WILLIAM A. PASSAVANT: A SERVANT TO ALL MEN, BLACK OR WHITE

DOUGLAS C. STANGE

WILLIAM A. PASSAVANT (1821-1894) graduated from the Presbyterian College of Jefferson in 1840. In the fall of that same year, he entered the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg. His education for the ministry in this Pennsylvania village prepared him for more than a half-century of service to the American people, a service of universal benevolence that has hardly been matched by another American Lutheran. After ministering to congregations in Baltimore and Pittsburgh, he looked to the whole area of Pennsylvania and the Middle West as his parish, establishing orphanages at Zelienople and Rochester, Pennsylvania, and hospitals in Pittsburgh, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Jacksonville, Illinois. His keen interest in education contributed to the formation of Thiel College in Pennsylvania and the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary (now the Lutheran School of Theology). His organizing ability was also evident in the creation of the Pittsburgh Synod, in 1845, and the General Council, in 1867.

As an editor Passavant provided his Church with publications that confronted the social problems of the day head-on. From 1848 to 1861, he served as editor and publisher of the Missionary. It was then united with Charles Porterfield Krauth’s Lutheran and became the Lutheran and Missionary, Passavant retaining for many years a post on the paper as co-editor. From 1881 to 1894, Passavant directed the publication of the Workman.¹

With Passavant we find a man who thought in terms of a universal ministry to mankind. In 1842, when writing to his mother, the twenty-one-year-old youth said: “... I am the servant of all men — black as well as white, Catholic and Protestant.” His statement was not an immodest boast, but was occasioned by his very earnest work amid the Negro population of Baltimore.²
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Passavant's ministry to Baltimore's Negroes was not his initial endeavor of this sort. While still a student at Jefferson he had organized a prayer meeting among the Negroes in Canonsburg, a program he maintained with deep interest throughout his college training. His correspondence with Samuel Mosheim Schmucker, a son of Samuel Simon Schmucker, reveals that the Gettysburg theologian's son had begun a class in the Negro Sunday school of his town. When the two correspondents came together at Gettysburg, they no doubt took part in the mission of the Seminary students to the village's Negro community. At least we know that Passavant on one occasion led the local Negro Sunday school of eighty pupils.

Passavant, following his ordination in the Lutheran Church, continued to show the same interest in the Negro people that he exhibited in his youthful enthusiasm as a collegian and seminarian. Serving his first parish on the waterfront of Canton in Baltimore, Passavant still found time to preach and minister to the needs of Negroes. In one instance, while preaching to a crowd of about 1,600 of the race he realized their need to express their worship in shouts of joy, and thereby continued to speak amid responses from the audience to his words.

Once when Passavant was to address a prominent congregation during a synodical meeting in Baltimore, he found out that no preparation had been made for preaching to the Negroes of the city. Securing a substitute for his scheduled preaching appointment, he himself set out to lead their worship.

These two anecdotes typify Passavant's preoccupation with the spiritual needs of the Negro, but more remarkable was his regard for their physical sustenance. With the organization of Lutheran deaconess work in the United States, he urged that the women educate young Negro girls as a preventive step in saving them from possible prostitution and moral decay. Then, too, no needy person was refused a bed in Passavant's hospitals because of the color of his skin. An appeal from the race rarely went unheeded. When William Philo Phifer solicited help from Passavant for the Alpha Lutheran Synod's work among freed Negroes, he happily received funds, clothing, and en-
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couragement for his ministry. Passavant wrote his friends, hoping to stimulate their interest in assisting the survival of this Negro Lutheran Synod:

What may be the future issue of this humble beginning [of aiding southern Negroes] I cannot predict. There are upwards of seven millions of colored people in the South alone and at the rate they are increasing there will be ten millions in a few years. Surely the Church of the Reformation has a work among those ignorant and fanatical people, just as it had amid the corruptions of the Roman Catholic Church in the dark ages. If we succeed, which we cannot doubt, it will bring new life to our American Church. How can we hope for Christ's presence, if we longer neglect the children of enslaved Africa at our very doors.

The Swedish patriarch, Tuve N. Hasselquist, sympathized with Passavant's desire to win the Negro to the "Church of the Reformation." Hasselquist, who had often employed his editorial pen in behalf of the Negro in his paper, the Hemlandet, wrote to his fellow Lutheran:

Dear Brother: God bless you in your endeavor to do something for the negroes. [sic] Our Church ought to have done much for that unhappy race. But alas, we have slept and are, I fear, sleeping yet; at least sleepy . . . .

Passavant was extremely active in the synodical life of his Church. Synodical gatherings provided excellent opportunities to solicit support for his numerous philanthropic enterprises. Usually he attended the General Synod and Pittsburgh Synod meetings ex officio; on some occasions, he was present as a welcomed and honored guest. In whatever capacity he did attend, it is certain that he was a spark that could fire normally lethargic Lutherans. For example, there seems to be a definite correlation between the major pronouncements on slavery and the physical presence of William A. Passavant.

On the whole, the American Lutheran synodical gatherings were silent in reference to their feelings for or against slavery. With the exception of the Franckean Synod, the Lutheran Synods said little against slavery, but when they did, Brother Passavant was usually in attendance.
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Synod (of Pennsylvania) in 1844, Passavant, then still a pastor in Baltimore and member of the Maryland Synod, heard one of the earliest formal Lutheran declarations on slavery:

Resolved, That the time has in our opinion arrived, when ecclesiastical associations are in duty bound to express their views on the system of American Slavery. Therefore Resolved, That we believe this system to be a moral, civil and religious evil, in conflict with the best interests of society, oppressive in its character, and dishonorable to God and man.\(^{13}\)

We have no way of knowing the degree of Passavant's involvement in framing the resolution on slavery. In no way would his "visitor's status" prevent him from taking a major role in initiating the proposal or helping to write it. In his capacity as an "advisory member" he worked both on the treasurer's committee and the committee on Sabbath observance. One has every reason to believe he did have something to do with this pronouncement, a belief that is substantiated somewhat by Passavant's future activity at synodical trysts.

When the Pittsburgh Synod of the Lutheran Church met in 1846, Passavant was pastor of First Lutheran Church in the city of Pittsburgh. The Synod was an infant of little over a year. The subject of slavery was brought up at the meeting and Passavant along with his fellow delegates drafted a resolution which declared

... That the practice of buying or selling men, women, or children, with the intention of enslaving them, or the holding of them in involuntary servitude or bondage, is, in the opinion of this Synod, a moral and national evil, and an offense condemned by the principles of humanity and the word of God.\(^{14}\)

The Pittsburgh Synod did not alter its position toward slavery, remaining steadfastly behind the resolutions of 1846. Five years later, members of the Synod discussed at great length possible participation in the General Synod. The report of the committee to consider uniting with the General Synod was wholly negative, and made it clear that the doctrinal basis of the General Synod was not a cause for refusing to become a part of the organization. However, the committee did feel that joining the larger body would cause "distractions and divisions" in some of the congregations. Finally, the committee explained its main reason for not uniting with the General Synod:

The objection ... mainly urged, was that the General Synod was identified with slavery; that delegates being slaveholders are admitted as members, and that we by uniting become implicated in the sin of slavery. This position, though strenuously opposed, even to the last, finally having excited the minds of some,
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influenced them to cast their votes against the union, hence the resolution for the union was lost.15

Joseph Welker, George F. Ehrenfeld, and Gottlieb Bassler, all graduates of the Gettysburg Seminary, signed the report. Passavant, a fellow-student of Ehrenfeld and Bassler, had worked with the latter in a Negro Sunday school when both were seminarians.16

At their meeting in 1852, the Pittsburgh Synod, after much discussion, decided to join the General Synod when that body would meet in May of 1853.17 In voting to make this step, they were not forgetting their statement a year before; in fact, they called the previous action to mind in a resolution that stated: "That by uniting with the General Synod, we do not change our relations or position in regard to slavery, as defined in our printed minutes." 18

It is likely that Passavant saw as part of his personal mission to the General Synod the stimulation of a discussion on the slavery issue. For example, in 1862, when the General Synod issued an extensive report on the state of the country, its phrasing resembled the political and social ideas of Passavant. The document, drafted by a committee that included Passavant, Simeon W. Harkey, Charles Porterfield Krauth, and others, was presented, accompanied by a serious and spirited debate. The several substitutes and amendments proposed were all rejected.19

J. G. Morris was present at the scene and wrote that little difference of opinion was expressed over the resolutions, except that third one, "... opposition to which was urged on the ground of expediency." 20 That resolution posited the civil war then raging to be the logical result of the evil of slavery:

Resolved, That while we recognized this unhappy war as a righteous judgement of God, visited upon us because of the individual and national sins, of which we have been guilty, we nevertheless regard this rebellion as more immediately the natural result of the continuance and spread of domestic slavery in our land, and therefore hail with unmingled joy the proposition of our Chief Magistrate, which has received the sanction of Congress, to extend aid from the General Government to any State in which slavery exists, which shall deem fit to initiate a system of constitutional emancipation.21
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Some opponents of the resolution felt the statement was virtually an endorsement of slavery since it recognized the Negro as property. If President Lincoln would compensate the owners of slaves he in reality was testifying that Negroes were chattel. Passavant, in differing from this point of view remarked:

The President and Congress of the United States, and its citizens must recognize the legality of the legal relation. The ground taken by the resolution is the middle ground, between abolition and slavery: it is the true ground on which a Church and a Synod should stand. We, as part of the people will be called on to pay for slavery in the border states and it becomes our duty to lead the way and prepare our people for this great movement. When we assist an unfortunate brother with the means to buy back his wife and children, we do not by any means recognize the right of property in man.\(^{22}\)

In saying this, Passavant stood in the ranks of the moderate abolitionists. His editorial comment on the resolutions was greatly contrasted with the testimony of the Lutheran Observer. The Baltimore paper deemed the passage of the slavery resolution as "unnecessary and inexpedient,"\(^{23}\) whereas Passavant in the Lutheran and Missionary wrote:

They put our General Synod, and through it our Church, in the true attitude to the great question of the hour . . . . Our Stars and Stripes are very glorious, — that is taken for granted now — and the practical question is: Shall this glorious standard be the unspotted symbol of freedom or be converted into a rag to hide and bandage the running ulcer of slavery? On this point our General Synod has spoken firmly and moderately, and had demonstrated that its long silence gave not consent to the system of slavery; that if it gave proof that it loved erring brethren too well to love altogether wisely it nevertheless did not love the wrong itself. The resolutions say enough: they do not say too much.\(^{24}\)

That the resolutions were adopted by an overwhelming majority, gave what the southern pastors thought sufficient cause for withdrawal from the General Synod. Later in the meeting a committee of five had been named to convey the statement, the prayers, and best wishes of the Synod to President Lincoln himself.\(^{25}\) The Lutherans in the South would not soon forget the action of this meeting of the General Synod nor the man who had read and supported so diligently the resolutions at the assembly — William A. Passavant!\(^{26}\)

Dr. John Bachman, a pro-slavery pastor in South Carolina, had had contact with Passavant on a variety of occasions, via synodical meetings and correspondence. Each man approximated the thinking
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of his environment when it came to the question of slavery; when they clashed, slavery was the issue of dispute. The two men hit head-on when Passavant, in 1857, published in the *Missionary* an abstract of the proceedings of the Middle Conference of the Pittsburgh Synod.

Gottlieb Bassler, Passavant's close friend, had been elected president of the Conference. As president of the body, he called for a report on the state of piety, morals, and education in the United States. An adjunct to the call for such a report was the appointment of a committee to speak on the subject of slavery. Passavant printed the committee's report in full.

Its preamble retold the fact of three to four million slaves whose position in humanity was deplorable:

They are deprived of their natural rights, said in our Declaration of Independence to be inalienable; of liberty and the pursuit of happiness; they are deprived of the opportunity of mental improvement; they are shut out from the reading of God's Word, ... they are worked, whipped, fed, bought and sold, and in every respect in which it is possible to treat human beings as brutes, they are so treated.27 ...

The manifest lack of public sentiment against slavery in the Free States provides a nutrient by which the institution grows stronger. The most ignominious patronage was "the open support of the Church in the South, and the connivance of the Church in the North." 28

Under these circumstances the Conference felt it their solemn duty to speak their mind before the Church and the world, and therefore, promulgated four theses which vigorously condemned slavery as sin, encouraged Christians to denounce it, sought its defeat at the polls, and set the institution up as "a proper subject for pulpit discussion." 29

Nearly two months later the *Missionary* 's subscribers read of John Bachman's displeasure with Passavant for printing the above information, in a missive that covered most of the *Missionary*'s front page.30

Writing from Charleston on November 24, 1857, Bachman stated he believed such topics as slavery were for the secular press rather than the religious press.

The report on the subject of slavery had been on a theme about which, from their want of personal observation the Pennsylvania
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pastors seemed to be in a remarkable degree informed. Moreover, they failed to notice in their preamble regarding the three million to four million slaves the fact that these human beings were brought to America's shores by northern and English shipowners, and raised from the depth of barbarism to a higher level of civilization ("although not of the highest") and from paganism to Christianity.

Instead of indiscriminately quoting the clause describing "inalienable rights" of man in the Declaration of Independence, Bachman maintained that the ministers of the Middle Conference should reread their history books. Does the clause actually refer to slaves? Bachman preferred rather to direct their attention to the Constitution, which guarantees the rights of the slaveholder and the legal form of slavery, a document signed by every member of the Pennsylvania delegation headed by Ben Franklin.

To be sure, the slaves are held in bondage, but they are not treated as brutes. Without denying the unity of the human race one must remember that "... the physical form, the color, and inferiority in intellect of the African tribes now in the state of mild servitude in our Southern country, were marked on them by their Creator." But the Missionary's pages are reserved for religious topics; subjects of ethnology and physiology in regard to the races of man are not to be intended for publication therein, but we must explain

... that from our experience in the midst of these descendants of Africans, we feel they, as at present constituted, are, with very few exceptions, incapable of self-government, and that they are better clothed and better instructed than if left by themselves.

The bondage they experience is but "a mild servitude." Any abuse they undergo causes a reaction of repugnance in the community, whose populace and laws censure such acts of maltreatment. As parents in either the North or the South have to chastise their children for disobedience, then so must a master punish his slaves from time to time. "When we assert that they as a body, are kind and humane, we speak with confidence."

A common accusation by northern abolitionists has been that the slaves are prohibited from reading the Bible. It is true that several states, afraid that the reading of incendiary tracts would cause slave rebellion, passed laws against teaching the bondman to read or write. These statutes soon went unheeded. Slaves are permitted to read the Bible. Missionaries frequent the plantations; in other instances, the slaves on their own accord enter the churches, the buildings of "every denomination" being open to them. This religious influence keeps them
from vice, an influence not always exercised with northern Negroes.

Bachman was born in Pennsylvania. He still possessed relatives in the Keystone State, a place revered by him as the womb where "the first nucleus of our Church in America was formed." Although Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania are trapped in the snare of sin and vice, Bachman believed conferences of the South Carolina Synod would not intermeddle in another Synod's jurisdiction over local morality, in a single phrase — clean your own house.31

Passavant published an editorial to complement Bachman's epistle.32 Written in a conciliating spirit it still judged several of Bachman's views as erroneous. Entitled "Free Speech," Passavant's primary purpose in writing the editorial was to support his own contention that the question of slavery did have a place in the religious press of the nation.

Passavant confessed his "unhappiness" over the wording of the Middle Conference resolution, but his sense of "editorial justice" did not allow him to alter its composition. On the "principle of common right" Bachman's stricures were published in their entirety. And although many would disagree with the substance of the writer's stand, few would doubt his sincerity.

Passavant extolled Bachman's work as a pastor, an author, a philanthropist and humanitarian among the Negro people of his area. Anything written by him, Passavant assured his readers, reflects his "venerable age, profound learning, eminent usefulness and a character of singular purity and benevolence."

However, Passavant took issue with Bachman's idea that the discussion of slavery had no right to appear in a religious journal, pointing out that the problem had its religious aspects, and should be discussed. He believed that the refusal to debate the issue had in many instances been "the cause of mutual misunderstanding and irritation. Truth never suffers from discussion, when it has a fair opportunity of self-defence." If the truth on the subject of slavery is to be found, and in this pursuit the secular press often fails miserably, then "the religious press must enter into the strife."

Admittedly, slavery is one of the most difficult questions to solve, but "to stifle discussion would be tyranny, to fear it, cowardice. Silence is simply an impossibility. If the Church will not speak, Slavery will."

In the next issue of the Missionary an editorial appeared en-
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titled, "Freedom better than Bondage." 33 Where above Passavant had defended the freedom of the religious press, now, over and above the counsel of "several sincere but fearful friends," 34 he sought to say a few words on the freedom of man. He knew that if his paper would "...be sustained only by ignoring any one error or wrong, it [would] go down to a cowardly grave."

It was in this spirit that Passavant had published Bachman's letter knowing that intelligent men in the North were anxious to hear the views of good men in the South regarding slavery. But Passavant regretted Bachman's espousal of "the inherent rightfulness of American slavery." In consideration of this Passavant felt he could not pass over in silence.

Passavant defined slavery from gleanings in the statute books of South Carolina, Louisiana, and North Carolina. All of these adjudged the Negro slave as an item of property like a book, or piece of furniture to be bought, sold, traded or inherited. Although Bachman had objected to the physical abuses of slavery he had made no testimony to its ignominy vis-a-vis higher Christian principles. "Alas!" Passavant exclaimed, slavery's "... uses for personal and selfish ends are its most terrible abuses, for what is the wrong of occasional bodily suffering, compared with the habitual deprivation of one of God's creatures of freedom, time, service, and all else, the loss of which makes man a slave?" The system of slavery "... is the greatest conceivable abuse of human power."

But Passavant contested another point in Bachman's argument, a thesis that the Southern pastor had also maintained in his book, The Doctrine of the Unity of the Human Race 35: The idea that there is some innate defect in the physical, intellectual and moral character of the Negro which made it impossible for him to seek his own destiny, and made it necessary for him to live under the paternal care of a master. Passavant believed this to be fallacious reasoning. Reflecting upon his extensive work among Negroes in the North, and knowing of their progress in Canada, he maintained that nothing prevented them from achieving the highest goals in life, except the physical and prejudicial enslavement that kept them trodden under foot.

Even if one admitted the Negro to be inferior when compared with the Anglo-Saxon race, this was assuredly no argument to enslave him.
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If it were, one could with similar logic enslave "... two-thirds of the globe, and the Chinese Coolies and lower Caste Hindoos must bow to our approach." "God forbid," Passavant continued, that we should ever derive an argument from their weakness or their degradation to doom them to bondage. The day of their pupilage is past, and they deserve to go forth as men and brethren, in the full and virtuous enjoyment of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." 36

In concluding his editorial, Passavant expressed the fraternal tone of his discussion with Bachman. He adjudged his own motives for involving the Missionary in the debate to be of two natures: (1) To defend the freedom of the press; (2) To defend the liberty of man. "With this we dismiss the subject," he wrote, "and gladly return to less exciting, even though not more important themes." 37

The tensions in America, however, would not permit Passavant to attend to "less exciting ... themes" for very long. Four years after his discussion with Bachman the country was immersed in the holocaust of a fratricidal Civil War. The Missionary's circulation rose and its coverage of the national scene broadened. Passavant's editorial pen was sharpened for the battle, his editorials having been, from the inception of the paper, loyal to the idea that the religious press should touch upon the moral issues in American politics.

When a few subscribers, for example, discontinued the Missionary because "it never [had] a favorable word for Slavery . . .," Passavant wrote:

We are sorry we cannot accommodate these friends. But we prefer freedom to bondage, both for ourselves and for all men . . . Moreover, a Church like the Lutheran, with its free spirit, needs one free outspoken press, on every question of faith and morals.38

His remark, a slap at the more conservative papers like the Lutheran Observer and the Lutheran Standard, was made while Passavant alone piloted the Missionary. When he merged his paper with Krauth's Lutheran, his editorial slant changed very little. Passavant's views could be found under the paper's column "Pittsburgh Department." One editorial entitled, "Afraid of Politics" echoed his views as a servant of the Christian press. "The province of a Christian Editor," he wrote,

[is] . . . to speak the whole counsel of God . . . His paper is set for the defence of the Gospel. The idea, that any portion of the teachings of [the] Gospel, is to be ignored, because it may come in conflict with party theories and platforms, dare not be countenanced, no, not for an hour! . . . The Editor who
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would suffer himself to be bound to silence by party connections or by dread of offending partisan readers, is not a Lutheran Christian. 39

The Lutheran and Missionary paid diligent attention to the events that transpired in our nation torn asunder by agony, hatred and war. It noted with acclaim and exuberance the impending Emancipation Proclamation of January 1863 in an editorial published two and a half months before the event. 40 The paper printed as a serial, Gustavus Seyffarth's tract on "African Slavery," in which he had reasoned that slavery was condemned by the Bible and that Christians upholding and extending it were guilty of sin. 41 Finally, when Lincoln was assassinated in 1865, Passavant, while reflecting on the eminence of the President, spoke also on the subject of slavery:

The Demon-Spirit of Slavery must die — God has reached forth the red-right hand of his wrath against it — and if we will not let Him smite it to death without smiting us, He will smite us. We cannot save slavery now, if we were willing to die for it. The only election given us now is to tear it from us and let it die, or, clinging to it and die with it. It must and will die. That is one grand consolation in this day of sadness. 42

With the exception of Schmucker of Gettysburg and Hasselquist no other man in American Lutheranism exerted as much influence as Passavant did in preaching the removal of slavery from our land. It was at the announcement of the Emancipation Proclamation that Passavant remarked how thankful he was to have been born in such an age as his and to be a witness of such a crisis in our country's history as that of the Civil War. In describing his emotions he spoke in the manner of one who felt the pulse of our present day and its racial revolution. If one would substitute for the Emancipation Proclamation, legislation as nearly important for the movement in the Negro's civil rights activity of our present day, Passavant's words sound awesomely close, and uncomfortably true. "The world moves," he wrote:

We are living years in days, and centuries in years . . . . What shall we say now, when we stand on the eve of events, which in the good providence of God, must not only girdle the deadly Upas of American slavery, but sooner or later make it a dry and lifeless trunk? Believing that liberty is better than bondage, and that slavery, as it exists in our land, is monstrous, unnatural, and wholly contrary to the clear teachings of the Divine Word, we daily and hourly thank God, over every successive step [to] overthrow [that] "sin which is disgrace to any people" . . . . It is a gain so unspeakably great, when viewed in its relation to the future, and the unnumbered millions of the white and colored races who will be affected by it, that no tongue of man can utter its greatness, and no pen of man portray its far reaching and beneficent consequences . . . . It is eminently right. God has spoken the word, "Let my people go!" 43
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