

Report on the Origins of the Endowment of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts

Eric LaForest

Co-chair, Beloved Community Commission

Submitted September 2024

I. Introduction

“The paint of the piazza under Uncle Frank’s feet is worn through to the board.” So wrote the niece of Mr. Francis Welles Hunnewell to Bishop William Lawrence, whose memoir features a chapter on the division of the Diocese of Massachusetts in 1901.¹ In the words of the bishop, who had envisioned and engineered that split, Hunnewell “was over sixty years of age, a man of wealth and leisure, director of large corporations, highly esteemed downtown, senior warden of the Church of the Advent. He undertook what was for anybody, and for him especially, a most irksome task, the raising of the one hundred thousand dollars to be presented to the Western Diocese.”² As chair of the fundraising committee appointed by the bishop at the 1901 diocesan convention that voted unanimously to divide the diocese, Hunnewell was summering at a luxury hotel in the White Mountains of New Hampshire, but he spent his time raising what is the equivalent of well over \$3 million dollars in 2024.

The financial origins of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts could, then, be traced back to that Gilded Age resort in Bethlehem, New Hampshire. Or they could be connected to sprawling copper mines of Michigan’s Upper Peninsula. Or to the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad that coursed its way through midwestern states at the close of the nineteenth century. Or, one generation back, to the economic codependency of Boston textile manufacturers and Southern cotton planters who relied on the stolen lives and labor of enslaved people. What might seem like a story of one Massachusetts diocese providing for the financial security of another Massachusetts diocese is really a much more fully American story of capitalism, investment, exploitation, and philanthropy.

This report seeks to fulfill the promise made at the 122nd Diocesan Convention of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts in 2023 to “share a report with the Diocese focusing especially

¹ William Lawrence, *Memories of a Happy Life* (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1926), 150.

² William Lawrence, *Memories of a Happy Life*, 150.

on the diocesan endowment and the originating funds transferred from the Diocese of Massachusetts upon our founding.”³ After a discussion of the history and historical context of the endowment and establishment of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts, the report will profile Bishop William Lawrence and Mr. Francis Hunnewell, the two men whose leadership was most indispensable. The report concludes with a collection of final considerations and lingering questions that could lead to further study and action.

II. Historical Background

Before exploring the specific circumstances around the origins of the endowment, some discussion of broader historical and historiographical issues in American capitalism and American slavery should prove helpful. As Beth English has claimed, “During the first decades of the nineteenth century, the manufacture of cotton textile goods drove much of the industrialization of New England. In the eastern part of Massachusetts, Boston businessmen invested their monies in spinning and weaving mills along the fall lines of the Charles River in Waltham and the Merrimack River in Lowell and Lawrence. In the central part of the state, local merchants in the Chicopee-Springfield area of the Connecticut River valley did the same.”⁴ Further, and as historian Noam Maggor writes in his *Brahmin Capitalism: Frontiers of Wealth and Populism in America’s First Gilded Age*, “When Americans went to civil war in 1861, the United States was the leading supplier of the era’s most important agricultural commodity—cotton. By the early twentieth century, that same country had emerged as the foremost industrial nation in the world, surpassing the manufacturing output of Germany, France, and the United Kingdom combined. This was arguably nothing less than the greatest leap in industrial capacity in human history to that point. It catapulted a new set of industries—iron and steel, mining, chemicals, meatpacking, and most importantly, railroads—to the core of American capitalism, radically recasting social relations, labor regimes, political institutions,

³ That resolution as well as further information about the atonement efforts of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts can be found here: <https://www.diocesewma.org/beloved-community-commission/atonement>.

⁴ Beth English, *A Common Thread: Labor, Politics, and Capital Mobility in the Textile Industry* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2006), 7.

and ideological commitments.”⁵ That transition out of enslavement and fully into industry would have been impossible without the antebellum regional economic ties that bound North and South.

So-called “new historians of capitalism” have explored these links extensively in the last few decades. These scholars, including most prominently Edward Baptist, Sven Beckert, and Walter Johnson, have clearly demonstrated how—the triumphant history of abolitionism notwithstanding—New England investment and economic development were fueled by the system of enslavement that flourished elsewhere. According to Edward Baptist, “Both South and North depended on slavery’s expansion. The products generated from the possibilities of co-exploitation explain much of the nation’s astonishing rise to power in the nineteenth century. Through the booms and the crashes emerged a financial system that continuously catalyzed the development of US capitalism.”⁶ Though there remains some scholarly disagreement about aspects of this history, there is resounding consensus about the economic and social conditions that led to American capitalism’s ascendancy as well as numerous new directions for study.⁷

Voices in the church have echoed those understandings, including recent historical work completed in the Diocese of Massachusetts and at the national church level. In a 2024 report, Alden Fossett wrote that, “Many of the people who fueled and funded the Episcopal Diocese of

⁵ Noam Maggor, *Brahmin Capitalism: Frontiers of Wealth and Populism in America’s First Gilded Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017), ix.

⁶ Edward E. Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014), 412.

⁷ More detailed discussion of the “new historians of capitalism” can be found at John J. Clegg, “Capitalism and Slavery,” *Critical Historical Studies* 2, no. 2 (2015): 281-304. See also Sven Beckert and Seth Rockman, eds. *Slavery’s Capitalism: A New History of American Economic Development* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016); Sven Beckert et al., “Interchange: The History of Capitalism,” *Journal of American History* 101, no. 2 (September 2014): 503-536; and Seth Rockman, “What Makes the History of Capitalism Newsworthy?,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 34, no. 3 (Fall 2014): 439-466. There are countless other interpretations of capitalism’s relationship to enslavement that are readily available and that challenge facile notions of the economic and social development of nineteenth-century America. For instance, in his *The Business of Slavery and the Rise of American Capitalism, 1815-1860*, Calvin Schermerhorn writes that, “The business of slavery in the early United States was a symphony of creativity and violence.” Calvin Schermerhorn, *The Business of Slavery and the Rise of American Capitalism, 1815-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), 9. And Caitlin Rosenthal, in her book *Accounting for Slavery: Masters and Management*, explains that “Studying the ways profit and innovation can accompany violence and inequality is particularly important in the world of modern capitalism. The mythology of capitalism suggests that many individuals pursuing their own interest can make whole societies wealthier. In our current moment, it is a commonplace to hear people argue that the ‘freer’ the market, the greater the profit and the faster the growth. Generally, those offering such explanations assume that a free market does not include slavery, but as I have conducted my research, I have come to see things differently.” Caitlin Rosenthal, *Accounting for Slavery: Masters and Management* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018), xii-xiv.

Massachusetts made their fortunes through wealth connected to the slave economy or by directly owning enslaved people.”⁸ And in 2021 the Racial Justice Commission of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts observed that, “While a particular congregation might not have owned slaves, or maybe no one in the congregation might have, the economic system of slavery was broad and encompassing. There were banks that provided loans and mortgages on enslaved persons; insurance companies which offered insurance policies; and ships and shipping companies that engaged in the transatlantic slave trade. There were also secondary economic impacts. The textiles that fueled the industrial rise in northern states was produced by the slave system.”⁹ Finally, from her influential *The Church Cracked Open: Disruption, Decline, and New Hope for Beloved Community*, Canon Stephanie Spellers wrote the following: “Of all the churches in America, the Episcopal Church was arguably the most willing to continue accommodating slaveholders, traders, and upper-class racists...Slavery was essential to America’s growing economic might, and especially in the South, that wealth and power flowed freely into the Episcopal Church.”¹⁰

This backdrop—including recent scholarship by historians as well as the recent adaptation of that scholarship by committees and leaders of the Episcopal Church—should shape how we view our own story.

III. The Origins of the Endowment

There would be no Diocese of Western Massachusetts without the leadership of Bishop William Lawrence; yet, as William J. Watts III has written in *Twin Killings: The Decision to Divide the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts in 1901*, “From 1870 to 1901, the Diocese of Massachusetts was the

⁸ Alden Fossett. “And You Will Know the Truth, and the Truth Will Make You Free: A Historical Framework (1620-1840) For Understanding How the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts Benefits Today from Chattel Slavery and its Legacy,” accessed June 26, 2024, <https://www.diomass.org/sites/diomass/files/attachments/Episcopal%20Diocese%20of%20Massachusetts%20Historical%20Framework%20for%20Understanding%20Benefits%20from%20Slavery%20and%20Its%20Legacy%20Report.pdf>.

⁹ Racial Justice Commission of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts. “The Episcopal Church and Slavery: A Historical Narrative,” accessed August 7, 2024, https://www.diomass.org/sites/diomass/files/attachments/Reparations%20Toolkit_Episcopal%20Church%20and%20Slavery%20Historical%20Narrative_2021_11.pdf.

¹⁰ Stephanie Spellers, *The Church Cracked Open: Disruption, Decline, and New Hope for Beloved Community* (New York: Church Publishing Incorporated, 2021), 60-1.

largest diocese in the Episcopal Church in the United States. Only the Diocese of New York and Pennsylvania were comparable in numbers of communicants and financial resources. However, with its geographic bounds mirroring those of the state, the Diocese of Massachusetts was almost two-thirds larger than the Dioceses of Pennsylvania and New York, whose boundaries no longer corresponded to those of their respective states.”¹¹ Watts notes that “the total property value of the parishes in the diocese for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1900, was approximately \$8,600,000.”¹² Those realities made the decision to divide the diocese much easier for the delegates who convened at Trinity Church in Copley Square in June of 1901.¹³

Those delegates’ support of the resolution was contingent on the creation of an endowment of \$100,000, allowing for a degree of financial security for the new western diocese.¹⁴ That security would mitigate some of the consternation felt by church leaders in the western half of the state. As Richard Nunley wrote in *From the Blackstone to the Housatonic: A History of the Episcopal Diocese of Western Massachusetts: The First Hundred Years*, “Clergy and congregations in western Massachusetts viewed with heavy heart the prospect of being cut off from Boston, the historic heart of Massachusetts’s identity, with all its tradition and prestige. A split would destine western Massachusetts to being permanently the country mouse, unwealthy, uninfluential, second-rate, an unpromising backwater where clergy could not hope to build a reputation and career.”¹⁵ Indeed, Nunley paints quite the picture of the humble beginnings of the second Massachusetts diocese: “At division, the new diocese had one-sixth the wealth of the old and, at 8,258, one-fifth the number of communicants. There were forty-eight parishes and missions, fifty-four clergy connected one way or another with the diocese, and zero diocesan institutions—for another two years it would not have even an office.”¹⁶

¹¹ William J. Watts III. *Twin Killings: The Decision to Divide the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts in 1901*, Master’s thesis (Boston: University of Massachusetts, Boston, 1997), 3.

¹² Watts, 115.

¹³ Because this report is focused primarily on the origins of the diocesan endowment, its author encourages readers to read William Watts’ work for more information on the process and politics of division. Though hard to find beyond a copy in our diocesan archives in Springfield, Watts’ master’s thesis deserves a much wider readership.

¹⁴ For the full resolution, please see the Appendix at the conclusion of this report.

¹⁵ Richard Nunley, *From the Blackstone to the Housatonic: A History of the Episcopal Diocese of Western Massachusetts: The First Hundred Year* (Springfield, MA: Episcopal Diocese of Western Massachusetts, 2002), 5-6.

¹⁶ Nunley, 7-8.

The endowment, then, was a lifeline that bought time for the first Bishop of Western Massachusetts¹⁷ and bought peace of mind for the Bishop of Massachusetts. In his memoir published in 1926, Lawrence wrote that, before the division, it was clear that, “the financial strength of the Church was in the east; and if they [the Western half of the diocese] were to be set off as the stronger dioceses have usually set off the weaker, with a mere pittance, they could not live; the Western Diocese would be perpetually anaemic [sic].”¹⁸ After the endowment secured in October, and, as time passed, Bishop Lawrence felt that he had done right by the situation, recalling that “the division of the Diocese was for the welfare of the Church. Within seven years this Diocese had regained its full strength and numbers. In certain ways it has brought relief to the Bishop.”¹⁹

Before that relief could be enjoyed, however, the money needed to be found. There were only four months between the passing of the diocesan resolution in June of 1901 and the fast-approaching General Convention scheduled for San Francisco in October, so the bishop’s fundraising committee certainly had its work cut out for it. And, as Watts graciously put it, “The vacationing rich were hard to reach.”²⁰

As previously mentioned, the committee was chaired by Mr. Francis Welles Hunnewell. He was joined by ten laymen and three clergymen. As was true for the diocesan convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts as a whole, the fourteen-member committee represented “some of the most prestigious families in Massachusetts.”²¹ Committee members hailed from the most influential parishes of greater Boston, including Church of the Advent (Hunnewell and George P. Gardner), Trinity Boston (Robert Treat Paine and Francis Sears), and St. Paul’s Boston (Rev. John Lindsay, its

¹⁷ As Bishop Alexander H. Vinton proclaimed in his first annual address in 1901, “Hearty and thankful acknowledgement should be made for the fraternal spirit developed in liberal offerings of parishes and individuals whereby the prompt completion and presentation of the handsome amount agreed upon were brought about. I would make grateful mention of the direct and influential interest displayed in this enterprise by the Bishop personally, and also among large-hearted laymen, of the indefatigable labours of him who made it his own concern to accomplish a result which was characteristic of Massachusetts energy, determination and Massachusetts Churchmanship.” *Journal of the Convention of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts* (Worcester, MA: F.S. Blanchard & Co., 1902), 72.

¹⁸ Lawrence, *Memories of a Happy Life*, 149.

¹⁹ Lawrence, *Memories of a Happy Life*, 151.

²⁰ Watts, 188.

²¹ Watts, 71. The full membership of the committee was as follows: Mr. Francis W. Hunnewell, chairman; Mr. S. Reed Anthony; Mr. E. Pierson Beebe; Mr. William H. Bent; Mr. George P. Gardner; Mr. William H. Lincoln; Mr. Marcus Morton; Mr. Robert Treat Paine; Mr. Clarence H. Poor; Mr. Charles G. Saunders; Mr. Francis B. Sears; The Rev. William B. Frisby; The Rev. John S. Lindsay; and the Rev. Carlton P. Mills. See *Journal of the Convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts* (Boston: Damrell and Upham, 1901), 104.

Virginia-born rector), which would become a cathedral seat in just over a decade. Six of the eleven lay members of the committee were also leaders and members of the exclusive Episcopalian Club of Massachusetts.²²

Though the life and career of Francis Hunnewell will receive closer attention in the section that follows, many other members of the committee have names that would be instantly recognizable to historians of Boston's Brahmin class. Robert Treat Paine, whose namesake great-grandfather had signed the Declaration of Independence, was a philanthropist and lawyer who "wisely and very profitably invested in Michigan copper mines. He was the principle [sic] investor in two western railroads, the Atchison Topeka and Santa Fe and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy. Foreseeing that land values would increase as a result of these railroads, he invested heavily in Nebraska land bonds."²³ A Harvard classmate of Bishop Phillips Brooks, he was also a member of the vestry of Trinity Church in Copley Square, the executive committee of the Episcopal City Mission, and the Trustees of Donations.²⁴ William H. Bent, another committee member and a New Englander who traced his family history back to the 1630s, was a Taunton manufacturer whose wealth was connected to "building cotton machinery."²⁵ S. Reed Anthony was a financier who co-established Tucker, Anthony, & Co., which remained active as a State Street investment banking and brokerage firm into the twenty-first century.²⁶

As the author of his *Harvard Crimson* obituary put it, committee member George Peabody Gardner was "known for his philanthropic activities as well as his financial successes."²⁷ He was directly descended from the planter Thomas Gardner, who landed at Cape Ann in 1624.²⁸ An 1868

²² Episcopalian Club of Massachusetts, *By-Laws of The Episcopalian Club of Massachusetts, and Officers and Members* (No place of publication: Episcopalian Club of Massachusetts, April 1903).

²³ Richard Heath and Jamaica Plain Historical Society. "Robert Treat Paine Housing Reformer," accessed August 23, 2024. <https://www.jphs.org/people/2005/4/14/robert-treat-paine-housing-reformer.html#gsc.tab=0>.

²⁴ Edwin M. Bacon, ed., *Men of Progress: One Thousand Biographical Sketches and Portraits of Leaders in Business and Professional Life in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (Boston: New England Magazine, 1896), 80, https://www.google.com/books/edition/_/5HFPAAYAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1.

²⁵ Edwin M. Bacon, ed., *Men of Progress*, 367.

²⁶ Edwin M. Bacon, ed., *Men of Progress*, 835.

²⁷ No author, "George Peabody Gardner, 83, University Trustee, is Dead," *The Harvard Crimson*, June 7, 1939, accessed July 3, 2024, <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/1939/6/7/george-peabody-gardner-83-university-trustee/>.

²⁸ Frank Augustine Gardner, *Gardner Memorial: A Biographical and Genealogical Record of the Descendants of Thomas Gardner, Planter* (Salem, Mass: no publisher, 1933), 1, <https://archive.org/details/gardnermemorialb00gard/page/n7/mode/2up>.

indenture contract between John L. Gardner (George P. Gardner's paternal grandfather who was, according to the Massachusetts Historical Society, "largely interested in commerce in the East Indies and Russia"²⁹) and his three sons reveals a significant inheritance of stocks and bonds in banks, railroads (such as the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad), manufacturing, mills, and in the Union Wharf Company of Boston Harbor, which John L. Gardner had purchased in the 1840s.³⁰ John L. Gardner's father, Samuel Gardner, spent his first seven years after Harvard as a merchant in Charleston before returning to Boston and marrying into the Lowell family.³¹ And one of John L. Gardner's sons, George Augustus Gardner, was a successful merchant and owner of eight ships who "when shipping declined, largely as one of the results of the Civil War...became deeply interested in railroads, banking and real estate."³² The son of George Augustus Gardner is the Gardner of the fundraising committee, and he served as junior warden of the Church of the Advent in 1901 before eventually becoming president of the Trustees of Donations.³³ He was also the nephew of Isabella Stewart Gardner and served as a trustee of her estate.³⁴ For one historian of the Brahmins, "George P. Gardner, through his directorships in railroads, copper companies, and the General Electric Co., in addition to banks, insurance companies, trusts, and manufacturing firms, demonstrated [a] capacity to gain a foothold in new corporate enterprises."³⁵ Regarding the family's position in the economic and political life of midcentury America, one of Isabella Stewart Gardner's biographers has recently claimed, "Many Brahmin families had made their fortunes in textile manufacturing, which of course depended on a regular supply of cotton from the South to be processed in mills throughout the Northeast...Political fervor was not in the Gardner family's nature. Their watchword was toleration, which made them genial friends and loyal business partners but did not place them

²⁹ Massachusetts Historical Society, "Biographical Sketch for Gardner Family Papers," accessed August 27, 2024. <https://www.masshist.org/collection-guides/view/fa0201>.

³⁰ Gardner Family Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Ms. N-1736. See also No author, "Union Wharf," *Union Wharf*, accessed August 27, 2024, <http://www.unionwharf.net/history/>.

³¹ Massachusetts Historical Society, "Biographical Sketch for Gardner Family Papers," accessed August 27, 2024. <https://www.masshist.org/collection-guides/view/fa0201>.

³² Frank Augustine Gardner, *Gardner Memorial: A Biographical and Genealogical Record of the Descendants of Thomas Gardner, Planter* (Salem, Mass: no publisher, 1933), 191, <https://archive.org/details/gardnermemorialb00gard/page/n7/mode/2up>.

³³ Frank Augustine Gardner, *Gardner Memorial: A Biographical and Genealogical Record of the Descendants of Thomas Gardner, Planter* (Salem, Mass: no publisher, 1933), 257, <https://archive.org/details/gardnermemorialb00gard/page/n7/mode/2up>.

³⁴ Natalie Dykstra, *Chasing Beauty: The Life of Isabella Stewart Gardner* (New York: HarperCollins, 2024), 254.

³⁵ Betty Farrell, *Elite Families: Class and Power in Nineteenth-Century Boston* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 132.

firmly on the right side of history at this time.”³⁶ In Gardner, needless to say, Bishop Lawrence had found a committee member who could come close to rivaling his own insider status.

With such a committee in place, confidence initially ran high that the impressive sum of \$100,000 would be raised in plenty of time. That confidence began to slip in the dog days of summer, however. As Bishop Lawrence recalled in a piece entitled “How the \$100,000 Was Raised” and published in the diocesan paper *The Church Militant* later that fall, “Those who have had to do with the raising of large funds know that the bulk of them must come in large subscriptions from a comparatively few persons. On this point the committee were somewhat disappointed. They had hoped for subscriptions in sums of at least \$5000 up to a total of at least \$50,000. They received, however, only \$25,000 in this way,—one subscription of \$10,000, and three of \$5000 each. That meant that a very thorough canvass had to be made of all the Churchmen and women in the Eastern Diocese who could give in goodly sums. To that task the chairman, Mr. Hunnewell, set himself, and throughout the summer he has been at his desk writing letters and reaching for names.”³⁷ Lawrence shared that “over ten thousand envelopes” with fundraising appeals from Hunnewell and the bishop were mailed to congregants “scattered at the sea-shore and in the country” and distributed at churches around the diocese in early September.³⁸ Fortunately for the committee, “Day by day throughout the summer the subscriptions came in,—\$2000, \$1000, \$500, \$50, and \$5.”³⁹ Then, as Watts writes, “On September 30, 1901, the money for the fledgling western diocese was finally raised.”⁴⁰ In the end, and in the bishop’s accounting, the two parishes that offered the most to the endowment of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts were Trinity (\$16,275, or well over half a million dollars in 2024) and the Church of the Advent (\$12,595).⁴¹ Along with gifts of \$9,887 from Emmanuel in Boson, \$7,845 from St. John’s Memorial Chapel in Cambridge, and \$6,500 from St. Barnabas in Falmouth, the five largest gifts amounted to over half of the original endowment.⁴²

Based on Bishop Lawrence’s article in *The Church Militant*, the entirety of the \$100,000 endowment was raised as new funds through this effort of the fundraising committee.⁴³ With one

³⁶ Dykstra, *Chasing Beauty*, 46-7.

³⁷ William Lawrence, “How the \$100,000 Was Raised,” *The Church Militant*, October 1901, 5.

³⁸ Lawrence, “How the \$100,000 Was Raised,” 5.

³⁹ Lawrence, “How the \$100,000 Was Raised,” 5.

⁴⁰ Watts, 189.

⁴¹ Lawrence, “How the \$100,000 Was Raised,” 6.

⁴² Lawrence, “How the \$100,000 Was Raised,” 6.

⁴³ This claim counters the plans set at the diocesan convention to divide restricted funds held by the Trustees of Donations to the Protestant Episcopal Church (of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts). See the

exception, and beyond the parish affiliations enumerated in the article, we do not know the names of the individual contributors to the fund. The exception is the chairman of the committee, Francis W. Hunnewell, whose \$10,000 gift is described in the diary of the bishop in an entry on September 16, 1901: “Frank Hunnewell’s Gen Offering will be \$10,000 bringing it [the endowment] within one or two thousand of the \$100,000. A fine work practically complete. Eastern diocese has done nobly to endow Western Epis[copate] with \$100,000.”⁴⁴ That information from an unpublished archival source confirms Hunnewell’s direct financial support of the fundraising effort. It also raises questions about the remaining \$90,000 as well as the Hunnewell family’s wealth accumulation. The following section seeks to respond to those questions in a preliminary fashion with the information currently available.

IV. Two Profiles

While we cannot make definitive claims about the individual contributors to the fundraising effort that endowed the Diocese of Western Massachusetts (beyond Mr. Hunnewell’s donation), we can understand that such an effort would have been impossible without the leadership of the bishop and the committee he appointed.⁴⁵ In following the approach of the authors of the Report of the

appendix for that resolution. Because the files of the Trustees of Donations have not yet been made available, this claim is provisional. There is no available evidence that contradicts the information in Bishop Lawrence’s article, and it stands to reason that a successful fundraising effort from the committee would obviate the need to transfer funds from sources enumerated in clauses III, IV, and V in the resolution.

⁴⁴ William Lawrence, *Diary 6: January 1901-June 30, 1902*. William Lawrence Diaries, Massachusetts Historical Society, Ms. N-1561.

⁴⁵ Along these lines, and as one historian of the Boston Brahmins put it, “The structural pattern of elite family networks, which linked the new industrial and financial organizations of Boston and New England, suggests but does not reveal the kinds of economic decisions, influence, or capital that flowed through these channels. Direct evidence of the flow of power through kinship networks in this era is as limited or as inaccessible as evidence of power and economic control flowing through interlocking directorates has proved to be in more contemporary studies. The existence of structural channels between organizations allows only a speculative rather than a definitive interpretation of the uses to which those channels were put.” See Farrell, *Elite Families*, 69. On the obviously pivotal role that Bishop Lawrence played, see Chapter XI of his memoir, in which he writes that, “After a careful study of the situation from all points of view by competent committees, I was sure that there was going to be a deadlock until I should throw in the weight of my word.” Lawrence, *Memories of a Happy Life*, 149.

Presidential Committee on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery,⁴⁶ this section introduces pertinent historical context for two key figures: Bishop William Lawrence and Mr. Francis W. Hunnewell.

The fortunes built by those figures, their families, and other families in the Boston elite have received a great deal of attention from scholars. The finest work of scholarship on the topic is a 2017 monograph by Noam Maggor entitled *Brahmin Capitalism: Frontiers of Wealth and Populism in America's First Gilded Age*. As Maggor writes, his book “focuses in particular on a cast of gentlemanly bankers from the Northeast, particularly Boston. After the collapse of slavery, these powerful men gradually extricated themselves from the cotton-based economy of earlier decades, in which their class had been deeply embedded as textile manufacturers. They moved their attention, and their immense financial resources, toward mines, stockyards, railroads, real estate, and a host of other business ventures in the Great West. This unprecedented wave of capital migration from the East transformed the West’s fledging industries. The region’s economic development, which had been fragmented, fragile, tentative, and gradual, became rapid, centralized, robust, and systematic. Large western territories—abundant with minerals, fertile land, dense forests, and other natural resources—were pulled firmly into the financial orbit of the United States.”⁴⁷ He continues, “With their flagship [cotton manufacturing] industry in crisis, unable to profitably absorb additional heavy investment, the urgency to forge new circuits of accumulation inspired the emergence of a whole new business orientation. The Bostonians thus made a fateful departure and set off on a new trajectory. They began to reenvision American capitalist development, not in modifying and salvaging the arrangement of earlier decades but in a far more ambitious program of continental industrialization.”⁴⁸ In a general sense, then, the endowment of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts is impossible to imagine without that reinvention and reorientation.

⁴⁶For instance, see this claim: “It is not possible to document here all the many gifts that Harvard received from donors whose wealth was tied up in Caribbean slavery and slave trading, both because of incomplete data and because the precise ways in which donors’ profits are connected to sugar production and Caribbean slavery are not always clear or easy to trace. Certain examples stand out, however, and these notable bequests, which proved critical to Harvard’s growth and the establishment of its reputation as a prestigious university, warrant specific mention.” Presidential Committee on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery, “Report of the Presidential Committee on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery,” accessed August 7, 2024. <https://legacyofslavery.harvard.edu/report/>. Both men featured in this section attended Harvard College.

⁴⁷ Maggor, 6. The work of Robert F. Dalzell, Jr. is also a valuable resource. See Robert F. Dalzell, Jr., *Enterprising Elite: The Boston Associates and the World They Made* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987).

⁴⁸ Maggor, 21.

The roots and tendrils of Bishop William Lawrence’s family fortune are well documented. The preeminent historian of the cotton industry, Sven Beckert, has written the following about the group of businessmen whose investment in cotton manufacturing transformed the American economy: “The [Boston Associates] venture proved hugely profitable, with dividends in most years above 10 percent on the paid-in capital. In 1817, the mills paid peak dividends of 17 percent. By 1823, the Boston Associates expanded further, building more mills in Lowell, about twenty-five miles north of Boston, and creating the largest integrated mills anywhere in the world. This move of American merchant capital into manufacturing marked another tight connection between slavery and industry.”⁴⁹ One prominent member of the group was Bishop Lawrence’s maternal grandfather, William Appleton, who, according to a report published by the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, “served as treasurer of his cousin Nathan Appleton’s textile mill in Lowell, MA, a venture which benefited tremendously from the low cost of cotton produced in the South through the labor of enslaved persons.”⁵⁰ Two other prominent members of that Boston Associates group were brothers Abbott and Amos Lawrence, the bishop’s great-uncle and grandfather, respectively. On the business success of the Lawrence brothers, the authors of *Industrializing Antebellum America: The Rise of Manufacturing Entrepreneurs in the Early Republic* have noted that “Amos and Abbott joined forces, forming A&A Lawrence in 1814. In the following decades, this firm that first distributed British cloth and later domestic-made goods became one of the most prosperous enterprises in New England... By the 1830s both Amos and Abbott Lawrence had expanded their business interests to include textile production and financial institutions.”⁵¹

Additional scholarship makes the link between the wealth of the Lawrence family and the institution of enslavement even more explicit. According to the authors of the Harvard report, “The wealth that Abbott Lawrence amassed through textile manufacturing and trade—like the fortunes of other Northern industrialists of the era—is inextricably tied to enslaved labor. Lawrence’s mills were staffed by free Northern workers, but they depended upon cotton produced by enslaved people

⁴⁹ Sven Beckert, *Empire of Cotton: A Global History* (New York: Vintage Books, 2015), 147.

⁵⁰ The Very Rev. Amy McCreath et al, “Report to the Reparations Sub-Committee of Diocesan RJC: From the History Committee of the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, Boston,” accessed August 31, 2024, https://drive.google.com/file/d/1TZbGCaKiLwD_3B4np9EaDaJWXTw5GdCF/view and <https://www.stpaulboston.org/reparations-slavery>.

⁵¹ Barbara M. Tucker and Kenneth H. Tucker, Jr., *Industrializing Antebellum America: The Rise of Manufacturing Entrepreneurs in the Early Republic* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 162 and 164.

laboring on southern plantations.”⁵² Or, as Fossett has written for the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, “Cotton mills brought with them other diversified industries—rail, machine shops, boarding houses, tenements –and these mills depended entirely on the raw cotton that was shipped from southern plantations in the United States and West Indian plantations. Enslaved Africans grew and picked that cotton. Thus, Episcopalians invested in the textile industries were profiting from the labor of enslaved Africans on cotton plantations.”⁵³

Amos Lawrence’s son, Amos Adams Lawrence, found himself “at the strategic center of the cotton manufacturing industry.”⁵⁴ As the “heir apparent” in the textile industry,⁵⁵ Amos A. Lawrence had a career that seems to be the perfect microcosm of the macro trends that Maggor describes. Bishop Lawrence, who wrote a biography of his father in 1888, made note of his father’s business acumen and timely investments. A partnership with Robert M. Mason proved lucrative, and the success of the pair’s Cocheco cotton mills and other ventures allowed them to be the primary benefactors behind the Diocese of Massachusetts’ Eastburn-Morgan Fund, which, as previously noted, might have been split by the two dioceses had the fundraising committee not reached its \$100,000 mark.⁵⁶ His career is summarized best in his own words; according to Bishop Lawrence, Amos A. Lawrence wrote in 1861 to Salmon Chase, President Lincoln’s Secretary of the Treasury, and described himself as “having been a large buyer of cotton in Southern markets for manufacturing purposes, and a consigner of manufactured goods to those markets.”⁵⁷

Given the nature of his accumulation of wealth, the following claim from two historians of nineteenth-century American industry might not fit expectations: “Amos Adams [Lawrence]’s

⁵² Presidential Committee on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery, “Report of the Presidential Committee on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery,” accessed August 7, 2024. <https://legacyofslavery.harvard.edu/report/>. It is interesting to juxtapose claims like these with other historians’ assessments of the worldview and self-regard of the Boston Associates. As Robert Dalzell wrote in *Enterprising Elite*, “Men like Amos Lawrence seem to have been operating out of a thoroughly coherent vision of society and their role in it. That vision may have been imposed many obligations upon them, but it never required that they atone for anything.” See Dalzell, Jr., *Enterprising Elite*, 66.

⁵³ Fossett, 32.

⁵⁴ Maggor, 33.

⁵⁵ Maggor, 33.

⁵⁶ William Lawrence, *Life of Amos A. Lawrence, with Extracts from His Diary and Correspondence* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1888), 50, <https://www.loc.gov/resource/gdcmassbookdig.lifeofamosalawre00lawr/?st=gallery>. Re the Eastburn-Morgan Fund, see Joseph Breed Berry, *History of the Diocese of Massachusetts, 1810-1872* (Boston: The Diocesan Library of the Diocese of Massachusetts, 1959), 211. For more on the claim about the endowment of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts, see footnote 34 and the appendix.

⁵⁷ William Lawrence, *Life of Amos A. Lawrence*, 176.

greatest legacy was as a central figure in the struggles around slavery that tore the Union apart during his lifetime.”⁵⁸ To be sure, the fascinating political activities of Amos A. Lawrence deserve closer study than can be addressed in this report. As his son wrote, Amos A. Lawrence reached a crossroads as the political crisis of slavery intensified at midcentury: “He was a Whig, bound in honor to preserve the original compact of the Union by which slavery was recognized, but bound also to use every legitimate means to prevent the increase of slavery, and animated with the hope that time and patience would bring about peacefully the abolition of the evil. His business acquaintance with Southern cotton-growers lead [sic] him to appreciate their side of the question, and to recognize the care that many of them took in the welfare of their slaves.”⁵⁹ Even as his wealth depended on the institution of slavery, Amos A. Lawrence was spurred to anti-slavery action after the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854.⁶⁰ He funded the activities of the New England Emigrant Aid Company, which sent as many anti-slavery immigrants into Kansas territory as possible, and even discreetly funded radical abolitionist John Brown.⁶¹ At the height of the controversy around Brown’s attack on Harpers Ferry, Amos Lawrence was at risk of being revealed as a financial supporter of Brown’s. In a remarkable letter to then Senator Jefferson Davis in December of 1859, Lawrence condemned Southern politicians’ efforts to embroil New England cotton “speculators” and referred to himself in this way: “Though largely interested in cotton factories as a shareholder, I never owned a bale of cotton in my life, and never had any business with any person whom I knew as a speculator in cotton.”⁶² These crosscurrents of codependency with the institution of enslavement and harsh criticism of its expansion were the contexts of Bishop William Lawrence’s childhood and early adulthood.

Though his father’s turn to anti-slavery action might surprise some, it should surprise none that, as Watts has written, “By the time Lawrence was consecrated bishop in 1894, he had become the second-richest prelate in the Episcopal church, with a net worth over two million dollars.”⁶³ Described by Richard Nunley as “a millionaire twice over at the time of his consecration, and intimately acquainted with the movers and shakers of the day,”⁶⁴ Bishop Lawrence was the

⁵⁸ Barbara M. Tucker and Kenneth H. Tucker, Jr., 180.

⁵⁹ William Lawrence, *Life of Amos A. Lawrence*, 73-4.

⁶⁰ William Lawrence, *Life of Amos A. Lawrence*, 76.

⁶¹ William Lawrence, *Life of Amos A. Lawrence*, 85 and 125.

⁶² William Lawrence, *Life of Amos A. Lawrence*, 137.

⁶³ Watts, 98.

⁶⁴ Nunley, 6.

quintessential insider who knew the Diocese of Massachusetts inside and out. In the words of one diocesan historian, “Through the shared memories of his grandfather, William Appleton, and his father, Amos Adams Lawrence, Bishop Lawrence’s experience of the Episcopal Church in Massachusetts stretched back virtually from the establishment of the diocese in 1784 to 1941, the year of his death.”⁶⁵ Though not intended to pose as a comprehensive biographical profile, and even as we do not speculate that Bishop Lawrence’s family fortune was used directly to fund the Diocese of Western Massachusetts, this sub-section will hopefully enrich our understanding of a central figure in the creation of that endowment.

Mr. Francis Welles Hunnewell

The second most important person involved in the endowing of the diocese was Mr. Francis Hunnewell, chairman of the fundraising committee. Beyond his piazza pacing and the generosity of his personal gift of \$10,000 to the endowment of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts, Hunnewell’s life and career require closer examination.

Francis Hunnewell was born in 1838 and matriculated at Harvard College in 1860.⁶⁶ His father, Horatio Hollis Hunnewell, was famous in New England for his leadership in the horticulture community and for his grand five-hundred-acre country estate in the town that became Wellesley, which was named after Hunnewell’s mother’s family.⁶⁷ Hunnewell followed his father into banking and was employed in his father’s firm, H.H. Hunnewell & Sons.⁶⁸ According to his 1917 obituary, although Hunnewell was “born wealthy, he was most democratic and easily approached. No call from any charity, irrespective of creed or color, ever appealed to him in vain.”⁶⁹ His philanthropic spirit, his impressive social and business connections, and his longstanding service to the diocese made him an ideal chairman of the fundraising committee.

⁶⁵ Mark J. Duffy, *The Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, 1784-1984: A Mission to Remember, Proclaim and Fulfill* (Boston: Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, 1984), 1.

⁶⁶ No author. “F.W. Hunnewell Dies, Aged 78,” *Boston Herald*, October 1, 1917, 8.

⁶⁷ Tamara Platkins Thornton, *Cultivating Gentlemen: The Meaning of Country Life among the Boston Elite, 1785-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 153.

⁶⁸ “F.W. Hunnewell Dies, Aged 78,” *Boston Herald*. In Paris, where Francis Hunnewell was born, his father worked for decades in banking with Samuel Welles for his firm Welles & Co. See James Frothingham Hunnewell, *Hunnewell: Chiefly Six Generations in Massachusetts* (No place of publication: The University Press, 1900), 31.

⁶⁹ “F.W. Hunnewell Dies, Aged 78,” *Boston Herald*.

Though the family history of the Hunnewells chronicles the direct involvement of the family with enslavement in the eighteenth century,⁷⁰ there is no question that the wealth accumulated by Hunnewell and his father and their relatives was due most directly to their careers as financiers. For Francis Hunnewell, that meant his sustained investment in copper mining and railroads. As his obituary recounted, “In business life Mr. Hunnewell was active in the affairs of several large and important corporations. He was for many years a director of the Calumet & Hecla Mining company; director and chairman of the board of directors of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad...; and director of the Bay State Trust Company.”⁷¹

His directorship of the Calumet & Hecla Mining company took place during the “bonanza years” of Michigan copper mining.⁷² Noam Maggor captured the frenzy of profit that defined that period in the Upper Peninsula: “Overall, the new operation [in Michigan] as conceived and carried out by the Bostonians proved an immense business triumph. Working the deepest mine shafts in the world and some of the lowest grade ore in the United States, it produced large amounts of copper...By [1885] the renamed Calumet & Hecla Mining Company was no longer a single profitable mine but a vast operation, with over a dozen large-scale and deep shafts, in control of the richest copper reserves in the United States.”⁷³ Interestingly, the company had a reputation for “comparatively low” wages and “as enlightened a policy of paternalism as that of any mining district in the world.”⁷⁴

Working under and alongside scions of other Boston families like Quincy Adams Shaw (uncle of Robert Gould Shaw, of the 54th Massachusetts Infantry Regiment) and Alexander Agassiz (son of the notorious Harvard professor Louis Agassiz),⁷⁵ Hunnewell was not alone in making the most of what one historian of the copper mines called “a Boston favorite, a socially approved field

⁷⁰ James Frothingham Hunnewell, *Hunnewell: Chiefly Six Generations in Massachusetts* (No place of publication: The University Press, 1900), 36.

⁷¹ “F.W. Hunnewell Dies, Aged 78,” *Boston Herald*.

⁷² C. Harry Benedict, *Red Metal, the Calumet and Hecla Story* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1952), 77. This text was essentially an official history of the company, as its 1951 forward was written by the president of the company at the time. For more on these years, see the work of William Bryan Gates, who wrote, “During the years 1885-1904, output of the Michigan district increased more rapidly in absolute terms than in any other period of the industry’s history.” See William Bryan Gates, *Michigan Copper and Boston Dollars: An Economic History of the Michigan Copper Mining Industry* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), 64.

⁷³ Maggor, 44.

⁷⁴ Gates, 92 and 109.

⁷⁵ Benedict, 58. Benedict writes, “The Shaw-Agassiz family had absolute control of Calumet and Hecla for forty years or more, and during their respective lives the Shaw-Agassiz team was in complete command.”

for speculation.”⁷⁶ Benedict summarized the situation well when he observed that, “Many of the early stockholders, the relatives and friends of Mr. [Quincy Adams] Shaw in Boston—the list characterized by one writer as reading like the ‘passenger list of the Mayflower’—devoted their wealth and leisure derived from the distant mine to scientific, cultural, and humanitarian purposes... Thus did Michigan contribute to the ‘flowering of New England.” He might have also added religious purposes to that list had he known about Mr. Hunnewell’s role in the creation of our endowment.

By 1901, the year of the vote to divide the Diocese of Massachusetts, Francis Hunnewell had become chairman of the board for the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad.⁷⁷ With this aspect of his financial investment and governance, Hunnewell was following in his father’s footsteps, as H.H. Hunnewell had been among the first group of textile investors to make the leap to railroad stock.⁷⁸ In his father’s diary on October 27, 1886, Francis Hunnewell recorded an entry in third person on his work as a railroad director: “Director Hunnewell returned from the West after spending some weeks on the C. B. and Q. Railroad system. Going as far north as St. Paul; west, Denver; south, Sante Fe; much pleased with his trip.”⁷⁹ Hunnewell’s career trajectory follows the general arc charted by Noam Maggor, who writes that, “The business community of Boston was at the forefront of this marriage of finance and large-scale industry. A community that prided itself on its steadfast traditionalism and arch-conservative approach to business readily took charge of a massive revolutionary process.”⁸⁰ That revolution, of course, required the dispossession of Indigenous lands and environmental degradation across generations. Such is the complex legacy of these economic transformations and the philanthropy that those transformations made possible.

⁷⁶ Gates, 189.

⁷⁷ No author, “C. B. & Q. Election of New Members,” *Worcester Daily Spy*, November 20, 1901, 1.

⁷⁸ See Arthur M. Johnson, Barry E. Supple, *Boston Capitalists and Western Railroads: A Study in the Nineteenth-Century Railroad Investment Process* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 38.

⁷⁹ Horatio Hollis Hunnewell, *Life, Letters, and Diary of Horatio Hollis Hunnewell* (Boston: privately printed, 1906, 143, <https://www.loc.gov/item/06042360/>). In another somewhat amusing entry from July of 1901, Hunnewell’s father commented on his son’s Herculean efforts to raise \$100,000 for the Diocese of Western Massachusetts: “Son Frank arrived this morning, a week later than usual. He has been detained in the city, trying to raise the modest sum of one hundred thousand dollars for his church,---a most worthy work, certainly. It seems, however, to some of us old-fashioned folks to be a big sum for the support of one person, even a bishop, but the donors, no doubt, take a different view entirely of it, and may deem it beneficial in promoting the spiritual welfare of the community and the church.” Horatio Hollis Hunnewell, *Life, Letters, and Diary of Horatio Hollis Hunnewell*, 270.

⁸⁰ Maggor, 205.

V. Conclusion and Final Considerations

Readers of this report will have noted that our story is not a straightforward one. While we do not and cannot know everything about the origins of our endowment, we can now see some important truths about and contexts around that story. What might seem like threads when compared to the great cables that bound other dioceses to the economic system of enslavement and other exploitative or extractive practices are nonetheless important to acknowledge.

Indeed, our story is not the same as, for instance, that of the Diocese of Maryland, whose Social Justice and Reconciliation ministry has gone to great lengths in recent years to come to terms with that diocese's deep entanglements with enslavement.⁸¹ Nor is it the same as that of the Diocese of Washington, whose research into its connections to chattel slavery and concomitant work on reparations and repentance have been underway for years.⁸² Nor is it the same as that of the Diocese of Rhode Island, where a diocesan ministry called the Center for Reconciliation Rhode Island has sought to “foster racial reconciliation and racial justice by confronting the ongoing legacy of slavery.”⁸³

In the end, and as the Diocese of Rhode Island has capably shown, the process of “working off the past” can and should proceed north of the Mason-Dixon line.⁸⁴ As historian Ronald Bailey has written, “One of the great travesties in the study of U.S. history is the suggestion that only the South benefited directly and substantially from slavery. The benefits from what we are calling the slave(ry) trade to the North and to the U.S. as a whole were far from indirect. It is quite easy to argue that the growth of the U.S. national economy directly depended on the fruits of the labor of slaves.”⁸⁵ Even with historical difference, how can we avoid a similar interpretive mistake here and now in western Massachusetts? Differences should not foreclose action; they should lend urgency to

⁸¹ For more information, see <https://episcopalmaryland.org/social-justice-and-reconciliation/>.

⁸² For more information, see <https://edow.org/ministries-programs/equity-and-justice/reparations/>.

⁸³ “Center for Reconciliation Rhode Island,” accessed August 28, 2024, <https://cfri.org/>.

⁸⁴ The quotation is one translation of a German historical concept called *Vergangenheitsaufarbeitung*.

⁸⁵ Ronald Bailey, “The Slave(ry) Trade and the Development of Capitalism in the United States: The Textile Industry in New England,” in *The Atlantic Slave Trade: Effects on Economies, Societies, and Peoples in Africa, the Americas, and Europe*, ed. Joseph E. Inikori and Stanley L. Engerman (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992), 219.

our continued exploration of our own history as it was, as it relates to our current moment, and not as it relates to other places.

It is possible that there are extant documents that would fill in some gaps that remain regarding individual contributions to the endowment. Even so, given the post-emancipation context and investment trends prevalent at the time of the establishment of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts, those further details would be unlikely to change much. One never knows, but the decision is now ours as a diocese to respond to this history as we feel we must, particularly given our commitment to becoming beloved community.⁸⁶

What should that response entail? Which actions would point us toward a process of atonement for the historical realities acknowledged in this report? Canon Stephanie Spellers reminds us of the stakes involved in writing that, “In 2017 the Episcopal Church pledged a long-term commitment to becoming beloved community...In order to fulfill that promise, this church and others like it will need to investigate our unique role in sustaining the nightmare too many of the children of God have suffered with the blessing and cooperation of dominant American Christianity. That honest reckoning will surely crack us open even further. Perhaps it will also lead to repentance, wisdom, and new life.”⁸⁷

Though this report was focused on the origins of the endowment, we might turn to three other directions in the years ahead, particularly with the 125th anniversary of the diocese quickly approaching: for one, we could examine more carefully the earlier history of enslavement in what became the Diocese of Western Massachusetts. With a number of parishes having been established before the abolition of slavery in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the 1780s, and more whose doors opened before the Thirteenth Amendment was ratified in 1865, we could take a closer look at that history at the parish level.

Second, we could deepen our inquiry into the financial ties to enslavement in western parishes after the abolition of slavery and before the establishment of the diocese (1780s-1901). We should resist the temptation to treat the history of the Episcopal Church in the western half of the state before 1901 as prehistory, as if it did not take place on this same land, in the same ledgers, and in our same church buildings.

⁸⁶ For more information on that commitment, see <https://www.episcopalchurch.org/beloved-community/>.

⁸⁷ Spellers, 54.

A third direction could be an examination of the function of race and racism in the Diocese of Western Massachusetts in the twentieth century. Though that topic was beyond the scope of this report, it is certainly worthy of closer study, as our most recent diocesan history does not engage with race as a category of analysis.⁸⁸ In other words, what would the local version of much larger trends of racism in the Episcopal Church look like?⁸⁹ What is the Diocese of Western Massachusetts version of the dynamic captured by Gardiner Shattuck with these painful words: “Racial prejudice...prevented [Black Episcopalians] from being accepted as equals by their white fellow church members. Prominent white clergy stressed the value of unity within church and society but often regarded African Americans through the paternalistic eyes of former slaveholders. The majority of white Episcopalians, for their part, simply wanted to be sure that no [Black Episcopalians] held or exercised power in ‘their’ parishes or ‘their’ dioceses.”⁹⁰ These are concerns that Episcopalians in all directions—north, south, east, and west—should consider.

Calls for atonement seem to require moral clarity and precision (as when a child is asked to clarify why they are apologizing), but the history of our nation, our church, and our diocese cannot be painted in only two colors. What if, instead of seeking tidy answers about sin, reconciliation, and beloved community, we leaned into the nuance of this history and embraced the call to be the kind of institution and community that wants to do the work even when it is hard and even when the answers are unsatisfying and messy? The work of atonement can and should proceed even as the past remains a clouded mirror.

In the end, this report will hold value if it informs future decisions about the relationships we cultivate, the decisions we make about the resources entrusted to us, the programs and initiatives that we prioritize, and the faithful values we choose to guide us as we become a beloved community.

⁸⁸ Richard Nunley, *From the Blackstone to the Housatonic: A History of the Episcopal Diocese of Western Massachusetts: The First Hundred Year* (Springfield, MA: Episcopal Diocese of Western Massachusetts, 2002).

⁸⁹ The Diocese of Massachusetts has made strides in this area. See the aforementioned Fossett report of 2024 as well as an essay in Duffy’s earlier diocesan history. See Robert A. Bennett, “Black Episcopalians and the Diocese of Massachusetts,” in *The Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, 1784-1984: A Mission to Remember, Proclaim and Fulfill* (Boston: Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, 1984), 57-73.

⁹⁰ Gardiner H. Shattuck, Jr., *Episcopalians & Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), 29.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Bacon, Edwin M, ed. *Men of Progress: One Thousand Biographical Sketches and Portraits of Leaders in Business and Professional Life in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*. Boston: New England Magazine, 1896.
https://www.google.com/books/edition/_/5HFPAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1.

Episcopalian Club of Massachusetts, *By-Laws of The Episcopalian Club of Massachusetts, and Officers and Members*. No place of publication: Episcopalian Club of Massachusetts, April 1903.

Gardner Family Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.

Gardner, Frank Augustine. *Gardner Memorial: A Biographical and Genealogical Record of the Descendants of Thomas Gardner, Planter*. Salem, Mass: no publisher, 1933,
<https://archive.org/details/gardnermemorialb00gard/page/n7/mode/2up>.

Hunnewell, Horatio Hollis. *Life, Letters, and Diary of Horatio Hollis Hunnewell*. Boston: privately printed, 1906, <https://www.loc.gov/item/06042360/>.

Hunnewell, James Frothingham. *Hunnewell: Chiefly Six Generations in Massachusetts*. No place of publication: The University Press, 1900.

Lawrence, William. *Diary 6: January 1901-June 30, 1902*. William Lawrence Diaries, Massachusetts Historical Society, Ms. N-1561.

Lawrence, William. "How the \$100,000 Was Raised." *The Church Militant*, October 1901, 5-6.

Lawrence, William. *Memories of a Happy Life*. Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1926.

Lawrence, William. *Life of Amos A. Lawrence, with Extracts from His Diary and Correspondence*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1888,
<https://www.loc.gov/resource/gdcmassbookdig.lifeofamosalawre00lawr/?st=gallery>.

Journal of the Convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts. Boston: Damrell and Upham, 1901.

Journal of the Convention of the Diocese of Western Massachusetts. Worcester, MA: F.S. Blanchard & Co., 1902.

No author. "Will Divide. Episcopal Diocese Has Voted Unanimously." *Boston Globe*, June 14, 1901, 18.

No author. "C. B. & Q. Election of New Members." *Worcester Daily Spy*, November 20, 1901, 1.

No author. "F.W. Hunnewell Dies, Aged 78." *Boston Herald*, October 1, 1917, 8.

No author. "George Peabody Gardner, 83, University Trustee, is Dead." *The Harvard Crimson*, June 7, 1939. Accessed July 3, 2024. <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/1939/6/7/george-peabody-gardner-83-university-trustee/>.

Secondary Sources

Adams, Thomas Boylston. "George Peabody Gardner." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* Third Series, Vol. 11 (1976): 132-134. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25080800?seq=1>

Allen, David Grayson. *Investment Management in Boston: A History*. Amherst: University of

- Massachusetts Press, 2015.
- Bailey, Ronald. "The Slave(ry) Trade and the Development of Capitalism in the United States: The Textile Industry in New England," in *The Atlantic Slave Trade: Effects on Economies, Societies, and Peoples in Africa, the Americas, and Europe*, ed. Joseph E. Inikori and Stanley L. Engerman, 205-246. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992.
- Baptist, Edward E. *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books, 2014.
- Baucom, Ian. *Specters of the Atlantic: Finance Capital, Slavery, and the Philosophy of History*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Beckert, Sven. *Empire of Cotton: A Global History*. New York: Vintage Books, 2015.
- Beckert, Sven and Seth Rockman, eds. *Slavery's Capitalism: A New History of American Economic Development*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Beckert, Sven et al. "Harvard and Slavery"
<https://www.harvardandslavery.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/Harvard-Slavery-Book-111110.pdf>.
- Beckert, Sven et al. "Interchange: The History of Capitalism." *Journal of American History* 101, no. 2 (September 2014): 503-536.
- Benedict, C. Harry. *Red Metal, the Calumet and Hecla Story*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1952.
- Berry, Joseph Breed. *History of the Diocese of Massachusetts, 1810-1872*. Boston: The Diocesan Library of the Diocese of Massachusetts, 1959.
- Center for Reconciliation Rhode Island. "Center for Reconciliation Rhode Island." Accessed August

28, 2024. <https://cfrii.org/>.

Clegg, John J. "Capitalism and Slavery." *Critical Historical Studies* 2, no. 2 (2015): 281-304.

Dalzell, Robert F. *Enterprising Elite: The Boston Associates and the World They Made*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Duffy, Mark J. *The Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, 1784-1984: A Mission to Remember, Proclaim and Fulfill*. Boston: Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, 1984.

Dykstra, Natalie. *Chasing Beauty: The Life of Isabella Stewart Gardner*. New York: HarperCollins, 2024.

English, Beth. *A Common Thread: Labor, Politics, and Capital Mobility in the Textile Industry*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2006.

Farrell, Betty. *Elite Families: Class and Power in Nineteenth-Century Boston*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

Fossett, Alden. "And You Will Know the Truth, and the Truth Will Make You Free: A Historical Framework (1620-1840) For Understanding How the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts Benefits Today from Chattel Slavery and its Legacy." Accessed June 26, 2024. <https://www.diomass.org/sites/diomass/files/attachments/Episcopal%20Diocese%20of%20Massachusetts%20Historical%20Framework%20for%20Understanding%20Benefits%20from%20Slavery%20and%20Its%20Legacy%20Report.pdf>.

Gates, Willaim Bryan. *Michigan Copper and Boston Dollars: An Economic History of the Michigan Cooper Mining Industry*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Hall, Peter D. "What the Merchants Did with Their Money: Charitable and Testamentary Trusts in Massachusetts, 1780-1880," in *Entrepreneurs: The Boston Business Community, 1700-1850*, ed. Conrad Edick Wright and Katheryn P. Viens, 365-421. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1997.

Hartford, William F. *Money, Morals, and Politics: Massachusetts in the Age of the Boston Associates*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2001.

Heath, Richard and Jamaica Plain Historical Society. “Robert Treat Paine Housing Reformer.” Accessed August 23, 2024. <https://www.jpshs.org/people/2005/4/14/robert-treat-paine-housing-reformer.html#gsc.tab=0>.

Johnson, Arthur M. and Barry E. Supple. *Boston Capitalists and Western Railroads: A Study in the Nineteenth-Century Railroad Investment Process*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Johnson, Walter. *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University press, 2013.

Lears, Jackson. “The Managerial Revitalization of the Rich,” in *Ruling America: A History of Wealth and Power in a Democracy*, ed. Steve Fraser and Gary Gerstle, 181-214. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Maggor, Noam. *Brahmin Capitalism: Frontiers of Wealth and Populism in America’s First Gilded Age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.

Magrath, The Rev. John T. *The Growth of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Massachusetts During the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Diocese of Massachusetts, 1901.

Massachusetts Historical Society. “Biographical Sketch for Gardner Family Papers.” Accessed August 27, 2024. <https://www.masshist.org/collection-guides/view/fa0201>.

McGouldrick, Paul F. *New England Textiles in the Nineteenth Century: Profits and Investment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

McGreath, Amy. “Report to the Reparations Sub-Committee of Diocesan RJC: From the History

Committee of the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, Boston.” Accessed August 31, 2024.
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1TZbGCaKiLwD_3B4np9EaDaJWXTw5GdCF/view and
<https://www.stpaulboston.org/reparations-slavery>.

No author. “Union Wharf.” Accessed August 27, 2024. <http://www.unionwharf.net/history/>.

Nunley, Richard. *From the Blackstone to the Housatonic: A History of the Episcopal Diocese of Western Massachusetts: The First Hundred Years*. Springfield, MA: Episcopal Diocese of Western Massachusetts, 2002.

Pak, Susie. *Gentlemen Bankers: The World of J.P. Morgan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Presidential Committee on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery. “Report of the Presidential Committee on Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery.” Accessed August 7, 2024.
<https://legacyofslavery.harvard.edu/report/>.

Racial Justice Commission of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts. “The Episcopal Church and Slavery: A Historical Narrative.” Accessed August 7, 2024.
https://www.diomass.org/sites/diomass/files/attachments/Reparations%20Toolkit_Episcopal%20Church%20and%20Slavery%20Historical%20Narrative_2021_11.pdf.

Rockman, Seth. “What Makes the History of Capitalism Newsworthy?” *Journal of the Early Republic* 34, no. 3 (Fall 2014): 439-466.

Rosenthal, Caitlin. *Accounting for Slavery: Masters and Management*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018.

Rothman, Joshua. *The Ledger and the Chain: How Domestic Slave Traders Shaped America*. New York: Basic Books, 2021.

Schermerhorn, Calvin. *The Business of Slavery and the Rise of American Capitalism, 1815-1860*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.

Shattuck, Gardiner H. Jr. *Episcopalians & Race: Civil War to Civil Rights*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000.

Spellers, Stephanie. *The Church Cracked Open: Disruption, Decline, and New Hope for Beloved Community*. New York: Church Publishing Incorporated, 2021.

Story, Ronald. *The Forging of an Aristocracy: Harvard & the Boston Upper Class, 1800-1870*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1980.

Thorton, Tamara Platkins. *Cultivating Gentlemen: The Meaning of Country Life among the Boston Elite, 1785-1860*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Tucker, Barbara M. and Kenneth H. Tucker, Jr. *Industrializing Antebellum America: The Rise of Manufacturing Entrepreneurs in the Early Republic*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Ware, Caroline F. *The Early New England Cotton Manufacture: A Study in Industrial Beginnings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.

Watts, William J. III. *Twin Killings: The Decision to Divide the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts in 1901*. Master's thesis, University of Massachusetts, Boston, 1997.

White, Richard. *Railroaded: The Transcontinentals and the Making of Modern America*. New York: Norton, 2011.

Williams, Eric. *Capitalism and Slavery*, rev. Ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944 and 1994.

Winthrop, Robert C., Jr. "Memoir of Robert M. Mason." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 18 (1880-1881): 287-317. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25079569>

Appendix: Resolution to Divide the Diocese of Massachusetts

“I. *Resolved*, That the Bishop of the Diocese and the General Convention consenting, a new Diocese be erected in the present Diocese of Massachusetts, to consist of the counties of Worcester (except the town of Southboro), Franklin, Hampshire, Hampden and Berkshire, as their boundaries are now established by law; provided that the full amount of \$100,000 for the Endowment of the Episcopate in the new Diocese shall have been secured by Oct. 1, 1901; and that such division take effect on the fifteenth day of November, 1901, the said territory containing more than six Parishes and more than six Presbyters who have been at least one year canonically resident within the bounds of such territory, regularly settled in a Parish or Congregation and qualified to vote for a Bishop, and the remaining portion containing more than twelve Parishes and more than twelve Presbyters who have been at least one year canonically resident therein and regularly settled in a Parish or Congregation and qualified to vote for a Bishop.

“II. *Resolved*, That a new Endowment Fund of \$100,000 shall be paid to the new Diocese in lieu of all claim on the present Episcopal Fund, and all other funds and property held by or for the present Diocese, except as hereafter provided.”

“III. *Resolved*, That the funds now under the control of the Diocesan Board of Missions, for use in the Missionary work of the Diocese, now amounting to \$18,429.29, also any further money which said Board may receive under the will of Mr. J.D.W. French, be divided in the ratio of forty per cent. to the new Diocese and sixty per cent. to the old Diocese.

“IV. *Resolved*, That, in the judgment of the Convention, the principal or income of the Eastburn-Morgan Fund should be divided in the ratio of forty per cent. to the new Diocese and sixty per cent. to the old Diocese.

“V. *Resolved*, That, in the judgment of the Convention, the principal of income of the Mudge Fund, the Thomas Nelson Memorial Fund, the Randolph Marshall Clark Fund, all of which are held by the Trustees of Donations to the Protestant Episcopal Church, also all funds held by the Society for the Relief of Aged or Disabled Clergymen, and also the funds held by the Trustees of the Fund for the Erection of Churches and Chapels, and also those held by the Society for the Relief of Widows and Orphans of Deceased Clergymen, subject to all their liabilities, should be divided in the ratio of twenty per cent. to the new Diocese and eighty per cent. to the old Diocese.

“VI. *Resolved*, That the Trustees of all the said funds be asked to take such action as may be necessary to effect the above division, and to make the same irrevocable; and to invoke the aid of the Courts, and, if necessary, of the Legislature, to accomplish this purpose.

“VII. *Resolved*, That, inasmuch as through the efforts of a committee consisting of Messrs. Francis W. Hunnewell, George P. Gardner and E. Pierson Beebe, a provisional sum of \$48,500 has been raised for the Endowment of the Episcopate of the new Diocese, this Convention, gratefully appreciating the work already done, hereby appoints a committee to co-operate with the above-

named gentlemen to complete the work of securing the \$100,00 needed for the Endowment of the Episcopate of the new Diocese.”

Source: Bishop William Lawrence, “An Historical Sketch, Prepared by the Bishop of Massachusetts,” in *Journal of the Primary Convention, November 19, 1901 and of the Special Meeting of the Convention, January 22, 1902, and of the First Annual Meeting of the Convention, April 23, 1902*. (Worcester, MA: F.S. Blanchard & Co., 1902), 6-7.