

Ohio Wesleyan University

Digital Commons @ OWU

Finley Letters

James B. Finley Letters

5-10-1848

Letter from David Young to James B. Finley

David Young

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.owu.edu/finley-letters>

Recommended Citation

Young, David, "Letter from David Young to James B. Finley" (1848). *Finley Letters*. 393.
<https://digitalcommons.owu.edu/finley-letters/393>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the James B. Finley Letters at Digital Commons @ OWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Finley Letters by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ OWU. For more information, please contact earutigl@owu.edu.

Dr B. Bannock May 10th 48

906
Yesterday I wrote in a hurry on the reception of yours, and supposed that the "Bishops recommendation" was designed to prevent the church from suffering all the 4 year interval of Gen. Con. by any unconstitutional act or acts of ^{the} Conference, But on examination it seems this is but an incidental part of the new scheme, for the "Delegate to Gen. Con. is to have power to

1. "Suspend enactments" of Gen. Con.
2. To "try appeals" from members of a Conference
3. To do such other things — as they judge proper"

On the first of these I refer you to what is contained yesterday letter.

On the second I refer you to the 5th restriction limiting the power of Gen. Con. in the Discipline. Then turn to Chap. 1819 answer to Question 4 — where it is provided "That an appeal to reversing Gen. Con. shall be allowed" to all persons converted by an Anabaptist Gen. Con. or one of its members.

Now it is certainly out of the power of Gen. Con. to turn over appellants to a Delegate committee, dubbed "Conference", in violation of the laws & constitution of the Church. This would be more fatal than the action of the last Gen. Con. for that did leave it ^{to} us half; this would leave us none of.

The first step in this business would be for you to recommend to the A. Gen. Con. to vote for the above restriction to be altered & an alteration to effect the object, must entirely re-model if not destroy the principles by which we have heretofore been protected & governed.

Where are those "number of brethren" of whom

Bishops speak in their paper recommending
I said Bishops, but is it not the ^{spirit} of one
in which the others have good naturally con-
-curred? Are not there "brethren" downcasters.

surely there are measures un contemplated
in the West. I can't get along with this
measure with any kind of patience only
by supposing that I do not understand it

The Times, circumstances, Original Author and
objects — of this document makes me
feel melancholy — To raise any kind
of paper tribunal to "suspend" the acts
unconstitutional, of Gen. Can. might be
be a benefit, & could do no harm — But
the more I think the more I'm convinced
that altering the rule, or rather adding to
the rule the privilege of calling an ex-
tra session of Gen. Can. ^{in the spirit of measure} when necessary

On the third of the above recommendations
"To do such other things as they judge proper"
in the absence of specification —

this proposition looks like big head
Is not this whole measure calculated
(taken all together) to stop your itinerant
wheels sooner or later? — If you make

that D, A, Conference — can't they act like
the "committee of nine" give directions
& make some body else judges over whom

the the Gen. Can. shall have no control

I say again for God's sake & the Church's
sake do as little legislating as possible

I shall not write what I think —
I pray God to preserve the church

until I always feel better when I pray
(P.S. send letters showing me another part & paper)

Yours
W B F. Finley
NB if I knew what the B's really wanted my mind
would feel better