

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE

Holy Chains

How the Catholic Church Justified the Practice of
Slavery

Written By John Retka

5/11/2009

I dedicate this work to my parents. Thank you for all your love and support.

Introduction

One can only imagine what it would have been like; outside for 18 hours a day in the grueling sun with hardly any water. Having sweat dripping down your face stinging your eyes and salting your lips; the constant threat of being beaten the only thing stooping you from collapsing right there in the fields. The voices of the master screaming "Work Harder!", "Work Faster!", as the cross swings from his neck. The world you have entered is hell, and the only way out it seems is death. For millions of African slaves, this was their reality during colonial times.

During the colonial period, the Catholic Church was one of slavery's biggest advocates. Through a comparison of both the United States and Brazil I will show that the Catholic Church fully supported the practice of slavery and was instrumental to its success. While the ways in which the Catholic Church supported slavery in both countries was different, it did so to encourage slavery in both countries. The sections of this paper will uncover those differences and at the same time uncover one of the darkest actions undertaken by the Catholic Church. I will show that through biblical interpretation, and primary church documents, that slavery was in no way countered by the Catholic Church until its abolition in the United States.

To set the context, I will begin with the story of the curse of Ham and the teachings of early Church fathers. I then will move to the practices of the Church in both countries during the time of the Atlantic slave trade. After exploring facts about the ownership of slaves in both countries by the Catholic Church, I will show how the Church justified the holding of slaves in both countries. Lastly, I will focus on the process

of Christianization, a justification used in both countries. I begin first with the story of the Curse of Ham

The Early Church

Curse of Ham

To gain an understanding of how the Church came to use the Bible as a means of justifying slavery, one must first understand the Biblical passages themselves. The passage most prominently used by the Catholic Church was Genesis 9: 21-27, also known as the story of the Curse of Ham. The passage reads as follows:

Noah, a man of the Soil, was the first to plant a vineyard. He drank some of the wine and became drunk, and he lay uncovered in his tent. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brothers outside. Then Shem and Japheth took a garment, laid it on both their shoulders, and walked backward and covered the nakedness of their father; their faces were turned away, and they did not see their father's nakedness. When Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his youngest son had done to him, he said, "Cursed be Canaan; lowest of slaves shall he be to his brothers." He also said, "Blessed by the Lord my God be Shem; and let Canaan be his slave. May God make space for Japheth, and let him live in the tents of Shem; and let Canaan be his slave."

Genesis 9:20-27 (NRSV)

There are two very important points that the Catholic Church focused on in this biblical passage. First are Noah's words that Canaan shall be cursed and shall be a slave to his brothers. The Curse of Ham story was used so predominantly because Ham was assumed to be the first African in the eyes of the Church. Therefore, because Ham was of African origin so too was his son.¹ Because of this the African was to be a slave to all his fellow "brothers", i.e. the free members of the Church.

¹ Stephen R. Haynes points out in *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery*, that "The difficulty

The second point that is concentrated on is the establishment of a hierarchy or class system by Noah. For he states that, "Blessed by the Lord my God be Shem; and let Canaan be his slave. May God make space for Japheth, and let him live in the tents of Shem; and let Canaan be his slave." With this passage, supporters of slavery—the freed higher class members of the Catholic Church, and the Church leaders themselves—saw themselves as the characters of Japheth and Shem from the biblical narrative, while the role of Canaan was reserved for the African slave. Because this story is versed within the pages of the most holy text used by the Catholic Church, the early followers and particularly early Church leaders took it to mean that slavery was indeed a punishment for sin.

For proslavery intellectuals, the act of Ham gazing upon his father naked and the Curse that Noah bestowed upon him and his descendants to be "servants or servants", were biblical proof that enslavement of Black Africans was God's will.² Ham was to live under all others. He was to be cursed by God for all eternity. That was used by the Catholic Church to justify its practice in slavery because by denying what was written within the Bible's pages was to deny the very word of God him/herself. Therefore to not practice slavery against Africans, as Noah said was to be practiced, would be going against the word of God and therefore committing a sin in the eyes of the Church.

with this argument is that, as abolitionists never tired of pointing out, proslavery intellectuals did not read Genesis 9:20-27 in the literal sense, If they had, they would have been forced to acknowledge that Noah's curse was aimed at Canaan, not Ham, and that according to Genesis 10's Table of Nations Canaan had no connection with Africa, 77

² Stephen R. Haynes, *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. 67.

Early Church Leaders

This interpretation, the belief that slavery was a punishment for sin, was especially recognized by the early leaders in the Catholic Church. The early statements of Church leaders influenced other members of the clergy and laity to accept slavery as a punishment for sin. For it was Augustine's own belief that Ham represented "the symbol of the man in isolation, the clan less, lawless, heartless man who, like heathen ethnics, did not know God"³ It was Ham's lack of the knowledge of God that caused him to sin against his father Noah. Therefore, it is slavery that must be the punishment for this sin.

Indeed we see these expressions by Augustine in chapters 15 and 16 of his famous writing *The City of God*. He speaks to the actions of God in regards to slavery by stating that:

God intending thus to teach us what the relative position of the creatures is, and what the desert of sin; for it is with justice, we believe, that the condition of slavery is the result of sin. And this is why we do not find the word "slave" in any part of Scripture until righteous Noah branded the sin of his son with this name.⁴

Because the word slave is not introduced to us in nature and rather by the punishment for an action, Augustine believes that slavery is the result of sin. Augustine continues by reiterating the point:

The prime cause, then, of slavery is sin, which brings man under the domination of his fellow,--that which does not happen save by the judgment of God, with

³ Haynes, 28.

⁴ Kenneth J. Zanca, ed. *American Catholics and Slavery: 1789-1866 An Anthology of Primary Documents*. Maryland: University Press of America, Inc, 1994. 14.

whom in no unrighteousness, and who knows how to award fit punishments to every variety of offense.⁵

Because God was the only one able to award just punishment for sin, for God to commit the African to a life of servitude was a dramatic declaration. Furthermore, since this punishment was sent down by God, it should be seen by all to be a fit punishment for Ham's sin.

It must be noted that Augustine was not the only Church leader who believed that slavery was a punishment for sin, Saint Isidore⁶ reflected similar views to that of Augustine's.

Those whom God perceived were not fit for freedom, he more mercifully inflicted with slavery. A slave's capacity for doing wrong must be restrained by his masters power. To be submissive as a slave is better than to be proud as a free man.⁷

This again focuses on the belief that the African was a problem that needed to be controlled. The African was by biblical justification a sinful creature, therefore they needed constant supervision by more "holy" members of the Church to ensure that their actions would be kept under control and would be of a less sinful nature.

⁵ Ibid. John Maxwell, author of *Slavery and the Catholic Church* states that in "419 A.D. Augustine regards slavery as the result, either of sin, as in the case of Ham or of adversity in the case of Joseph... Augustine writes that the state of slavery is justly imposed on sinners as a penalty for their own benefit", 35.

⁶ c.560-636, Spanish churchman and encyclopedist, bishop of Seville, Doctor of the Church. Born of a noble Hispano-Roman family from Cartagena, he spent his youth under the supervision of his brother St. Leander, powerful bishop of Seville, and may have helped the latter in the extirpation of Arianism among the Visigoths. During his own tenure of the bishopric (from c.600) Isidore wielded considerable ecclesiastical power; he presided at the second Council of Seville (619) and at the fourth national Council of Toledo (633). He is best known, however, for his voluminous writings. His most influential work is the *Etymologies* or *Origins*, an encyclopedic treatise that aims to set down all the knowledge of the time. (Extracted from Encyclopedia.com on 4-7-2009)

⁷ John Francis Maxwell. *Slavery and the Catholic Church: The History of Catholic Teaching Concerning the Moral Legitimacy of the Institution of Slavery*. Chichester: Barry Rose Publishers, 1975, 35.

Having an understanding of slavery as a punishment for sin helps us then understand the earlier teachings of Saint Paul on slavery. Paul taught that slaves should obey their masters and accept the situation that they are in. However, Paul's teachings also said that the master and the slave become equal in Christ after baptism had occurred. But then he continues on to say that slaves must obey their masters as they would obey Christ. This causes me to question Paul's teaching.⁸ If the two individuals—the master and the slave—are equal after baptism, then how can there be a master and a slave? This is just the first of many contradictions we will see the Church make when trying to justify the practice of slavery. As we move forward and explore how the middle Church justified the practice of slavery, we will see more and more questions arise, many with no visible answer.

The Church during the Atlantic Slave Trade

Pope Gregory

We can see through the actions of Pope Gregory XVI how the contradictions and confusion about Church feelings on slavery continued through the 1800s. On December 3, 1839, Pope Gregory XVI condemned the practice of the African slave trade as unchristian and unlawful by issuing the constitution *In Supremo Apostolatus*.⁹ In the

⁸ Paul taught on the one hand a “dogmatic theology” concerning slavery (“slaves and masters, when you have been baptized, you are brethren in Christ”); and on the other hand a “moral theology” of slavery which was adapted to, and valid in, the legal situation of the roman empire in his day (“slaves—obey your masters as you would obey your Master, Christ; master—look after your slaves with fairness and justice; master and slaver—make use of your legal relationship to grow in Christians virtues”). Maxwell, 84-84.

⁹ Apostolic Letter condemning the slave trade, written by Pope Gregory XVI and read during the 4th Provincial Council of Baltimore, December 3, 1839

constitution Gregory makes reference to Paul's teachings on the duties of masters and slaves, as well as Paul's teaching on treating Christian slaves as brothers in Christ.

Pope Gregory only condemns the "unjust" trading and holding of slaves. Within the document, the pope mentions how the apostles used slaves and ordered them to be submissive to their masters. Gregory mentions this because he wants to acknowledge that the church had participated in the slave trade during its early years.¹⁰ The document then calls for an end to trading in slaves and threatens those who do not obey him with severe punishment.¹¹

Note that the pope is only discussing the slave trade itself not slavery as a whole. "It is clear that the pope is condemning unjust enslavement and unjust slave-trading. There is no contradiction of the common catholic teaching concerning just enslavement and just slave-trading. And there is no excommunication of those who carried on this unjust Negro slave trade."¹² Therefore, transactions pertaining to slavery that are carried out without falling under the Catholic Church's definitions of being unjust are acceptable in practice.

¹⁰ Inspired in fact by the Divine Spirit, the Apostles, it is true, exhorted the slaves themselves to obey their masters, according to the flesh, as though obeying Christ, and sincerely to accomplish the Will of God; but they ordered the masters to act well towards slaves, to give them what was just and equitable, and to abstain from menaces, knowing that the common Master both of themselves and of the slaves is in Heaven, and that with Him there is no distinction of persons. *In Supremo Apostalus*

¹¹ We warn and adjure earnestly in the Lord faithful Christians of every condition that no one in the future dare to vex anyone, despoil him of his possessions, reduce to servitude, or lend aid and favour to those who give themselves up to these practices, or exercise that inhuman traffic by which the Blacks, as if they were not men but rather animals, having been brought into servitude, in no matter what way, are, without any distinction, in contempt of the rights of justice and humanity, bought, sold, and devoted sometimes to the hardest labour. *In Supremo Apostalus*

¹² Maxwell, 73.

The Declaration of The Holy Office

We can see a confirmation of these beliefs by the Catholic Church in 1866, when the Holy Office issued an Instruction in reply to questions from a Vicar Apostolic of the Galla Tribe in Ethiopia.¹³

...slavery itself, considered as such in its essential nature, is not at all contrary to the natural and divine law, and there can be several just titles of slavery and these are referred to by approved theologians and commentators of sacred canons.¹⁴

Here we see the Holy Office declaring the position that slavery is essential and not contrary to the natural or divine law. The Instruction continues saying:

For the sort of ownership which a slave owner has over a slave is understood as nothing other than the perpetual right of disposing of the work of a slave for one's own benefit—services which it is right for one human being to provide for another.¹⁵

Therefore, because the work being provided by the slave is right for one human being to provide to another, slavery then, is justifiable. This again raises questions. The master often thought of the slave as less than human, a creature with no rights. How then can one consider this to be a mutual understanding between two human beings if one does not think the other to be human?

The Instruction ends by giving a brief way of distinguishing between practicing slavery in an unjust and just manner.

¹³ Ibid, 78.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

From this it follows that it is not contrary to the natural and divine law for a slave to be sold, bought, exchanged or donated, provided that in this sale, purchase, exchange or gift, the due conditions are strictly observed which the approved authors likewise describe and explain. Among these conditions the most important ones are that the purchaser should carefully examine whether the slave who is put up for sale has been justly or unjustly deprived of his liberty, and that the vendor should do nothing which might endanger the life, virtue or Catholic Faith of the slave who is to be transferred to another's possession.¹⁶

Two Important points can be extracted from this section. First, in order for the purchaser to make a just purchase, he¹⁷ must make sure that the slave has been justly, and not unjustly deprived of his liberty. Second, the buyer must make sure that the seller has done nothing to endanger the life of the slave, endanger the slave's virtue, or endanger his Catholic faith. The declaration made by the Holy Office in 1866 formed a basis for the distinction between chattel-slavery, which was considered morally unjust, and ameliorated slavery, which the Church deemed to be morally legitimate.

The distinction between chattel and ameliorated slavery is that in unjust chattel-slavery, the master has full rights of ownership over the slave as his personal property. On the other hand, ameliorated slavery only allowed the master the right of use or, *dominium utile*, a perpetual right of disposing the work of his slave for his own benefit.¹⁸ So the distinction between chattel and ameliorated slavery is the fact that in chattel-slavery, the owner had all personal rights to you, including your life, while in

¹⁶ Ibid, 79.

¹⁷ I use the word he in this document because at the time the majority of slaveholders in Brazil as well as the United States were men. However, I am not stating that all holders were men, He/his is only being used for commonality.

¹⁸ Ibid, 86-87.

ameliorated slavery he owned your ability to work but not your body, at least in the eyes of the Church.

Facts on Ownership

As we look toward the actions of the Catholic Church in the practice of slavery, we can see tremendous similarities in the ways in which the process was carried out and justified. One area that possesses such a similarity is in the actions of the Catholic clergy themselves in Brazil and the USA.

Brazil

The clergymen in Brazil were models for the justification of slavery during the Atlantic slave trade, themselves commonly members of the privileged slaveholding class. They possessed and exploited slaves of their own, as did the monasteries, Catholic brotherhoods, and other Church organizations. By doing so they set an example for the lay population which strengthened the worst aspects of slavery.¹⁹ The laity saw the way in which the clergy lived comfortably and sought to have similar lives of vast wealth. Therefore they used the justification of the Church to hold slaves of their own.

The clergymen of Brazil lived very comfortable lives in comparison with the clergy of other societies. Secular priests—priests that did not belong to any particular order--such as those in Brazil, were primarily responsible for their own financial security, which led them into a variety of economic activities. Although they were supposed to refrain from wholesale or retail trade, crafts, and direct employment outside the Church, not all

¹⁹ Robert Edgar Conrad, *Children of God's Fire: A Documentary History of Black Slavery in Brazil* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 152.

seculars observed these restrictions evidenced by the secular priests in Brazil. In fact, many religious groups benefitted by not following these practices, and by using African slaves with virtually no labor costs.

The Jesuits in Brazil

The Jesuits can be seen as the group who most benefitted from the practice of slavery among the different religious orders. They constructed a vast network of sugar plantations, cattle and horse ranches, truck farms, brickworks, schools, seminaries, Churches, religious retreats, and other facilities. Sugar mills were a major source of income²⁰. These mills were extremely successful because of the Jesuits' use of African slave labor. The seventeenth-century Jesuit Antonio Vieira said, "Brazil is sugar and sugar is the black man"²¹. Moreover, working to the point of exhaustion, African slaves cut, milled, and processed sugarcane with the holy approval of the priests²². This labor by slaves allowed the Jesuits to amass great wealth.

But wealth was not the only thing the Jesuits acquired through the process of slavery, they also became landowners. The Jesuits became the colony's largest landowner and the biggest holder of slaves in all the Americas²³. Priests moved to the forefront of sugar production and controlled some of the largest properties, such as the Jesuits plantation know as the Engenho Sergipe de Conde, or the "Queen of the

²⁰ Conrad, 29.

²¹Laennec Hurbon, "The Church and Afro-American Slavery," in *The Church in Latin America 1492-1992*, ed. Enrique Dussel (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1992), 187.

²² Kenneth P. Serbin. *Needs of the Heart: A Social and Cultural History of Brazil's Clergy and Seminaries*. Notre Dame, Indiana: Universtiy of Notre Dame Press, 2006, 31.

²³ Ibid, 29.

Reconcavo" in the seventeenth century²⁴. Nevertheless, the Jesuits were not the only religious order to profit from African slavery in Brazil.

The Benedictines

The Benedictines also profited from holding African slaves. *In Children of Gods Fire: A Documentary History of Black Slavery in Brazil*, Henry Koster, a British author living in Pernambuco, Brazil, depicted the practice of slavery in a Benedictine Plantation. He describes how the monks of St. Benedict, like ecclesiastical slaveholders throughout Brazil, unconditionally derived the same kinds of benefits from slaveholding that were enjoyed by ordinary Brazilians, and furthermore the monks encouraged marriage not only for religious reasons, but also because they wished to increase the number of new slaves on their estates through births.²⁵ The Benedictines, just as the Jesuits, relied on the African slaves for their labor and they administered the sacrament of marriage because they saw it as a benefit to their work force.

There can be no doubt that there was support of slavery by the clergy, and for the few that did speak out against it their voices fell upon deaf ears, and sometimes even resulted in disciplinary action. One such case occurred in Brazil when an Italian friar questioned whether what was being practiced was legitimate or illegitimate slavery.

Legitimate slavery held slaves under true masters or acquired them through "just wars". Illegitimate slavery held slaves that were from "unjust wars" and not of true masters. After questioning the authority of the church practicing in illegitimate slavery

²⁴ Ibid, 30.

²⁵ Conrad, 186.

the friar was disciplined by the Archbishop of Bahia. The governor of Bahia writes to the Portuguese secretary of state:

To avoid the spread of such a pernicious doctrine, the Archbishop immediately ordered him to suspend his confessions, requesting that I deport him in the same ship, which is continuing its voyage, and that the captain not allow him to go ashore without a positive order from Your Excellency.²⁶

This example makes it clear that members of the church had to agree to the practice of slavery whether it was legitimate or not. For if they did not they faced harsh punishment from the church hierarchy. Therefore we can see how the clergy in particular played a large role in the practice of slavery, even if they didn't truly agree with it. But it is also very evident that some clergy fully supported the practice.

The power of slaveholding planted itself firmly within the religious orders and it can be said that for the Brazilian clergy, faith and sugar were inseparable.²⁷ They amassed vast wealth among the orders and strengthened their relationship between themselves and the other colonists. By employing part of its wealth and income to sustain cultural activities and welfare functions for the poor, the Church added substantially to the well-being of colonial society. In doing so they gained support of their actions by the colonists, and more importantly strengthened the relationship between themselves and the elite members of society.²⁸ This relationship was vital to the church and the community.

²⁶ Ibid, 180-181.

²⁷ Serbin, 30.

²⁸ Mark A. Burkholder, and Lyman L. Johnson. *Colonial Latin America*. 6th Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008, 111.

If the Church was going to maintain its authority in Brazil it had to establish worthy connections with the most powerful people in the hierarchy.²⁹ In most cases this included wealthy slave owners or *senhores*. It can be inferred that that interlocking relationships between priests and *senhores* strengthened the Church's social position and also increased its dependence on the plantation system.³⁰ Therefore, by trying to gain power in the social hierarchy, the Church became increasingly engrossed in the practice of slavery.

In summary, there is vast evidence that supports the Church's involvement in slavery. Most of which can be attributed to the Catholic Church's lust for power. This lust can be divided into two groups. First, is the Church's lust for the connections with the elites of society. This can be seen by the way in which the Church sided with the elites, most of which were slaveholders. They came to progressively rely on these elites more and more and ultimately came to have to rely on the plantation system as well.

Secondly, is the lust of the church to be an elite member of society. Particular consideration must be given to the clergy's involvement in the process of slavery. Many religious orders, especially the Jesuits, held slaves on various types of plantations. They used African slave labor to accomplish their success and to accumulate great wealth. The orders also used this wealth to the Church's benefit by re-investing it back into the community. In doing so the social status of the Church was elevated, and the power of

²⁹ Note here the connection with the hierarchy that we explored earlier that was issued by Noah to his sons. The Church seems to be connecting itself with the higher levels of the hierarchy rather than being on the same level with the African slave.

³⁰ Serbin, 30.

the Church in Brazil was increased. With these things in mind it is clearly visible that the Church in Brazil fully supported and justified the practice of slavery.

The United States

The ownership of slaves by Catholics in the United States is said to have begun with the African's first arrival to the new world in 1526. Spanish explorer, Lucas Vasquez de Ayllon, the discoverer of the Chesapeake Bay, received a grant to the land he had discovered for Charles V. With the grant he established the settlement of San Miguel de Guadalupe, which was not far from the site of the City of Jamestown which was completed 50 years later. The building of this settlement is perhaps the first instance of the use of slave labor by a Catholic in the United States.³¹

Slavery was proposed in the colonies even earlier however. The population of indigenous people in the area of Louisiana had been virtually wiped out due to the massacres brought forth by the Spaniards and French, and by the diseases that they carried which the natives had no immunity too. Bartolome De Las Casas, a strong proponent to the end of indigenous slavery, proposed to Charles V that the native people be substituted for African slaves in 1517. We see the same sort of feelings expressed by the French Catholic Governor of Louisiana.

Jean Baptiste Le Moyne de Bienville, Colonial Governor from August 22, 1701, had some regard for the Indian natives, but apparently no compunction against the use of the Negro slaves, for the understandable reason that the Negroes from

³¹ Richard Roscoe Miller. *Slavery and Catholicism*. Durham, North Carolina: North State Publishers, 1957, 40.

Africa we able to survive the rigors of the work which they were compelled to do.³²

The problem for the Africans was that they was able to survive the rigors of hard work and did not succumb to diseases like the Native American did. This ultimately would prove terrible for the African slave because with the notion of a more able bodied workforce, came the ideology that they could be worked that much harder.

Bienville is a very important character when talking about catholic slave ownership in the United Sates, for it was Bienville who published the famous Code Noir or "Black Code".

The Black Codes

The Black Codes were laws justifying how African slaves were to be treated and handled. They affirmed the connection of government with the Roman, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. The codes were originally issued by the French King Louis XIV because he wanted there to be one religion, Catholicism.

His passion for absolutism and unity demanded that his subjects agree with him even in matter of religion. He found it unbelievable that a person who worshipped God in a different way could be a good subject. Such views were shared also by the Catholic clergy and approved by public opinion. Religious unity, moreover, was regarded as essential to political unity.³³

Because the slaves were thought to be heathens, they restricted the possibility of religious unity, and consequently needed to be taught the Catholic faith. The following

³² Ibid, 41.

³³ George Breathett, "Catholicism and the Code Noir in Haiti," *The Journal of Negro History*, 1988), 2

declarations provide examples from the “Code Noir” or Black Code that were issued in King Louis XIV’s edict of 1685:

Article II. All slaves that shall be in our islands shall be baptized and instructed in the Roman, Catholic, and Apostolic Faith.

Article III. We forbid any religion other than the Roman, Catholic, and Apostolic Faith from being practiced in public. We desire that offenders be punished as rebels disobedient of our orders. We forbid any gathering to that end, which we declare to be conventicle, illegal, and seditious, and subject to the same punishment as would be applicable to the masters who permit it or accept it from their slaves.

Article IV. No persons assigned to positions of authority over Negroes shall be other than a member of the Roman, Catholic, and Apostolic Faith, and the master who assigned these persons shall risk having said Negroes confiscated, and arbitrary punishment levied against the persons who accepted said position of authority.³⁴

Ultimately, the Black Code, with respect to its detailed provisions, long validity, and authoritative status, was in fact the most important legal enactment regarding slavery. Almost everywhere in the Americas—and its colonized areas where slavery was practiced—the laws promulgated by the administration ascribed a central role to religion.³⁵ Although the Black Codes were issued by a French King, they still played a vital role in establishing the connection between the Catholic Church and slavery in both the United States and Brazil.

³⁴ The Code Noir (The Black Code), <http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/335/> (accessed March 18, 2008).

³⁵ Laennec Hurbon, “The Church and Afro-American Slavery,” in *The Church in Latin America 1492-1992*, ed. Enrique Dussel (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1992), 367.

The Black Codes were accepted both in the United States and Brazil but for different reasons. Because the Black Codes were considered political in the USA, and since the Catholic Church in the U.S. tended to avoid speaking against anything connected with politics, the Codes were naturally accepted to avoid any possible conflict that could arise. In Brazil, in contrast, the Church was deeply engraved in politics and since the Codes carried some political implications, the Church fully supported them to keep the bond between the Church and the State intact

Because of the Black Code, the Catholic Church had to be involved with slavery even if it did not want to. Its name was stamped on a leading legal document regarding slavery, and the Church was to be the chief instigator and supporter of slavery. Therefore the document was still considered relevant in both countries even though they were not under French rule.

The Jesuits in America

The Jesuits of the United States were very similar to their brothers in Brazil. Both held slaves and managed them for a considerable amount of profit. The Jesuits from Brazil brought with them the process of sugar cane farming to Louisiana. With this followed the terrible notion of working a slave to the death.

...the sugar planters of Louisiana unhesitatingly avowed that they found it upon the whole their most profitable plan to work off (kill with labor) their whole number of slaves about once in every seven years and renew the whole stock.³⁶

³⁶ Miller, 55.

The Jesuits had brought with them from Brazil a long dark history of mistreatment of African slaves. "It was the Catholic Jesuit priests who introduced this slave-killing sugar plantation work into Louisiana even after they had [taken] part in it for two hundred years in the West Indies".³⁷ The Jesuits, seen as a strong Catholic religious presence in Louisiana, were never judged for their poor treatment of their African slaves. To the white citizens, they were good holy individuals that did good deeds for the community. This provided the Catholic Clergy with another form of justification.

For the Catholic Clergy, the justification for being able to hold slaves was a reward for their charitable contributions.

Some clergy rationalized slavery as a recompense for performing good works. In one of their religious conferences, they adopted the following resolution: through "the blessing of God, by a preserving course of industry and rigid economy [we] acquired a competent support for ourselves and families and as a reward for our laborious exertion we received such [slaves] as [were] guaranteed to us" In this perspective, if one worked hard for one's own self and family, then one had the right, through divine blessings and reward for doing good works, to own black slaves.³⁹

Therefore, because they had done good deeds for their community and worked hard to achieve that good the clergy believed that they had the right to own slaves. Slavery then would make it easier for them to continue to do good deeds for the community and be able to sustain themselves in their own homes. Overall, the slaveholding clergy of the U.S. claimed that the African slaves were their reward for the life sacrifices they made in the name of God.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁹ Dwight N. Hopkins, "Columbus, the Church, and Slave Religion," *The Journal of Religious Thought*, 32.

I would like to turn our attention now to the ways in which the Catholic Church in both Brazil and the United States justified their holding and exploiting of African slaves. The Church often used the notion that what they were doing for the slave was better than the situation that they were living in previously. In the next section we will see how the Church and its slaveholding members used the notion of a betterment of condition along with biblical defenses for slavery as justification for the holding of the African Slave.

Justification of Holding African Slaves

It is important to note here one vast difference between the United States and Brazil. In the United States there was a separation between Church and State. This meant that in most cases, the Catholic Church had very little say in what the government of the United States decreed as a governing body over the people. However, this was not the case in Brazil. In Brazil, Church and State were harmoniously mixed. The actions and feelings of the State were in direct relationship with the Church. The following section will show this distinction quite clearly; while the Brazilian side speaks little about the biblical defense of slavery it speaks more on Church tradition.

We see the opposite with the United States in that it justifies the practice of slavery as having a biblical defense rather than one that is steeped in Church tradition. This primarily happens because Catholics in the United States argued with Protestants about the Bible and the way it was to be interpreted. We begin first with by exploring the arguments between Protestants and Catholics in the US.

The United States

In order to gain an understanding of how the Bible was used for the justification of slavery in the United States one must first have an understanding of how the church itself functioned within the country. It can be noted that in the 1860's, religion was much more important and central to the lives of the American person than any other center of value.⁴³ It must also be noted that most of the country at that time was of the Protestant⁴⁴ faith. The power of religion in American society was backed up by its sheer dispersion throughout the country. Everywhere one looked there were religious institutions, from the mighty religious colleges in big cities to the small rural churches of the Midwest. Religion had its place everywhere in America; therefore, we can see how the views of the church, especially proslavery ones, were so widely accepted by the American community.

By understanding the views of the Protestant community toward biblical interpretation, we see how the Catholic ideals of biblical literalism were strengthened. The views of the Protestant society were changing through the period leading up to the Civil War. They were looking for more intellectual ways of discerning problems that they faced in everyday life. Thomas Paine was one of these Protestant thinkers who were beginning to view the Bible in a different way.

⁴³ Mark A. Noll *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis*. North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006, 11.

⁴⁴ It is important to note that the faith of most Americans was protestant because then we have a means of comparing and contrasting their views with those of the Catholic Faith.

"To say that everything contained within the lids of the bible is divinely inspired, and to insist upon the dogma as fundamentally important, is to give utterance to a bold fiction, and to require the suspension of the reasoning faculties. To say that everything in the bible is to be believed, simply because it is found in that volume, is equally absurd and pernicious"⁴⁵

We can see by the above passage the views of the Protestant were that the Bible could not always be considered the word of God in every sense. It must be pointed out however, that the Protestant Church was still focused of biblical interpretation, just not in the literal sense. Therefore, it was this extensive history of literal interpretation accompanied with a lengthy Church tradition that differentiated Protestant and Catholic thinking towards slavery. However, the two groups did agree on at least one vision that was shared between all slaveholders in the southern part of the United States.

The issue of family honor has deep roots in the South. Family names, property ownership, and civil status are important to southerners to this day.⁴⁶ This therefore gave the religious southern slaveholder yet another justification for the practice of African slavery. White southern slaver owners saw their lives as having much to do with honor. And, because Ham violated Noah's honor by seeing him naked, he has lost all loyalty to the family. Therefore, southerners were attracted to the story because it showed that slavery was a punishment for dishonor within the family.

The southern slaveholder turned again to the Bible in Exodus 20:12 —"honor thy father and they mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the lord has given

⁴⁵ Noll, 31

⁴⁶ To own slaves was to be seen with the highest degree of honor, honor, for southerners, was something that Ham lacked completely.

you”—the southern slaver owner found a way of declaring Ham’s complete dishonor of his father as being a punishment for not following the words of the Bible.⁴⁷ Therefore, as a punishment for this sin, Ham and his descendents were bound to a life of servitude until the sins of the world were wiped away by the second coming.⁴⁸ The southern slaveholder was to be the one to oversee that this sentence was served, and in many cases it was the belief that slavery was a far better thing for the African than freedom was.

In an article entitled *The Use of the New Testament in the American Slavery Controversy*, we see a powerful declaration by a Catholic slave holder on the issue of slavery. The declaration reads:

“We claim for the institution of southern slavery, that it has done more for the religious, social, and physical condition of the African Race, than has ever been done... In Less than two centuries, three millions of them now living—to say nothing of the dead—have been brought into a state of...Christianity the African Negro, before slavery, had been “worshiping the Devil.”⁴⁹

This merely strengthens the argument that Catholics in the United States thought it better for the African to be in slavery than to be free. Because if they were free they would be running wildly through the street, would have no sense of order, and would be poisoning the country with their demon devil worship. Because of the fear of the

⁴⁸ Pennsylvanian Methodist John Bell Robinson, “if Ham and his son Canaan had been true to their father and grand-father, there would have been no slaves nor negroes in this world of ours.” Ibid, 75.

⁴⁹ J. Albert Harrill. *The Use of the New Testament in the American Slaver Controversy: A Case History in the Hermeneutical Tension between Biblical Criticism and Christian Moral Debate* (Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation, 2000), 150.

religions of the African slave the Catholic slaveholder turned to the Bible for support in justifying the practice of slavery.

In an article entitled *John Hughes and a Catholic Response to Slavery in Antebellum America*, we see the views of the Catholic Bishop of New York in his defense of slavery in the south.

"Although the Lord, in his omnipotence, could have obliterated the evil, He chose to permit its historical continuance as part of the plan to preserve free will for the human race. Slavery, like other evil in this world, was the price humanity paid for its original sin and had been preserved even after Christ's coming as a means to test man's moral faculties".⁵⁰

Hughes shared the same view as many southern Catholics that if God had wanted there to be no slavery he would never have created it or given Noah the authority to curse Ham.

Furthermore, southern Catholic slaveholders took the Bible to be the true word of God. Therefore, to go against what was written in the Bible was heresy.

"We...believe the Bible to be the Word of God, and to mean just what it says". To claim that servant means free servant, hired laborer, apprentice, or employee "disregards the plainest principles of language" and denies that the Bible "is the word of God go against what was written in the Bible was heresy."⁵¹

⁵⁰ Walter G. Sparrow, "John Hughes and a Catholic Response to Slavery in Antebellum America," *The Journal of Negro History*, 1972, 257-258

⁵¹ Harril, 164.

The same can be said about the words of Jesus Christ within the Bible. Many believe that since Jesus said nothing on the matter of slavery that it was fully accepted by both him and his Father.

The Silence of Christ on emancipation proved his support of slavery. Indeed throughout the entire Bible, God "has singled out the greatest slaveholders of that age, as the object of special favor".⁵²

One can see how this would cause the south to rise up angrily at abolitionists.⁵³ To them, an abolitionist was a godless person, bent on destroying the word of God and a person that must be dealt with in the most careful way.

It is clear that even in the Northern part of the United States, and area of the country most affiliated with freedom during the time of slavery, also had mixed feelings on the issue's of slavery's justification by the Church and on its ability to help civilize the slave. The following is an excerpt from a Catholic Newspaper based out of Boston, written in 1831:

Slavery, it matters not in what form, or order, has existed in the world ever since the fall of Adam, and what is still more, will continue to the end of time. We are

⁵² Ibid, 166.

⁵³ We can see this in a letter addressed to the abolitionists by an unknown southern slave holder.

"You [abolitionists] attempt to avert the otherwise irresistible conclusion, that slavery was thus ordained by God, by declaring that the word "slave" is not... found in the Bible. And I have seen many learned dissertations on this point from abolitionist pens. It is well known that both the Hebrew and Greek words translated "servant" in the Scriptures, mean also, and most usually "slave". The use of one word, instead of another, was a mere matter of taste with the translators of the Bible.... You endeavor to hang an argument of immoral consequences upon the wretched subterfuge, that the precise word "slave" is not to be found in the translation of the Bible. As if the translations were canonical expounders of the Holy Scriptures, and their words, not God's meaning, must be regarded as his revelation. It is vein to look to Christ and his Apostles to justify such blasphemous perversions of the word of God." Harrill, 165.

friends of well regulated freedom, and from our soul detest oppression under any shape or color. While we are convinced that no human institution is, or can be, exempt from defects, we must, to the credit of our southern neighbors, say that, although Protestant Britain has fastened the curse of Negro servitude upon them, the slave of the south enjoys more comfort, is more moral, and certainly more exempt from care, and the temptation to vice, than the free black or indigent white man of the North. Why, if slavery be, as it is, a blot upon the escutcheon of American freedom, did not the Fathers and Founders of our national Constitution, when the Revolution was fought, and gloriously won, immediately wipe it off by their declaration?⁵⁴

This passage shows us a few things about how most Catholics thought about slavery in the United States. First is the belief that slavery is better for the African than freedom. If a slave was free, they had to fend for themselves. They had to find a place that would employ them and a place that would allow them to have shelter. Even in the northern states these places were few and far between.

Second, is the point made about it being written into the constitution that slavery be abolished. The writer shares the common view that if the governing body of the United States wanted slavery abolished they would have abolished it with the founding fathers. But the government had its own ideas on the issue of slavery in the United States. I return again to the writings of Maxwell who points out that:

It was a Catholic, Chief Justice Roger Taney, who was one of the judges of the Supreme Court which was responsible for the judicial decision that Negro Slaves were not intended by the Declaration of Independence to be included as a part of the people, and had been regarded as beings of an inferior order and

⁵⁴ Zanka, 127.

altogether unfit to associate with the white race in social or political relations, and as so far inferior that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect, and that Negroes might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for their own benefit.⁵⁵

This shows us that even those who we would have put in charge of changing the Declaration of Independence had their biases towards the African Slave. While the north had their biases and confusions on the matter, southern Catholics had the Bible to turn to for the justification of slavery, and had their strong opinion that slavery was the best thing for the heathen African.

Brazil

During the period of Brazilian slavery Father Antonio Vieira was seen as one of the foremost "defenders" of the slaves. I use the word "defender" loosely here because Vieira himself did not condone the practice but merely fought so that the slave would not be beaten or punished cruelly. In fact, Vieira spoke to the slaves and asked them to consider their time spent under their masters as a way of achieving salvation. As Conrad describes:

Vieira fashioned the Church's discordant doctrines on slavery into a complex baroque "harmony." Justifying slavery through scripture, especially the example of the Babylonian Captivity, he urged the slaves to submit willingly to their earthly chains. Only their bodies could be enslaved on earth, he told his black listeners, but their souls were free unless, by their own sins, they sold themselves to the devil. Lifelong slavery was hard, but when they served their masters with a

⁵⁵ Maxwell, 112-113.

good will, slaves were in reality serving God and making place for themselves in heaven.⁵⁶

Vieira indisputably knew that life was hard for the African slave and used this to his advantage. His professions to the African slave were that if they endured their condition as slaves and worked hard for their masters they would be rewarded in heaven, ultimately achieving salvation by God.

Vieira's teachings were often confirmed in his sermons. While giving such a sermon to the slaves and masters of the congregation at the Church of the Black Brotherhood of the Rosary in Bahia he stated to the slaves:

You are the brothers of God's preparation and the children of God's fire. The children of God's fire of the present transmigration of slavery, because in this condition God's fire impressed the mark of slavery upon you; and, granted that this is the mark of oppression, it has also, like fire, illuminated you, because it has brought you the light of the Faith and the knowledge of Christ's mysteries, which are those which you solemnly profess on the rosary. But in the same condition of the first transmigration, which is that of temporal slavery, God and His Most Holy Mother are preparing you for the second transmigration, that of eternal freedom.⁵⁷

So for Vieira, the slave was merely going through slavery to achieve salvation that would be granted in the second migration. Furthermore, Vieira discouraged the slaves for ever seeking a bodily form of salvation. Using Christ as an example he explains that:

Christ, mankind's Redeemer, come only to redeem and liberate men from slavery of the soul, and not from the slavery of the body, the clear and manifest reason is

⁵⁶ Conrad, 186.

⁵⁷ Ibid, 190.

that mere men would be sufficient to liberate men from the slavery of men; {however,} to free from the enslavement of the devil and from sin, all God's power is required⁵⁸

The last passage brings us to another key argument that was used by both nations in the justification of slavery; the fact that Jesus Christ said nothing about the practice made it an acceptable one. Slavery was the slaveholders way of acting out of God's will; to enslave in this life for heaven in the next.

There was but another way for the Catholic Church to justify the holding of African slaves. The Church realized that they could argue that they were merely trying to help the African heathen find salvation. As we will see this practice became vital in the justification process for the Catholic Church, but still it did meet with various forms of resistance as well.

Christianization of the African

Brazil

The process of Christianization was another key element used to justify the practice of slavery by the Catholic Church. Through this practice, clergy members, as well the slave-owners themselves, would teach the heathen and barbaric slaves the ways of civilized Catholic society and hopefully through this process they would be saved in the afterlife. One such advocator was the Brazilian Archbishop of Bahia.

Through the colonial period in Brazil many ecclesiastic members of the Brazilian community became spokespersons for the practice of slavery. One such spokesperson

⁵⁸ Ibid.

was the D. Sebastiao Monteiro da Vide, The Archbishop of Bahia. The Archbishop was a great supporter of the Christianization of the African slaves, and saw them as an unintelligent people that needed help along the correct path.

And because the slaves of Brazil are those most in need of Christian Doctrine, so numerous are their nation and so diverse their languages, we should search for every means to instruct them in the faith, or for someone who may speak to them in their languages, and in our, when they can understand it.⁵⁹

With this passage the Archbishop expresses the common understanding of the African people from the Catholic Church's perspective. The Church viewed the major diversity of the Africans as a deterrent to their salvation. By having so many different types of people and so many different languages, the Africans were a separated people, who did not possess one central religion. This made them heathen, and therefore it was the Catholic Church's job to instruct the African savages in the civilized way or religion so that they may one day find their salvation.

The Archbishop stressed the importance of teaching the African slave the ways of the Christian doctrine:

We order all persons to, ecclesiastics as well as secular, to teach or have taught the Christian doctrine to their families, and especially to their slaves, who because of their ignorance are those most in need of this instruction, sending them to Church so that the priest may teach them the Articles of Faith, so that they may know what to believe; the Pater Noster and Ave Maria, so that they may know how to pray; to Commandments of the Law of God and of the Holy Mother Church, and to moral sins, so that they will know how to behave; the virtues, so that they may recognize good values; and the seven Sacraments, so that they may receive them with dignity, and with them the grace with which they give,

⁵⁹ Ibid, 155.

and the other prayers of Christian doctrine, so that they may be instructed in everything which is important to their salvation...⁶⁰

The above section, demonstrates the initial intention of the Church's role in slavery. They were to provide salvation to the heathen African slaves by teaching them the Christian doctrines and laws. This shows that the slaves were to be immersed in the ways of the Catholic Faith just as any other member of the secular community. Father Dutertre, often remembered for having a vast amount of sympathy concerning the treatment of African slaves, encouraged the practice of the sacraments by the slaves, especially marriage.

"Our Frenchmen see to it the slaves marry as soon as possible in order to have children who will eventually replace their father, do the same work, and bring them the same benefits".⁶¹

Therefore it was an asset for the slave owners to allow their slaves to marry because out of marriage comes children and those children are in essence free workers that can improve your work force. Dutertre also shared the view point that the Africans were better off as slaves, especially when they were treated humanely.

"They feel much happier as our slaves, when they are tolerably nourished and treated amenably, than they would be as free men in their own countries where they would die of hunger".⁶²

⁶⁰ Ibid, 154-155.

⁶¹ Laennec Hurbon in Dussel, 366.

⁶² Ibid.

Many others agreed with Dutertre and came to the conclusion that by treating their slaves better they would get better work out of them, which lead to them being able to work longer and thus create more profit for the slave owner.

While many agreed that through the method of Christianization there should be humane treatment of slaves, the Church was also careful to point out that after carrying out this practice; the slave was still a slave to his master. Even though the slave would be a Christian he was still bound to a life of servitude. The master was the teacher and the slave the student, therefore the student must still obey the master even when he teaching was complete. While the Church strongly urged the slave owners to Christianize their slaves many still objected to the practice for various reasons.

The book, *The Church in Latin America: 1492-1992*, describes the delicate balance between religion and politics that was carried out in regards to the practice of slavery:

The Catholic Church played a major role in the semi-feudal organizations of the colonies. There was a close link between the church and the plantations in the French and Spanish Caribbean. Many Mills on the larger islands had their own chapels, with chaplains paid by the proprietor. Production needs, however, did not always coincide with those of the Church, which led to numerous conflicts over issues such as working on feast days. But one could not manage without the other: the mill needed the religious justification for slavery, this being that the main reason for bringing black pagans from Africa was to teach them the way of Christian salvation; the church had powerful interests in the sugar mills...So the dominant factor was the alliance between the Church and the sugar producers, with the former preaching a message of submission to discourage black rebellion.⁶³

⁶³ Dussel, 204.

Overall, the Church had two objectives when it came to practicing slavery; one was to convert as many slaves as possible to Christianity, and the other was to profit from the practice. The Church sought to amass great wealth through the exploitation of African slave labor, and it could not do so if the mills and the Church did not have a justifiable reason for the keeping of slaves. This was not always the case however when it came to Christianization and it did meet with resistance at times, particularly in the United States.

The United States

Three common objections to Christianization are documented in Marcus W. Jernegan's article entitled *Slavery and Conversion in the American Colonies*.

Among the principle arguments against conversion of slaves were, first, that it would increase the cost of maintenance. Time would be consumed in instructing them, and especially in their attending Church. Sunday labor was common; some masters required their slaves to work on Sunday, as on other days, or compelled them to work for their own support that day, in order to lessen the cost of maintenance.⁶⁴

To Christianize the slaves meant that they would have to hold true to observing the Sabbath and Holy days. This would cause the slaveholder to lose money and days that could have otherwise been used for work. Jernegan continues with the second objection stating that:

Another and more serious affect of conversion was the alleged change in the attitude and character of the slaves. It was asserted that conversion developed notions of religious equality, and made slaves haughty and dissatisfied, and

⁶⁴ Marcus W. Jernegan, *Slavery and Conversion in the America Colonies*, *The American Historical Review*, 1916, 516.

increased the danger of insurrections. The notion was widespread that the converted African became intractable and ungovernable, because of the increased knowledge obtained through religious instruction.⁶⁵

Uprisings were commonplace during the colonial slave period. An instance where such an incident occurred can be seen in the story of the Count of Casa Bayona and his slaves on Maundy Thursday.

The Count of Casa Bayona decided to enact the Last Supper on Maundy Thursday. He, being the master, was going to humble himself before his slaves, washing the feet of twelve of them. This he did, in imitation of Jesus, washing the feet of twelve black slaves, then seating them at his table and serving them a meal. While the lesson the Count read into this may have been that the slaves had to humble themselves in everyday life, the slaves, on the other hand, took the lesson as being proof of their own dignity, and showing that there should be no inequality between the master and the slave. That same night, after what indeed proved to be their last supper, they rose up and burned down the mill. The rebellion was repressed; the Count ordered them to be beheaded and had their twelve heads mounted on lances.⁶⁶

It was because of the possibilities of revolts of this nature that the slave owners did not want to Christianize their slaves.

Although originally thought to be simple minded, the masters soon learned that their slaves were incredibly intelligent. The African slaves took what they learned from their masters to heart and truly accepted the Bible into their everyday lives. But because

⁶⁵ Ibid, 516-517.

⁶⁶ Dussel, 205.

of this great understanding many slaves started to perform dangerous actions and ask dangerous questions. During a revolt in Curacao, the leader of the group, a slave named Tula, had a conversation with a Franciscan Schinck in which he exclaimed that:

Master Priest, are not all persons descended from Adam and Eve? Did I do wrong in freeing twenty-two of my brothers who were wrongfully imprisoned?...I was arrested once, and asked without ceasing for mercy for a poor slave; when they finally set me free, blood was pouring from my mouth; I fell to my knees and cried to God: O Divine Majesty, O most pure Spirit, is it perhaps your will that they should ill-treat us this way? Master Priest, they treat their animals better... We want nothing but our freedom.⁶⁷

It can be seen that by teaching the slaves the Christian way of life, they were beginning to realize that what was happening to them was wrong. This put the Catholic Church in a very difficult position because if the masters did not want to Christianize their slaves then there really was no true way to justify their holding.

Jernegan continues further and describes that the third common objection was one that was made on social grounds.

The belief was common that imported African Negroes were hardly above beasts, and the appearance of many negroes must have given ground for such a notion. Savages of the lowest types were quite different in appearance and character from the Negro of the present generation, so much changed by infusion of white blood and contact with a Christian civilization. From a social standpoint, association with the imported Negro was extremely objectionable. To mingle with him in Church, or to receive him on terms of equality at the communion table, was not only undesirable but positively dangerous.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Jernegan, 516-517.

The two societies were supposed to be separated into the civilized white slave owners, and the heathen Africans slaves. By teaching them the Christian faith, both groups were being put on the same level socially. They would attend the same Churches and pray the same prayers; this outraged many of the owners because they did not want to consider themselves similar to the slave in any way. Therefore, if the process of Christianization would do this, the slave owner would object to it.

Conclusion

Taking all the previous sections into account it is easy to see how the Church justified the practice of slavery in the United States and Brazil. First was the issue of Biblical interpretation. The Catholic Church in both countries looked to it for ways of justifying the practice of slavery. By displaying that God and Jesus did not condone the practice, that Noah condemned his son Ham the first African into slavery and by stating that since the Bible is God's word and going against it would be a terrible sin, the Catholic Church was able to create one way of justifying the practice of slavery.

Another way they did this was through the Black Codes. Though the codes were originally issued by a French king, they still had merit in other countries that practiced Catholicism and Slavery. With them, the Catholic Church had a way of providing documentation that stated that what they were doing was right.

A Third factor was the actions of the Church leaders and clergy. By owning slaves it enabled them to amass great wealth, a factor that would have been frowned upon by the Church if it was not done in a justifiable way. Therefore the Church demonstrated that while their slaves worked for them they would be taught the ways of the Catholic

Faith. This eventually spread to the laity of the slave owning areas as well and eventually became the major justification for the practice of slavery by the Catholic Church.

Writing this has taught me that one should never judge a book by its cover. Having been educated in Catholic institutions most of my life, I found it hard to believe what I was reading at first. I believed the Catholic Church to be a pure entity that could not have carried out the actions that I was reading about. But what I now see is that even the Catholic Church has its dark secrets, and no matter how hard they try they cannot deny the fact that they played a profound role in the institution of slavery in the United States and Brazil.

Works Cited

- Breathett, George. "Catholicism and the Code Noir in Haiti." *The Journal of Negro History*, 1988: 1-11.
- Burkholder, Mark A., and Lyman L. Johnson. *Colonial Latin America*. 6th Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Capizzi, Joseph E. "For What Shall We Repent? Reflections on the American Bishops, Their Teaching, and Slavery in the United States, 1839-1861." *Theological Studies*, 2004: 767-791.
- Conrad, Robert Edgar. *Children of God's Fire: A Documentary History of Black Slavery in Brazil*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press., 1983.
- Dussel, Enrique, ed. *The Church in Latin America 1492-1992*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1992.
- Harrill, J. Albert. "The Use of the New Testament in the American Slaver Contreoversy: A Case History in the Hermenutical Tension betwee Biblical Criticism and Christian Moral Debate." *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* (The Center for the Study of Religion and American Culture) 10, no. 2 (2000): 149-186.
- Haynes, Stephen R. *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery*. New York: Oxford Universtiy Press, 2002.
- Hopkins, Dwight N. "Columbus, the Church, and Slave Religion." *The Journal of Religious Thought* 25-35.
- Jernegan, Marcus W. "Slavery and Conversion in the America Colonies." *The American Historical Review* (American Historical Association) 21, no. 3 (April 1916): 504-517.
- Maxwell, John Francis. *Slavery and the Catholic Church: The History of Catholic Teaching Concerning the Moral Legitimacy of the Institution of Slavery*. Chichester: Barry Rose Publishers, 1975.
- Miller, Richard Roscoe. *Slavery and Catholicism*. Durham, North Carolina: North State Publishers, 1957.
- Noll, Mark A. *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis*. North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Serbin, Kenneth P. *Needs of the Heart: A Social and Cultural History of Brazil's Clergy and Seminaries*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.

Sharrow, Walter G. "John Huges and a Catholic Response to Slavery in Antebellum America." *The Journal of Negro History* (The Association for the Study of African-American Life and History, Inc.) 57, no. 3 (July 1972): 254-269.

The Code Noir (The Black Code). <http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/335/> (accessed March 18, 2008).

Zanca, Kenneth J, ed. *American Catholics and Slavery: 1789-1866 An Anthology of Primary Documents*. Maryland: University Press of America, Inc, 1994.

Sources Consulted

- Attridge, Harold W., Jouette M. Bassler, Wayne A. Meeks, Werner E. Lemke, Susan Niditch, and Schuller M. Eileen, . *The Harper Collins Study Bible*. New Revised Standard Version. San Fancisco, 2006.
- Breathett, George. "Catholicism and the Code Noir in Haiti." *The Journal of Negro History*, 1988: 1-11.
- Burkholder, Mark A., and Lyman L. Johnson. *Colonial Latin America*. 6th Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Capizzi, Joseph E. "For What Shall We Repent? Reflections on the American Bishops, Their Teaching, and Slavery in the United States, 1839-1861." *Theological Studies*, 2004: 767-791.
- Cobb, Howell. *A Scriptural examination of the institution of slavery in the United States*. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1972.
- Conrad, Robert Edgar. *Children of God's Fire: A Documentary History of Black Slavery in BRazil*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press., 1983.
- Dussel, Enrique, ed. *The Church in Latin America 1492-1992*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1992. Elkins, Stanley, and Eric McKittrick. "Institutions and the Law of Slavery: Slavery in Capitalist and Non-Capitalist Cultures." *American Quarterly* (The Johns Hopkins Universtiy Press) 9, no. 2 (1957): 159-179.
- Finkelman, Paul, and Joseph C. Miller, . *Macmillan Encyclopedia of World Slavery*. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan Reference USA Simon and Schuster Macmillan, 1998.
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth, and Eugene D. Genovese. "The Divine Sanction of Social Order: Religious Foundations of the Southern Slaverholders World View." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 211-223.
- Harrill, J. Albert. "The Use of the New Testament in the American Slaver Contreoversy: A Case History in the Hermenutical Tension betwee Biblical Criticism and Christian Moral Debate." *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* (The Center for the Study of Religion and American Culture) 10, no. 2 (2000): 149-186.
- Haynes, Stephen R. *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery*. New York: Oxford Universtiy Press, 2002.
- Hopkins, Dwight N. "Columbus, the Church, and Slave Religion." *The Journal of Religious Thought* 25-35.

- How, Samuel Blanchard. *Slaveholding not sinful. Slavery, the punishment of man's sin, its remedy, the gospel of Christ*. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1971.
- Jernegan, Marcus W. "Slavery and Conversion in the America Colonies." *The American Historical Review* (American Historical Association) 21, no. 3 (April 1916): 504-517.
- Klein, Herbert S. "Anglicanism, Catholicism and the Negro Slave." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* (Cambridge University Press) 8, no. 3 (April 1966): 295-327.
- Klein, Martin A. *Historical Dictionary of Slavery and Abolition*. Scarecrow Press, 2002.
- Mattoso, Katina M. De Queiros. *To Be a Slave in Brazil: 1550-1888*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991.
- Maxwell, John Francis. *Slavery and the Catholic Church: The History of Catholic Teaching Concerning the Moral Legitimacy of the Institution of Slavery*. Chichester: Barry Rose Publishers, 1975.
- Miller, Richard Roscoe. *Slavery and Catholicism*. Durham, North Carolina: North State Publishers, 1957.
- Milne, Pamela J. "No promised land: rejecting the authority of the Bible." 49-73.
- Morrison, Larry R. "The Religious Defense of American Slavery Before 1830." *The Journal of Religious Thought* 19-29.
- Noll, Mark A. *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis*. North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Penyak, Lee M., and Walter J. Perry, . *Religion in Latin America*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2006.
- Rodriguez, Junius P., ed. *The Historical Encyclopedia of WORLD SLAVERY*. 2 vols. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 1997.
- Ruuth, Anders. "Royal Mission in a Gigantic Country: Some Characteristics of the Early Colonial Church in Brazil." *Swedish Missiological Themes* 92, no. 2 (2003): 323-346.
- Serbin, Kenneth P. *Needs of the Heart: A Social and Cultural History of Brazil's Clergy and Seminaries*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.
- Sharrow, Walter G. "John Huges and a Catholic Response to Slavery in Antebellum America." *The Journal of Negro History* (The Association for the Study of African-American Life and History, Inc.) 57, no. 3 (July 1972): 254-269.

The Code Noir (The Black Code). <http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/335/>
(accessed March 18, 2008).

Zanca, Kenneth J, ed. *American Catholics and Slavery: 1789-1866 An Anthology of Primary Documents*. Maryland: University Press of America, Inc, 1994.

Annotated Bibliography

Finkelman, Paul, and Joseph C. Miller, . *Macmillan Encyclopedia of World Slavery*. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan Reference USA Simon and Schuster Macmillan, 1998.

These encyclopedias give a huge overview of slavery from a historical standpoint, and give mass amounts of information related to the issue of slavery. These will be used as starting points in researching various aspects of Christianity and its involvement with slavery in the United States.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth, and Eugene D. Genovese. "The Divine Sanction of Social Order: Religious Foundations of the Southern Slaverholders World View." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 211-223.

With this article the authors explain and give examples of how Christianity and slavery were vital in the eyes of the southerners to maintain their social order. It gives justifications as to why the slaveholders had to hold authority over Negroes, and shows how biblical interpretation was vital to the success of slavery in the southern United States.

Harrill, J. Albert. "The Use of the New Testament in the American Slaver Controversy: A Case History in the Hermeneutical Tension between Biblical Criticism and Christian Moral Debate." *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* (The Center for the Study of Religion and American Culture) 10, no. 2 (2000): 149-186.

With this article, Harrill demonstrates that the understanding of pro and anti-slavery advocates depended on their interpretation of the bible. Pro-slavery advocates took a far more literal approach to the Bible, whereas Anti-slavery advocates tended to shy away from the literal translation of the Bible and ultimately adopted a new interpretation of the Golden Rule taught by Jesus Christ. This article also includes the views of African American Abolitionists such as Frederick Douglass. Douglass' view was to keep Christianity together with the Biblical interpretation, while others such as Nat Turner, wanted to reject "white" Christianity and use violence for abolition.

Hopkins, Dwight N. "Columbus, the Church, and Slave Religion." *The Journal of Religious Thought* 25-35.

With this article, Hopkins gives examples of how early Spanish Christian teachings on slavery were carried over to the United States, and how these teachings were then used to justify the practice of slavery. Examples of which include Christianization of slaves, biblical passages that were commonly used to justify slavery and the support of papal authority in Latin American slavery.

How, Samuel Blanchard. *Slaveholding not sinful. Slavery, the punishment of man's sin, its remedy, the gospel of Christ*. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1971.

This book is divided into three parts; The Address, The Appendix, and The Conclusion. The Address is an argument of Samuel B. How before the general Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in October 1855. In the address and appendix, How presents evidence of why Slavery is the punishment for sin. Furthermore, he discusses the sanctions set upon slaveholders in regards to the fair and unruly treatment of Negro Slaves. The Conclusion carries examples of why Christianity was vital and important to both slaves and slaveholders.

Jernegan, Marcus W. "Slavery and Conversion in the America Colonies." *The American Historical Review* (American Historical Association) 21, no. 3 (April 1916): 504-517.

Shows many examples of how the Church justified the practice of slavery. This article also shows the tensions that were present between the Church and the slaveholders with regards to the religious practice of the slaves. This presented a problem because if the church should not claim that they were trying to convert the slaves to Christianity then they had no way of justifying their involvement in the practice of slavery.

Klein, Herbert S. "Anglicanism, Catholicism and the Negro Slave." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* (Cambridge University Press) 8, no. 3 (April 1966): 295-327.

In this article, Klein compares the Christian process of converting slaves in Cuba and Virginia. Klein shows that Virginia slaveholders were not as accepting of the doctrines of Christianity placed upon the slaves themselves. This created much tension between the church and the slaveholders because without the process of Christianization there could be no real case for the legitimacy of slaveholding.

Morrison, Larry R. "The Religious Defense of American Slavery Before 1830." *The Journal of Religious Thought* 19-29.

Morrison displays the Biblical reasoning the Church used in regards to slavery in this article. He uses many Bible passages and themes such as the Curse of Cain, to emphasize the views of the Catholic Church during this period. He explains how southern slaveholders looked at Biblical passages with extreme detail in order to find any trace of pro-slavery argument. Therefore, those in favor of slavery could argue that if God recognized slavery in the Scripture, slavery could not possibly be viewed as immoral.

Rodriguez, Junius P., ed. *The Historical Encyclopedia of WORLD SLAVERY*. 2 vols. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 1997.

These encyclopedias give a huge overview of slavery from a historical standpoint, and give mass amounts of information related to the issue of slavery. These will be used as starting points in researching various aspects of Christianity and its involvement with slavery in the United States.

Sharrow, Walter G. "John Huges and a Catholic Response to Slavery in Antebellum America." *The Journal of Negro History* (The Association for the Study of African-American Life and History, Inc.) 57, no. 3 (July 1972): 254-269.

In this article, Sparrow gives an account of the Archbishop of New York, John Huges. With the help of his sermons and other letters he reveals that although Huges preached about some of the cruelties of slavery, he still supported the practice as a way in which to better the lives of the Africans.

