church, although they continued to use the white Baptist church for their services and meetings until 1871.<sup>18</sup> In Wilmington, the Orange Street Baptist Church was formed by blacks in the summer of 1866.<sup>19</sup> By April of 1866 blacks in Murfreesboro had formed their own church, but they used the white church for their services.<sup>20</sup> Then in November, they built their own church "for the erection of which our citizens of every class contributed cheerfully." They hired a black minister, L. W. Boon. Boon noted that his church would temporarily stay within the bounds of the predominantly white Chowan Association. But he predicted that by May of 1867 there would be twenty black churches with approximately 3,000 members in that Association. At that time, he proposed, these black churches should form their own Association. Boon asked for the "cooperation of the ministers of the Chowan Association, without whose aid and countenance he desires not to take a step."<sup>21</sup>

The Colored Baptist Church of Raleigh, with three hundred members in December of 1866, had been established for "many years." But they had worshipped in the basement of the city's white Baptist Church when it was not occupied by the white members. In a petition to the state legislature on December 1, 1866, these blacks explained that they had "long felt the necessity of a separate house of worship, but the . . . kindness of the white bretheren, in connection with our poverty, has induced us to adapt ourselves to the situation without complaint." But since emancipation, they felt that their "religious enjoyment, and usefulness . . . would be greatly promoted, by having a separate organisation, and distinct house of worship. . . ." But they did not have the money "to purchase a suitable lot." Therefore they asked the legislature to grant them a half-acre or so of state property so they could build a church, "to be used & occupied by us, until such time as the State may need said lot for public purposes." This petition was signed by the eight "white officers" and the six "colored deacons" of the Baptist Church of Raleigh.<sup>22</sup> However, the Joint Standing Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds recommended that the request be denied.<sup>23</sup> The legislature obviously agreed, for no land was granted.



Many other North Carolina black Baptists chose to remain within the white churches.<sup>24</sup> It is impossible to discover why they chose to do so. Perhaps, as in the case of the Raleigh blacks, money was the cause. For blacks in the countryside, distance as well as the lack of financial resources might have been the reasons. Or perhaps they were indeed happy within the white churches. White ministers did teach them and their children to read and write, and Sunday schools for blacks were started in many white churches.<sup>25</sup> But the trend toward separation in the Baptist faith, started during Presidential Reconstruction, continued. In May of 1867, J. D. Huffman, a well informed white minister, estimated that the white Baptist churches had "retained only a fragment of their 'very large' colored membership which existed at the close of the war."<sup>26</sup> And in 1867, black Baptists did form their own General Association. In 1869 they held their first state convention<sup>27</sup>. And by 1872 the two races were entirely separated.<sup>28</sup>

The developments in the Methodist churches of North Carolina closely paralleled those of the Baptists. The Southern Methodists were immediately forced to face the issue of the separation of blacks from their congregations because of the already well-organized black Methodist organizations — the African Methodist Episcopal Church and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. In 1866, the annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of North Carolina received memorials from the Zion African Churches of New Berne and Fayetteville, asking that the churches they were currently using be "conveyed" from the white to the black Methodist organization.<sup>29</sup> However, the committee to whom these petitions were referred rejected the requests for an outright transference of property. But the white North Carolinians did agree to abide by the rule of the General Conference, "that whenever entire churches and congregations shall have voluntarily left us and united with the African M. E. Church, the Trustees be advised to allow them the use of the house of worship heretofore solely occupied by them, as before they left our church."<sup>30</sup>

While these and other similar cases were easily solved,<sup>31</sup> the events at the Front Street Methodist Church in Wilmington during 1865 led to bitterness and suspicions on both sides—white and black. The white minister, Reverend L. S. Burkhead, set the tone when, after Union troops occupied Wilmington in the winter of 1864-1865, he denounced the freedmen for being "intoxicated with the bright visions of their own importance . . . , all filled with [ideas of] . . . social supremacy and political equality." He also specifically attacked a Chaplain Hunter, who had previously delivered what, to whites, was an inflammatory sermon to the black portion of the Front Street Church congregation.<sup>32</sup> Hunter, a North Carolina slave before the war, was, in 1865, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States<sup>33</sup> and a chaplain in the United States army. He had told the black congregation that they were now free. But more important, he told blacks that they were equal to whites and deserved all the opportunities and privileges to which all Americans are entitled. That same afternoon Burkhead wrote that Hunter had preached a "pure anti-slavery gospel," dashed with the radical spirit of political intrigue. . . ." As a result, Hunter had unsettled all of the freedmen's "former principles and ideas

of subordination." Moreover, "some of the class leaders . . . seemed already in imagination to be walking the streets of the capital of the nation and listening to their own silver-toned voices dispensing the 'glad tidings' of the Greeley and Sumner gospel to the Congress of the United States."<sup>34</sup>

In response to these attacks, the black members of the church petitioned General J. C. Scofield, then the commander of the occupying Union troops in North Carolina. They explained that they were "under the jurisdiction of the M. E. Church, South, whose teachings are in opposition to the interests of the Government of the United States." Therefore they asked to be allowed "to transfer" their "relation to the A. M. E. Church of the U. S." They told Scofield that they wished "to dispense with the services of the Rev. Mr. Burkhead, appointed by the North Carolina Methodist Episcopal Conference, South" and replace him with Chaplain Hunter. They also wanted Scofield to give them "possession of our church property" and to "protect us in the worship of God according to the dictates of our own consciences." Burkhead retorted by accusing Chaplain Hunter of merely manipulating the congregation for his own ends.<sup>35</sup>

Scofield ordered a compromise. He ruled that the black members of the congregation would use the church for half the day, "when the pulpit will be occupied by such minister, white or colored, as the colored members may select." Whites would use the church for the rest of the day. But members of both races could attend the services of whichever minister, white or black, they chose. Burkhead was furious. He claimed that the order was "enough to try a second cousin of Job." And he predicted that the decision would "kindle the spirit of envy, hatred and revenge; and thus arrays the negroes against the whites in bitter controversy which must necessarily tend to greatly damage both parties."<sup>36</sup>

Given Burkhead's feelings, it is not surprising that the compromise failed to end the disquiet. On June 18, Burkhead, at the opening of his service, "made some remarks . . . against colored persons, whether soldiers or otherwise, presuming to take seats with the 'superior' class in the lowest part of the house." A white observer felt that these remarks were "altogether uncalled for, and alike insulting to the colored soldiers and their [white] officers present." He pointed out that there was only "one colored man seen below and he a well-dressed soldier, behaving as respectfully as any person." *The Wilmington Herald* agreed that Burkhead would have been wiser if he had spoken privately to the "offending" black soldier. But it also argued that "there must be taken into the act . . . the hostility the blacks first showed in this Church" by attempting "to eject the whites entirely," thus creating "a strong feeling against them; and then the natural prejudice of the white people against association with the blacks" also had to be considered.<sup>37</sup> The tensions at the Front Street Methodist Church did not diminish until October of 1865 when the black members bought another building for their exclusive use.<sup>38</sup>

White members of the Fifth Street Methodist Episcopal Church of Wil-



mington obviously agreed with the attitudes expressed by Burkhead and the *Wilmington Herald*. In January of 1866, members of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church asked the board of the Fifth Street Church for the use of their church for one-half of each day. The board, by a unanimous vote, refused. The members of the board believed that such an arrangement "would be detrimental to the peace, comfort and best interests of our church." They were clearly bitter because these blacks had left their church to form their own church. Therefore, the board resolved: "That colored people separated from our church without any provocation on our part; that the history of the past shows how earnest and constant our labors have been for their salvation; and that, notwithstanding they are not now under any spiritual guidance, we, nevertheless, feel the same earnest desire for their good moral deportment, . . . and final salvation. . . ." <sup>39</sup>

Despite the obstacle of poverty, many black Methodists, like black Baptists, chose to leave the white church organization completely. The tabular statement issued by the annual convention of North Carolina Methodists in November of 1866 showed an increase of almost 2,400 white members over 1865. But black membership declined by over 2,000 from the 1865 figures and by almost 7,000 from the 1860 figures.<sup>40</sup> And of those blacks who chose to remain members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, many protested their inferior status. In Wilmington, throughout 1865, Reverend Burkhead complained that every Sunday some blacks tried to sit in that portion of the church designated for whites only. However, he noted that on each occasion he was successful in getting them to move to the gallery.<sup>41</sup> In Salisbury, the *Carolina Watchman* reported that in May of 1866 "an ill-advised negro woman tested . . . her supposed privilege under the 'civil rights bill,' to seat herself among the white people." Although the minister stopped the service to tell her that a seat was "provided" for her in the gallery, thereby causing her to leave the church, the *Watchman* was disturbed by her "insubordinate" behavior. Noting that "our churches are built with galleries for the accommodation of colored members," it claimed that the gallery seats were just as comfortable as those on the first floor. Thus the black woman should have been satisfied with "the place appointed for her color."<sup>42</sup>

Unlike the white-dominated Methodist churches, the A. M. E. and A. M. E. Zion churches enjoyed rapid growth in North Carolina. By 1869 the A. M. E. Church of North Carolina had fifty ministers and 7,431 members.<sup>43</sup> By the end of 1865, the A. M. E. Zion Church of North Carolina had 7,267 members belonging to fifty churches, thirty-five of which had been begun or had switched from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South during 1865.<sup>44</sup>

While it is impossible to determine with certainty why many black churches chose to renounce their affiliation with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South in order to join either the A. M. E. or the A. M. E. Zion Church, the resolutions adopted by the Wesley Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church of Raleigh may be typical of the thoughts of most North Carolina black Methodists. On April 16, 1865 this church group held a meeting "to take in to consideration the propriety

of transfuring [sic] our Church to the A. M. E. Church and resolve our connection with the Methodist E. Church South." These blacks explained that they took this action because the white Southern church had seceded from the Methodist Episcopal Church twenty-one years before "for the purpose of perpetuating Slavery." They also accused the Southern church of having "taught rebellion [sic]." They explained that they were "compelled to liston [sic] to her ministers till the coming of the Fedarel [sic] Army, (and) now we Desiar [sic] to dispenche with the Services of men whos [sic] fidelity to the government by us is doubted in order therefore that we may be able to worship God according to the dictates of our consciences [sic]. . . ." <sup>45</sup>

Yet from the scant evidence available, it seems that these black churches tried to create and maintain good relations with North Carolina whites. At the 1865 Convention of the A. M. E. Zion Church of North Carolina, resolutions were passed along these lines. It was resolved that

. . . whereas, Moses was not permitted to lead the children of Israel into the promised land because he called his brethren rebels, . . . and as we are ministers of the gospel of peace, therefore

*Resolved*, That it be our duty to avoid all irritative expressions both in our private and public discourse, that we may be wholesome examples to our congregations . . . <sup>46</sup>

Another resolution echoed the same theme when it noted that

*Whereas*, For the preservation of peace it is necessary that all just laws should be obeyed; therefore—

*Resolved*, That we will at all times counsel obedience to lawful authority, and impress upon our people the necessity of honesty and industry, that the lands may be cultivated, the wastes built up, and that the desolate parts of the land may bud and blossom as a rose. <sup>47</sup>

A third resolution thanked the Methodist Church, South for "the favors we have received" from many of their ministers, "who have extended the friendly hand and cheered our heart when we were ready to faint." <sup>48</sup> A fourth resolution was the only one which had even a hint of anything which whites could interpret as threatening to them and their position in Southern society. The resolution argued "that as this is our native land, here we design to stay, acting our part as patriotic citizens, engaging in every thing that will conduce to the well being of the entire people of this our beloved country." <sup>49</sup>

The A. M. E. Zion Church of North Carolina, like the white churches, also was active in educating blacks. But of course its motives were different. At the December, 1865 Convention, those attending urged young black men and women to qualify themselves "to fill important stations" in the church. And they recommended that the local churches encourage "those now capable by appointing them as superintendents and teachers in our Sabbath Schools," which were "the nursery of the church" out of which would come "the material . . . to organize the Army of Reserve to carry forth the hallowed crusade of mercy and grace." <sup>50</sup>

The Committee on Education reported that "when compared with that period when we could only look through a glass darkly, education is now in a flourishing condition." However, it is noted that the ministry must "keep the importance of this subject constantly before the people; otherwise we can not expect the blessings of this favorable opportunity to be fully realized." It also argued that "the importance of establishing day schools wherever it is possible can not be too strongly urged." Then the Committee proposed several resolutions, all of which were adopted. The first resolution thanked "our (white) friends who have sacrificed so much to extend the blessings of education to the rising generation of our people." But the second resolution stressed "the necessity of encouraging colored teachers wherever capable ones can be obtained." Another resolution applauded a proposal to build a Manual Labor School in North Carolina.<sup>51</sup>

The Convention delegates also noted that there were problems in their educational efforts. In "an appeal . . . to the Benevolent Public," they explained that while their members "will go forth . . . to organize churches, . . . to gather the lost sheep of the House of Israel, . . . [and] to organize both Sabbath and day schools wherever it is possible," they could not do so effectively because "there are great masses of . . . [freedmen] who have no books nor means to obtain them." Therefore, they asked for donations "either of money or books" from those "whose hearts overflow with benevolence toward this long-oppressed people. . . ."<sup>52</sup>

Only the Episcopal Church escaped the tensions, the problems, and the divisions experienced by the other Protestant churches in North Carolina. The major reason for this was the reunification of the Northern and Southern branches of the Episcopal Church in 1865. While Southern Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians split with their Northern counterparts before the Civil War over the issue of the morality of slavery, the Southern Episcopal churchmen established a separate church in 1861 only out of the necessity of political disunion. Therefore, reunification after the war was a simple matter.

One of the results of this reunification was a well-financed and extensive program of education for the freedmen. Under the auspices of the Protestant Episcopal Freedmen's Commission, founded in 1865 to provide "religious and secular instruction" for the freedmen, Northerners and Southerners worked together with a minimum of tension or suspicions. The Commission was especially successful in North Carolina. The Episcopal leader of the state, Bishop Thomas Atkinson, was a member of the Commission. He and the Episcopal press of North Carolina, the *Church Intelligencer*, worked hard to allay white fears about the Commission. The *Church Intelligencer* often reminded its readers that the Freedmen's Commission "contemplate[d] no political results."<sup>53</sup> It also explained that the Commission "was gotten up after consultation with Southern Bishops, and Clergy and Laymen. . . . Its operations among us are to be under the guidance of the proper ecclesiastical authority here. With this safeguard," it argued, there was no danger. "We have little fear that any fanaticism will be allowed to rule its counsels."<sup>54</sup>

In his 1866 annual address to the Episcopal Convention of North Carolina, Bishop Atkinson echoed the same theme. He called the establishment of the Freedmen's



Commission "one of the most benefit acts of the late [Episcopal] General Convention," because it "furnished a means of aiding the colored population which is effective and altogether safe." And he reminded his audience that "the practical question is not whether they shall be taught, but by *whom* they shall be taught. Teachers they have already. . . . Shall they be such as will impart sound instruction, and be under our direction, or shall they be such as chance or fanaticism may send?"<sup>55</sup>

It is thus clear that although the North Carolina Episcopalian organization, unlike the other Protestant groups discussed, were willing to work with Northern Episcopalians, it still retained a belief in black inferiority. The *Church Intelligencer* argued that slavery was "the true and normal condition" of blacks. Therefore, it had "no high hopes for the future" of the black race. In fact, it expected to see the "gradual decay" of blacks, "and, at no distant date, their almost complete extinction."<sup>56</sup> And it felt that Southern whites were more qualified to teach the freedmen because "they know the subjects they have to deal with."<sup>57</sup>

Yet the attitudes of the Episcopalian Church tended to be slightly more liberal than those of the other churches discussed. The theme of social control was still there; but it was tempered by a parallel theme calling for the elevation of the freedmen so they could become better, more active citizens. Bishop Atkinson expressed these two themes in his annual address to the 1865 North Carolina Episcopal Convention. First, he admitted that slavery may have been immoral, a thought which would never have been uttered by the clergy of the other Southern churches previously discussed. He explained that "some of us have ever feared, while the colored people were in the condition of slavery, that the power and control which the white race possessed over them was not exercised in such a way as to make us acceptable to God." He did feel that there were "kind feelings" between master and slave. He also praised the efforts of the masters to provide their slaves not only with "physical comfort," but also with religious training so blacks could "progress from barbarism to civilization, from Heathenism to Christianity." But he argued that the slave system was "no doubt defective, better adopted to the early stage of a people's progress from the savage state, than to that which they have now reached."

Atkinson therefore urged whites to be both just and kind to the freedmen. "They have a right to wages for their labor." He also asked whites to "allow for the immediate intoxicating effect of so great and sudden a change in their condition. . . . We must allow for occasional instances of what seems to us folly, or perversity or ingratitude." But "above all," he told whites that it was their duty to provide blacks with "sound religious instruction" so they would not fall "into the hands of mischievous, and sometimes, no doubt, malevolent, fanatics which, would be a great calamity to them, and also to us." Therefore he called for the Episcopal clergy "to teach and to befriend the colored people, and especially to train . . . the children of that race."<sup>58</sup>

In May of 1866, Atkinson added another moral reason to his call for the education of the freedmen. He argued that blacks, "as a race," lacked the ability to take

care of themselves. Therefore “that class of our population . . . need all the efforts of Christians and philanthropists to avert from them ruin, and, it may be, even extinction.”<sup>59</sup> The *Church Intelligencer*, in October of 1865, sounded the same theme when it argued that it was the duty of whites, “no less to ourselves than to them—to do all that may be done, and as rapidly as it may be safely done, to educate and elevate” the freedmen. Blacks had “to be trained to the responsibilities and duties of their new position” as freed people.<sup>60</sup>

The 1865 North Carolina Episcopal Convention also urged whites to accept the freedmen’s new status and “to elevate the colored race as fast as it may come.” To accomplish this end, the Committee on the Religious Instruction of the Freedmen proposed several resolutions. One recognized, as no other church group discussed previously did, that the black man was truly free. It noted that “in view of the radical changes wrought in the colored man’s political, and, to a large degree, social condition, it is advisable that there should be radical changes also brought about in his religious and ecclesiastical relations—that to reach him with the teachings and blessings of the Church, it is the sense of this Council, that separate houses of worship should be provided as soon as practicable, (the white people, in this, aiding the colored,) . . .—that there should be separate Sunday schools and separate congregations—that colored superintendents and catechists should be secured and appointed when practicable . . .—that all colored congregations, when competent to form a parish, should have power . . . of electing their own pastors, and that the pastors may be either white or colored clergymen. . . .”

A second resolution asked the North Carolina clergy to seek out “at once . . . suitable colored men for catechists and Sunday school teachers, and to give them, as far as possible, personal instructions to fit them for these posts.” Another urged black Episcopal ministers “to come among their own people in this Diocese, and labor in their sphere with us. . . .” The Committee further recommended that “steps be taken . . . for the education of colored young men for the ministry of the Church to their own people in our midst.” Thus this Committee paved the way for separate but equal parishes. However, action on these resolutions was postponed until the next state-wide meeting.<sup>61</sup>

At the 1866 Annual Convention, held in May, these resolutions were adopted, largely due to the efforts and influence of Bishop Atkinson.<sup>62</sup> Atkinson told the Convention that “ministers of a people ought, as a general rule, to be of that people themselves; having, as far as may be, the same habits of thought, language, and feeling. . . .” He also noted that there were not even enough white ministers to take care of all the white communicants. Therefore if black ministers were not ordained, blacks might not have any ministers at all.

Obviously fearing that such logical arguments were not enough to persuade the Convention, Atkinson also maintained that “as with regard to schools, . . . the question is not whether there shall be colored Ministers, but what sort of colored Ministers these shall be?” He reminded the Convention that the other religious groups already had black ministers. Thus the real question was: Shall blacks have

ministers "taught in the [Episcopalian] Church, ruled by the Church, imparting the doctrines of the Church, or shall they be fanatics and political emissaries, self-commissioned, or sent by some foreign, and it may be hostile, society?"<sup>63</sup>

Once the resolutions were passed, the *Church Intelligencer* applauded the concepts expressed in the resolutions. It argued that schools had to be established to train blacks for the ministry, because "we must have *colored ministers* to carry the gospel *most effectively* to this class." It believed that the Church could not do "its full work for the colored man without the employment of colored clergyman [*sic*], and the sooner we have them . . . , the better."<sup>64</sup> Thus the Episcopal Church of North Carolina, like other religious groups, showed that it was unwilling to accept blacks within the local white churches on terms of complete equality. But unlike the other religions, the Episcopalians recognized that blacks were truly free. Therefore, they encouraged the freedmen to develop their own churches and their own leaders within the national and state church structures.

Nor were North Carolina Episcopalians satisfied with mere words. They translated their liberal rhetoric into action. Episcopalians established not only Sunday schools, which were the primary means of educating blacks in Southern Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches. They also began day schools. By May of 1866, the North Carolina Diocese had more schools and teachers for the freedmen than did any other diocese. They had established three parochial schools—in New Berne, Wilmington, and Raleigh—with six teachers, and about five hundred students.<sup>65</sup> There were also other day schools established, which were locally operated and supported. For example, in Gaston County, "the ladies of the family" of one of the principal owners of the High Shoals Iron Works began two schools, one for white and the other for black children. "A large number" of blacks were taught "the rudiments of an English education" and given religious instruction twice a week. On Sunday, there were two Sunday schools, again one for whites and one for blacks.<sup>66</sup> And perhaps most significant, in 1867 St. Augustine Normal School and Collegiate Institute was established in Raleigh to train black teachers and ministers. It was sponsored and supported jointly by the Diocese of North Carolina and by the Protestant Episcopal Freedmen's Commission.<sup>67</sup>

Thus the Episcopal Church of North Carolina, with the help of the national General Conference, began what was, for the time, liberal programs, establishing separate black churches and educating a black ministry. Of course, the Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians also had separate black churches and ordained black ministers. But these religious groups did not admit their black churches and black ministers into the church governing bodies. Only the Episcopalians accepted not only black ministers into the annual diocesan conventions, on a basis of equality, but also lay delegates from black churches.<sup>68</sup> Moreover, blacks who remained in white churches, while having to accept certain reminders of their supposed inferiority, did receive the same rights of burial in the churchyard, marriage in the church, confirmation, baptism, and visitation by the minister as did whites.<sup>69</sup> North Carolina blacks responded positively to these liberal programs as well as to the efficient and comparatively large educational system. Most black Episcopalians



remained in the Church and new black communicants joined in large numbers.<sup>70</sup>

Despite the success of these programs, some North Carolina Episcopalians opposed the liberal trends. One white communicant from Wilmington, labeling himself a "Confederate Ch[urch]man," wished that the Church would not "have 'nigger on the brain.'" He criticized a white Episcopal minister for teaching blacks to read and write because "all they are fit for, is to work & love God." And while he "was willing, if it be necessary to teach the nigger the Gospel in the Ch[urch]," he did not want "anything to do with the new-fangled notions now raging."<sup>71</sup>

In St. John's Church in Williamsboro, the Reverend H. H. Prouts began to teach his black communicants how to read and write in the summer of 1866. The entire white community rose up against him, making his educational efforts "a matter of personal malice against him." White spread "tales about him, and said many bitter things against him. . . ." Some refused to go to Church. Feelings became so intense that Prouts resigned and left for the North. Eliza Tillinghast, a member of a prominent and wealthy North Carolina family and one of Prouts' parishioners, bemoaned the actions of her neighbors. She remarked: "It does not look as if the war had humbled us much."<sup>72</sup>

The Reverend John Tillinghast also encountered stiff opposition to his educational efforts among the blacks in his Clinton, North Carolina church. The twenty-one year old Tillinghast set up a blackboard in his church in September of 1866 to teach blacks the alphabet. The white members of the congregation were so angered that they not only refused to attend services, but they also refused to speak to Tillinghast. One gentleman in the community felt that Tillinghast had erred in running "so counter to public opinion." He believed that it would have been better if he had "simply preached Jesus Christ" to the freedmen rather than "injure them as much as he has done, by attempting to give them *book learning*." Even a member of Tillinghast's family criticized his activities. She feared that teaching blacks the alphabet would "injure the darkeys—because it will increase the spirit against them."<sup>73</sup>

Many other North Carolinians also objected to blacks receiving religious training or holding religious meetings. Captain Charles A. Hill, a Freedmen's Bureau officer stationed in Elizabeth City, reported that during the summer of 1865 whites would not permit religious meetings by blacks unless directed and controlled by a local white minister "in the interest of the hitherto Secession Element." Whites, "by the force of public opinion," also prohibited the establishment of day schools for blacks. But he noted that by September, attitudes had changed. He argued that largely due to the efforts of the Freedmen's Bureau, religious meetings "were freely held." Also in Elizabeth City and in Hertford, the county seat of Perquimans County, all in the northeastern part of the state, "day schools are in contemplation."<sup>74</sup>

There is also evidence that elsewhere in North Carolina whites and blacks began to work together to further black religious education and to establish black churches. At the end of December, 1865, Colonel Eliphalet Whittlesey, head of the Freedmen's Bureau in North Carolina, reported that "in some instances" planters

Alexander: North Carolina Churches Face Emancipation and the Freedmen: An  
started schools for their black workers. He also noted that some churches were  
organizing Sabbath schools for black children.<sup>75</sup> In Charlotte, whites donated  
money to help blacks purchase a lot, build a church, and educate their children.<sup>76</sup>  
In Tarboro, blacks held a fair on Christmas Day, 1866, to raise funds for the  
African Methodist Church. Whites as well as blacks attended and the local paper,  
the *Tarboro Southerner*, applauded the effort.<sup>77</sup>

However, in some places, more trouble was still reported. In August of 1866, a  
fire, "thought to be the work of an incendiary," was discovered in the Orange  
Street Baptist Church of Wilmington, which was "used by the colored people as  
a place of worship."<sup>78</sup> In Cleveland County, the Freedmen's Methodist Episcopal  
Church was "burned to the ground" by whites.<sup>79</sup> In Tarboro in December of 1866,  
whites strongly objected to a black minister preaching to blacks at the bi-racial  
Methodist church. *The Southerner* feared that such a precedent would lead to  
"amalgamation" of the races "in all its terrors."<sup>80</sup> In 1867, blacks in Duplin County  
complained that whites had threatened them with violence for holding religious  
meetings.<sup>81</sup>

Thus, except perhaps within the Episcopal Church, white religious groups gen-  
erally retained their ante-bellum racist beliefs and kept blacks who remained in  
their churches in an inferior position. While the churches did attempt to educate  
blacks, they did so mainly in order to control them. Such attitudes probably made  
it even easier for many North Carolina whites to oppose black religious activities  
and education, sometimes to such an extent that violence, including arson, ensued.  
In response to these attitudes and actions, blacks formed their own churches and  
attempted to create an educated leadership so they could help themselves. Thus  
one of the significant developments within the Protestant churches in North  
Carolina during Presidential Reconstruction was the gradual shift from racially-  
mixed to totally segregated churches. The Episcopal Church represented the only  
exception. Here, largely because of the unification of the Northern and Southern  
branches of the church and because of the enlightened leadership of Bishop  
Atkinson, separate black churches were established and black ministers were  
trained, and then these churches and their ministers were admitted to the diocesan  
convention on a basis of equality by the end of the Reconstruction period. But  
there was even dissent to this program among some white Episcopalians. Thus  
most white Protestant churches in North Carolina failed to provide the moral  
leadership that would have been necessary to begin to reduce racial tensions.  
Suspensions and fears, on the part of both blacks and whites, increased; the races  
gradually moved farther apart.

*University of Dayton*

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Letter from Reverend C. H. Wiley to Reverend S. S. Markland of the Bethany Church, dated Greensboro, June 30, 1865, printed in *The Daily Standard* (Raleigh), July 22, 1865, p. 2. Hereafter referred to as *Standard*.
- <sup>2</sup> Reprinted in *Daily Sentinel* (Raleigh), June 9, 1866, p. 3. Hereafter referred to as *Sentinel*. There are no extant copies of the *Newbern Commercial*. See also the *Wilmington Journal*, November 22, 1866, p. 2 for similar views.
- <sup>3</sup> *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of North Carolina, Held with the Church at Forestville, November 1-4, 1865* (Raleigh: Biblical Recorder Book and Job Printing Office, 1866), November 4, 1865, p. 16 (hereafter referred to as *Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth Baptist State Convention*).
- <sup>4</sup> *Minutes and Proceedings of the Fifty-first Anniversary of the Pee Dee Baptist Association, Held with Forks of Little River Church, (Montgomery County), October 19, 20, 21, 1866* (Wadesboro: Argus Office, 1867), pp. 6-7 (hereafter referred to as *Minutes of Pee Dee Association*). North Carolina Baptists formed geographical associations for local decision-making. The Pee Dee Association, composed of Baptists from Anson, Richmond, Montgomery, Stanly, Moore, and Robeson counties, set policies for the south-central and south-eastern parts of the state.  
In the report cited above, the Pee Dee Association also recommended "the establishment of Sabbath Schools for the instruction of the colored people under the control of the churches . . ." (*Ibid.*)
- <sup>5</sup> See e.g. John Luther Bell, Jr., "Protestant Churches and the Negro in North Carolina During Reconstruction" (Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of North Carolina, 1961), pp. 1, 21-22 (hereafter referred to as Bell, "Protestant Churches"); *North Carolina Presbyterian* (Fayetteville), August 22, 1866, p. 2.
- <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>7</sup> *Minutes of the Fifty-third Session of the Synod of North Carolina, Held in Charlotte, on the 10th, 11th, 12th and 13th of October, 1866* (Fayetteville: N. C. Presbyterian Office, 1867), October 13, 1866, pp. 17-20. Hereafter referred to as *Minutes . . . Synod of North Carolina*.
- <sup>8</sup> *North Carolina Presbyterian*, August 8, 1866, p. 1. In response to these calls for the religious education of the freedmen, local Presbyterian churches established many "Sabbath-schools for blacks." (*Minutes . . . Synod of North Carolina*, October 12, 1866, p. 11.)
- <sup>9</sup> *The Episcopal Methodist* (Raleigh), July 17, 1867, p. 2.
- <sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>11</sup> *The Wilmington Herald*, June 30, 1865, p. 2 and September 9, 1865, p. 1; *The People's Press* (Salem), February 10, 1866, p. 2; Bell, "Protestant Churches," pp. 54-55; Reverend L. S. Burkhead, "History of the Difficulties of the Pastorate of the Front Street Methodist Church, Wilmington, North Carolina, For the Year 1865," *Annual Publication of Historical Papers* (Durham: Historical Society of Trinity College, 1908-1909), Series VIII, pp. 66-67 (hereafter referred to as Burkhead, "History").
- <sup>12</sup> Bell, "Protestant Churches," p. 6.
- <sup>13</sup> *The Daily Dispatch* (Wilmington), November 6, 1865, p. 2. At this meeting North Carolina Presbyterians also decided not to reunite with the Northern Presbytery. The North Carolinians felt that the "Northern churches had rendered reunion impossible" when they declared the Southern churches "out of fellowship" until they "acknowledged the sin of slavery." Even



after emancipation, the North Carolina Synod was unwilling to make such a declaration. (*Ibid.*)

- 14 *Ibid.*, November 29, 1866, p. 2, reporting the proceedings of the General Assembly of the Southern Presbytery, at their 1866 meeting in Memphis, Tennessee.
- 15 *Minutes of the Twenty-Second Annual Session of the Eastern Baptist Association, Held with the Church at Moore's Creek, October 3-4, 1865* (Raleigh: Biblical Recorder Book and Job Printing Office, 1866), October 4, 1865, p. 5 (hereafter referred to as *Minutes of Eastern Association*). The Eastern Association was composed of churches in New Hanover, Sampson, Bladen, Wayne, Duplin, Jones, Craven, Carteret, Lenoir, Beaufort, and Onslow counties. See also J. R. Davis, "Reconstruction in Cleveland County," *Annual Publication of Historical Papers* (Durham: Historical Society of Trinity College, 1914), Series X, pp. 17-18; Bell, "Protestant Churches," pp. 56-57; *Minutes of the Sixth Annual Session of the Central Baptist Association, Held with the Church of Franklinton, Franklin County, N. C., October 5th-7th, 1865* (Raleigh: Biblical Recorder Book and Job Printing Establishment, 1865, p. 13 (hereafter referred to as *Minutes of Central Association*).
- 16 *Minutes of Pee Dee Association*, p. 7.
- 17 Bell, "Protestant Churches," pp. 54-55.
- 18 *Ibid.*, p. 58.
- 19 *Wilmington Journal*, July 10, 1866, p. 3.
- 20 Lt. George S. Hawley to Capt. F. A. Seeley, April 30, 1866, Freedmen's Bureau Papers, Unentered Letters Received by the Superintendent of the Eastern District, Record Group 105, National Archives.
- 21 S. J. Wheeler, "Letter from Murfreesboro," *The Biblical Recorder* (Raleigh), January 16, 1867, p. 2.
- 22 "To the Speakers and Members of the Legislature of North Carolina," Legislative Papers, North Carolina Department of Archives and History, Raleigh (hereafter referred to as NCA).
- 23 "Report of the Building Committee on the memorial of sundry white citizens and colored Freedmen," [December, 1866 or January, 1867], Legislative Papers, NCA.
- 24 *Minutes of Central Association*, p. 13, "Statistical Table"; *Minutes of Pee Dee Association*, pp. 15-16.
- 25 See e.g. *The Biblical Recorder*, April 5, 1866, p. 2; *The Daily Dispatch*, May 18, 1866, p. 2; *Minutes of Pee Dee Association*, pp. 15-17.
- 26 *The Biblical Recorder*, June 5, 1867.
- 27 Bell, "Protestant Churches," pp. 68-69.
- 28 Davis, "Reconstruction in Cleveland County," p. 18.
- 29 *Journal of the Thirtieth Session of the North Carolina Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Fayetteville, November 7-12, 1866* (Raleigh: Branson & Farrar, 1866), November 8, 1866, pp. 6-7, (Hereafter referred to as *Journal of Annual Conference*.)
- 30 *Ibid.*, November 10, 1866, pp. 18-19.
- 31 See e.g. Lt. George S. Hawley to Capt. F. A. Seeley, April 30, 1866, Freedmen's Bureau Papers, Unentered Letters Received by the Superintendent of the Eastern District for other cases.
- 32 Burkhead, "History," pp. 63, 42, 44.
- 33 The Northern Methodist Church.
- 34 Burkhead, "History," pp. 42, 44.
- 35 *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50, 54, 70, 73-74.
- 36 *Ibid.*, p. 56, entry dated March 5, 1865.
- 37 *Wilmington Herald*, June 20, 1865, p. 2.

- 38 *The Daily Dispatch*, October 13, 1865, p. 3.
- 39 *Wilmington Herald*, January 24, 1866, p. 1; *The Daily Dispatch*, January 24, 1866, p. 3.
- 40 *Journal of Annual Conference*, November 9, 1866, p. 13.
- 41 Burkhead, "History," pp. 74-80.
- 42 *Carolina Watchman* (Salisbury), May 7, 1866, p. 2.
- 43 Bell, "Protestant Churches," p. 92.
- 44 *Minutes of the North Carolina Annual Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church in America. 1865* (Hartford: Case, Lockwood and Company, 1866), p. 8.
- 45 Records of the United States Continental Command, Army of the Ohio and Department of North Carolina, April 23, 1865, National Archives, Record Group 393.
- 46 *Minutes of the North Carolina Annual Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church in America, 1865*, December 30, 1865, p. 16.
- 47 *Ibid.*, December 29, 1865, p. 11.
- 48 *Ibid.*, December 30, 1865, p. 15.
- 49 *Ibid.*, December 29, 1865, p. 11.
- 50 *Ibid.*, December 28, 1865, p. 9.
- 51 *Ibid.*, December 30, 1865, p. 13.
- 52 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- 53 *The Church Intelligencer* (Charlotte), November 30, 1865, p. 161. See also *ibid.*, October 25, 1865, p. 161; February 22, 1866, p. 22; May 3, 1866, p. 61.
- 54 *Ibid.*, February 22, 1866, p. 22.
- 55 *Journal of the Fiftieth Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of North Carolina, Held in Christ Church, Newbern, May 30-June 4th, 1866* (Fayetteville: n. p., 1866), May 30, 1866, p. 17. Hereafter referred to as *Journal of Fiftieth Convention*.
- 56 *Church Intelligencer*, October 5, 1866, p. 146. See also *ibid.*, December 7, 1865, p. 165.
- 57 *Ibid.*, February 22, 1866, p. 22.
- 58 *Journal of the Forty-Ninth Annual Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of North Carolina, Held in Christ's Church, Raleigh. September 13-15, 1865* (Raleigh: J. C. Gorman's Book and Job Printing Office, 1865), September 14, 1865, pp. 22-24. Hereafter referred to as *Journal of Forty-Ninth Annual Council*.
- 59 Reprint of part of a letter from Bishop Atkinson, *Church Intelligencer*, May 3, 1866, p. 61.
- 60 *Ibid.*, October 5, 1865, p. 146.
- 61 *Journal of Forty-Ninth Annual Council*, September 15, 1865, pp. 36-38. See also *Standard*, September 18, 1865, p. 3.
- 62 *Journal of Fiftieth Convention*, May 31, 1866, pp. 22-23 and May 30, 1866, pp. 16-19. See also the *Wilmington Journal*, June 7, 1866, p. 2.
- 63 *Journal of Fiftieth Convention*, May 30, 1866, pp. 17-19.
- 64 *Church Intelligencer*, February 28, 1867, p. 26.
- 65 *Ibid.*, July 26, 1866, "Quarterly Report of the Executive Committee of the Protestant Episcopal Freedmen's Commission, May 24, 1866," pp. 110-11.
- 66 *Ibid.*, February 28, 1867, "Letter to the editor," p. 26.
- 67 Bell, "Protestant Churches," pp. 123-25.
- 68 *Ibid.*, pp. 107-108. While this concept was accepted at the 1866 annual meeting, it was not until 1870 that the first black minister and the first black church were admitted into the Diocese of North Carolina.
- 69 *Ibid.*, p. 107.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 106-107, 117.

<sup>71</sup> Fragment of a letter, unsigned to Paul C. Cameron, June 5, 1866, Cameron Family Papers, University of North Carolina, Southern Historical Collection.

<sup>72</sup> Unaddressed letter from Eliza B. Tillinghast, August 18, 1866, William Norwood Tillinghast Papers, Duke University, Manuscript Division. (Hereafter referred to as Tillinghast Papers.)

<sup>73</sup> Sarah Ann Tillinghast to Emily Tillinghast, September 20, 1866, William N. Tillinghast to Robena M. Tillinghast, October 2, 1866, Eliza B. Tillinghast to Emily Tillinghast, October 6, 1866, William N. Tillinghast to Emily Tillinghast, October 15, 1866, Tillinghast Papers.

<sup>74</sup> Hill to Horace James, September 6, 1865, Freedmen's Bureau Papers, Unentered Letter Received by the Superintendent of the Eastern District.

<sup>75</sup> Colonel Eliphalet Whittlesey, "Quarterly Report Ending December 31, 1865," House Executive Document No. 70, 39th Congress, 1st Session. See also the Report of the Secretary of War dated October 30, 1866, in Reports of the Committees of the House of Representatives, House Report No. 23, 39th Congress, 1st Session, Series 1305, p. 61.

<sup>76</sup> *The Western Democrat* (Charlotte), October 2, 1866, p. 2.

<sup>77</sup> *The Southerner* (Tarboro), December 20, 1866, p. 3.

<sup>78</sup> *Wilmington Journal*, August 23, 1866, p. 2.

<sup>79</sup> A. W. Shafer to the Acting-Assistant Adjutant General, June 5, 1867, Records of the United States Continental Command, Second Military District: North Carolina and South Carolina, National Archives, Record Group 393.

<sup>80</sup> *The Southerner*, January 3, 1867, p. 3.

<sup>81</sup> Superintendent Rutherford to John P. Stanford, Solicitor for Duplin County, March 29, 1867, Freedmen's Bureau Papers, Letters Sent By the Superintendent of the Southern District.



