

Charles Pettit McIlvaine Letters

7-6-1865

Letter to Bishop Hopkins

Henry Lee

The Charles P. McIlvaine letters were written in the 18th and 19th century and therefore may contain language that we understand today as harmful or offensive. You may encounter paternalist descriptions of Native Americans, racial slurs, or sexism. For more information, see our policy page.

Follow this and additional works at: https://digital.kenyon.edu/mcilvaine_letters

Recommended Citation

Lee, Henry, "Letter to Bishop Hopkins" (1865). *Charles Pettit McIlvaine Letters*. 289.
https://digital.kenyon.edu/mcilvaine_letters/289

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Charles Pettit McIlvaine Letters by an authorized administrator of Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact noltj@kenyon.edu.

Bart. July 6. 165

My dear Bishop

I thank you for your communication of your letter to Bp Hopkins. With me exception I had felt strongly all the grounds of objection to Bp H's course which you bring forward, but am so earnestly desirous that the sundred elements of our Body should be brought together with the least possible delay, that I was fain to overcome my reluctance to give sanction to a somewhat dangerous precedent, to the extent of authorising Bp H to send his letter in his own name with assurance of my concurrence. I inclose copy of my note on next leaf.

The point in regard of which

Bp. Whittingham
on Letter to Walker
Bp.

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

I do ^{not} share in your apprehensions
is that of the danger of having a
"military" representative sent to
General Convention from some
Southern Diocese. I am very positively
assured by such of the clergy from
the South as I have seen, that the
opinion of Churchmen is strongly
against the desecration of the
ministerial office by military
service; and that no clergyman
who has been guilty of it is likely
to recover his standing with ease
or speedily.

The utterances of our brethren of
Georgia are greatly to be regretted:
but even those had perhaps better
be ignored by us, if he be disposed
to take an altered tone, rather
than drive him, and others in support
of him, into an attitude of open opposi-

tion.
Very faithfully
your friend & brother
W R Whittingham

Rev Dr Knellwaine

(Copy)
Rev Rev (Doubtless)

I have received your printed
circular of June 22d inclosing a draft
of a letter to the Bishops in the States
lately in rebellion, for my signature.

I cannot sign, as my own, a
letter about the contents and phrase-
ology of which I have had no opportu-
nity of previous conference.

But that the brotherly and
timely action proposed by you may
have, as far as I am concerned, the
spirit and substance of entire
unanimity, I cordially authorize
you to send your proposed letter,
as written by you in my behalf
with my hearty concurrence in
its purport and end

Very faithfully & truly
your friend & brother

(Signed) W R Whittingham

Rev Rev John H Hopkins, D.D.

Bishop of Vermont
and Lenox Bishop &c &c

(Copy.)

K. 7. 20. 650706 b

Davenport, Iowa,

July 6, 1865.

Rt. Rev.

and dear Brother,

The Circular proposed to be sent to the Southern Bishops, was duly rec'd. I have given to it as full a consideration as I am capable of, and regret that I must decline giving to it my signature. It contains several sentences, which are susceptible of an interpretation which I could not approve, and which might give an impression to those to whom it is addressed that would be contrary to what I believe to be the facts in the case. I cannot go into details; but, my dear Bishop, will it not be better for our Southern brethren to go to work to undo what they have done in organizing a separate Ecclesiastical Body;

and there, in the regular course of things, return to that Body from which they voluntarily and prematurely retired? We can hardly ask or expect them to come to the General Convention so long as their distinct organization is in existence. Personally I should prefer to wait three years before having them again with us, so that time might be given for the purpose above indicated, and for the general quieting down of both civil and ecclesiastical matters; but if they should, any of them, appear at the approaching Triennial Meeting, I should be most strongly in favor of treating them only as brethren in Christ; though I am opposed to any advances, or compromises on our part which would, either seemingly or in reality, give a false impression of our position, or commit the Church at large to views or principles which she has never

adopted.

If the ground should be taken that their General Organization falls with the so-called Confederacy, it might be said that the Confederacy did not really exist when they organized; and yet the Dioceses, concerned gave in, in a formal manner, their adherence to the new Body. Is no action now required, on their part, to place them where they were before? I cannot argue this point at length, but it seems to me to be attended with serious difficulties, which the seceding Dioceses alone can remove.

But to my mind the Circular is objectionable on other grounds, and I know you will give me credit for sincerity and honesty when I say that I cannot consistently sign it.

Faithfully your Brother
in Christ,
Henry W. Lee

Bishop Hopkins.

App. Sec. of
War

Letter to App. Sec. of War
(Am. War Dept.)

[Faint, illegible cursive handwriting, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]