

THE BOOK OF PEACE: A COLLECTION OF ESSAYS ON WAR AND PEACE

By The American Peace Society

Originally published in 1845, this is a collection of sixty-four essays by a variety of authors and from a wide range of viewpoints on the subjects of war and peace. According to the preface, "There has been, since the time of the gifted Erasmus, a great deal of eloquent writing on Peace; and the following pages contain the best productions on the subject not only of past ages, but of our own." Although written over 150 years ago, these essays on war and peace are extremely relevant given world conditions today. 606 pages.

This book is Classic Reprints No. 124. It is available hardbound for \$75 postpaid. Order from:

VANCE PUBLICATIONS

P.O. Box 11781 Pensacola, FL 32524

Phone: 850-474-1626 Fax: 850-937-1970

Website: www.vancepublications.com

E-mail: vancepub@vancepublications.com

Order Line: 1-800-363-9604

THE
BOOK OF PEACE:

A COLLECTION OF ESSAYS

ON

WAR AND PEACE.



BOSTON:
GEORGE C. BECKWITH, 60½ CORNHILL.

PHILADELPHIA:—PERKINS AND PURVES.

NEW YORK:—M. W. DODD.

PORTLAND:—WM. HYDE.

1845.

P R E F A C E.

THERE has been, since the time of the gifted Erasmus, a great deal of eloquent writing on Peace; and the following pages contain the best productions on the subject not only of past ages, but of our own. No theme has ever waked a purer or loftier inspiration; and on no topic in the whole range of morals, theology, or general literature, can there be found finer specimens of taste and eloquence. We have also culled from a wide as well as luxuriant field;—from the gardens of intellect and learning in both hemispheres, from some of the best writers in the last three centuries, from men of every faith, Protestant and Catholic, Orthodox and Unitarian, Episcopal, Baptist and Presbyterian. The subject is itself a sort of Delos, whither the best spirits of every party, creed and clime gather to blend in sweet and hallowed sympathy; and these pages exhibit a constellation of the peaceful pleiads pouring their mingled splendors on this common theme of religion, humanity and Christian patriotism.

We have studied the utmost brevity possible, and have sometimes condensed quite a volume into a short essay, without the omission of any essential argument, illustration or fact. Some of these tracts are of necessity selections, yet give both the sentiments and language of their respective authors. We have only condensed for the sake of greater brevity, economy and force. The work is truly *multum in parvo*, a thesaurus of information on peace,

containing a far greater amount of facts, statistics and arguments on its various topics, than our own or any other language can furnish in thrice the compass.

Hardly any references are given, because they could not be without occupying too much space for such a work ; but we have authority, good and ample, for the most astounding statements in this volume, and our readers may rely on the substantial accuracy of them all. We cannot flatter ourselves, that they will assent at once to every position here taken on a subject so vast, and of such various aspects and bearings ; but we feel quite sure, that every intelligent, fair-minded Christian will readily respond to nine in ten, if not to ninety-nine in a hundred of the sentiments enforced, and that even in the remaining case there will be found a kind and Christian spirit, such as an Apostle would enjoin, and a martyr breathe.

G. C. B.

OFFICE OF THE AM. PEACE SOC.,
BOSTON, JULY 1845.

CONTENTS.

No. 1.	—Cause of Peace,	1
" 2.	—A Sketch of War: what it is, and what it does,	9
" 3.	—Testimonies against War,	21
" 4.	—War and the Bible,	33
" 5.	—War Curable,	37
" 6.	—Four Aspects of War,	49
" 7.	—Universal Peace; by David Bogue, D. D.,	53
" 8.	—Military Discipline,	65
" 9.	—Erasmus on War,	77
" 10.	—Russian Campaign,	81
" 11.	—Union in Peace,	93
" 12.	—Military Preparations,	101
" 13.	—Progress of Peace, or how much already gained in the cause,	105
" 14.	—Waste of Property by War,	113
" 15.	—Appeal to Cities,	125
" 16.	—War Inconsistent with Christianity; by Howard Malcom, D. D.	129
" 17.	—War Unlawful under the Christian Dispensation; by J. J. Gurney,	137
" 18.	—Chalmers on Peace,	149
" 19.	—Chief Evil of War; by William E. Channing, D. D.,	157
" 20.	—Loss of Life by War,	161
" 21.	—Witnesses for Peace,	173
" 22.	—Views of War; by Robert Hall,	177
" 23.	—The Early Christians on War; by Thomas Clarkson,	181
" 24.	—War-Debts of Europe,	193
" 25.	—Results of one War,	197
" 26.	—Neckar on Peace,	201
" 27.	—Peace Practicable,	209
" 28.	—Substitutes for War,	213
" 29.	—Arbitration as a Substitute for War,	217
" 30.	—Congress of Nations,	229
" 31.	—Extinction of War; by Hon. Josiah Quincy, L.L. D.,	253
" 32.	—War Unchristian,	257
" 33.	—Insensibility to the Evils of War; by W. E. Channing, D. D.,	269
" 34.	—Claims of Peace on all Christians,	277
" 35.	—The only Remedy for War; by W. E. Channing, D. D.,	289
" 36.	—A Solemn Review of War; by Noah Worcester, D. D.,	293
" 37.	—Sieges,	305
" 38.	—A Glimpse of War; by W. E. Channing, D. D.,	313
" 39.	—Military Hospitals,	325
" 40.	—Safety of Pacific Principles,	333
" 41.	—War-Prayers,	357
" 42.	—Claims of Peace on Women,	361
" 43.	—Solemn Appeal; by William Ladd,	373
" 44.	—The Battle-Field,	393
" 45.	—Inefficacy of War; by Hon. William Jay,	397
" 46.	—Militia Drills,	409
" 47.	—United States Navy—What is its use? by Samuel E. Coues,	413
" 48.	—Mistakes about Peace,	421
" 49.	—Peace and Government; by Geo. C. Beckwith,	425
" 50.	—Criminality of War; by Howard Malcom, D. D.,	433
" 51.	—War a Destroyer of Souls,	449
" 52.	—War and the Hearth, or the Influence of War on Domestic Happiness	457

No. 53.—Plain Sketches of War; by R. P. Stebbins,	469
“ 54.—Grimké on Peace,	473
“ 55.—War as a Judicial Redress,	485
“ 56.—War and Missions,	489
“ 57.—Causes of War; by Jonathan Dymond,	501
“ 58.—Moral Results of War; by Jonathan Dymond,	509
“ 59.—War Unlawful for Christians; by Jonathan Dymond,	517
“ 60.—Efficacy of Pacific Principles; by Jonathan Dymond,	541
“ 61.—Rights of Self-Defence,	545
“ 62.—War a Trial by Battle; by Charles Sumner,	549
“ 63.—True Grandeur of Nations; by Charles Sumner,	553
“ 64.—Claims of Peace on Literary Men,	577
Index,	595

THE
CAUSE OF PEACE.

THE cause of peace is as old as Christianity. Ancient prophets, in foretelling the Messiah's reign, caught a distant glimpse of its glory; and its principles, embodied by our Savior in his Sermon on the Mount, and thickly scattered throughout the New Testament, were so strictly put in practice by the early Christians, that not a few of them went to the stake rather than bear arms, on the supposition of its being inconsistent with their profession as disciples of the Prince of Peace. But the church, even before her union with the state under Constantine in the fourth century, had sadly degenerated in this as in other respects; and, ever since that fatal era, she has lent her sanction to the custom of war, with little thought of its being incompatible with her religion of peace. Erasmus, the morning-star of the Reformation, wrote in behalf of this cause with an eloquence worthy of the first scholar in Christendom; and, though his voice was little heeded by the warring Christians of that age, the seed sown by his hand has begun, in the present century, to spring up more or less among Christians of every name, and to promise in the end a rich and glorious harvest.— Specific efforts in this cause are of recent date. The first effectual appeal was made in a pamphlet published in December, 1814; and the first Peace Society in modern times was organized in the city of New York, during the summer of 1815, and followed, in eight or ten months, by one in Massachusetts, another in Ohio, and a still more important one in London, all without any knowledge of each other's existence; a striking proof that God had himself prepared the way. Similar societies have since been multiplied in England and America. Kindred efforts have been made to some extent in France, in Switzerland, and other parts of Christendom; and their influence has reached the extremities of the civilized world, and been felt in some degree by nations never blest with the light of the gospel. The American Peace Society, organized in 1828 as a

bond of union among all the friends of peace throughout our country, and soliciting coöperation without regard to sect or party, has been cordially espoused by some among all the religious denominations in the land, and the pulpits of almost every sect have actually been occupied more or less by its agents in pleading the claims of this great evangelical enterprise.

I. HOW MUCH ACCOMPLISHED ALREADY.— Success in this cause has been much beyond the means used, comparatively greater than in any kindred enterprise. Few are fully aware how much has already been gained. In little more than twenty years preceding the commencement of our efforts, the wars of Christendom are supposed to have wasted more than \$30,000,000,000, and sacrificed no less than nine millions of lives; but its general peace has been preserved since 1815 by the various agencies and influences which constitute the cause of peace. The sentiments of the civilized world on this subject are very different now from what they were fifty years ago; and difficulties, which would then have involved nations in conflict, have frequently been settled with scarce a thought of shedding each other's blood for the purpose. Leading cabinets have become far more pacific than formerly; their services have generously been tendered, in a variety of instances, to avert the threatened horrors of war; and other expedients than a resort to the sword for the adjustment of international difficulties, are fast coming to form the established policy of Christendom. Let this process continue fifty years longer, and it will be well-nigh impossible to involve civilized nations in war.

II. THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE PEACE CAUSE.— All the social relations of mankind may be reduced to three classes;—the relation of individuals to one another; the relation of individuals to society, of citizens to government; and the relation of one society or government to another. The principles of peace are applicable to all these relations; but the cause of peace is concerned only with the *intercourse of governments*, and aims merely to *prevent war between nations*.

Nor is such a restriction peculiar; for it forms the very basis of united action among the friends of temperance. The principles of that reform are applicable to all kinds of drink and food; but, in the cause of temperance, they are restricted to the use of alcoholic or intoxicating liquors. Its friends may, each for himself, extend its

principles as far as they please ; but the cause itself does not meddle with tea or coffee, tobacco, or opium, or animal food. It may be said, for it has been, that its principles, if carried out, would lead to the utter exclusion of such articles ; but for such a conclusion, whether right or wrong, the friends of temperance do not, in their associated capacity, make themselves responsible. They go merely for the prevention of drunkenness ; and, however extensive or important may be the legitimate application of their principles, their cause is concerned with applying them solely to the use of such drinks as will intoxicate.

It is thus with the cause of peace. However extensively applicable its principles may be, we aim, as a society of peacemakers, at the application of them only to the conduct of one nation towards another, and shall accomplish our whole object by persuading them to regulate their intercourse on the pacific principles of the gospel. If it be said, that wars can never cease so long as capital punishments disgrace the statute-books of Christendom, and strife continues among individuals, families, and churches, we reply, that tea, and coffee, and tobacco, and theatres, and gaming-houses, are all so many incentives to intemperance, yet no one deems it any part of the temperance cause to meddle with such things. /

This singleness of aim excludes a variety of objects which have sometimes been attributed to the cause of peace. If our only province is the intercourse of nations, and our sole object the prevention of international wars, then we have, as friends of peace, nothing to do with capital punishments, or the right of personal self-defence, or the question of discarding all physical force from the government of states, schools, and families. We go merely against war ; and war is " a contest by force between nations." It is not only conflict unto death, but conflict between governments alone ; and neither a parent or teacher chastising his child or his pupil, nor a father defending his family against the midnight assassin, nor a traveller resisting the highway fobber, nor a ruler inflicting the penalties of law upon a criminal, can properly be called war, both because in most of these cases there is really no conflict, and because the parties in them all are either individuals, or government and individuals, not nations alone. The cause of peace is not encumbered with such cases, but confines itself to the single object of abolishing the custom of international war.

III. COMMON PRINCIPLES, OR BASIS OF UNION AMONG THE FRIENDS OF PEACE. — If perfect identity of views were necessary to concert of action, there could be no such concert in any cause. Such identity does not exist in the cause of temperance or anti-slavery, of Bibles, tracts, or education, in any enterprise of benevolence or reform. There is all the similarity of views requisite to union of efforts; and it would be easy to find among the friends of peace, a platform of common principles sufficiently broad for them all to stand upon, and work together in consistent, harmonious, effective coöperation.

1. We all regard war as a mass of evils; as one of the worst scourges, if not the very worst, that ever smote our world; as extremely pernicious in all its appropriate influences on the temporal and the spiritual interests of mankind. — 2. We hold war to be morally wrong; wrong in its origin, in its principles, in its motives, in its means, and all its legitimate results; as a crying offence against God, and the chief sin of all ages and climes. The whole war-system we regard as a tissue of folly, guilt, and mischief. — 3. We all think war impossible without deep criminality on one side, if not on both, and sure in its progress to involve both parties in a series of the worst crimes; for every war, however begun, is prosecuted on each side with essentially the same feelings, and by the very same deeds. — 4. We agree in our views concerning the moral character of nearly all the wars that have ever occurred. We unite in condemning every war of pride or jealousy, of avarice or ambition, of revenge, prevention, or redress; and few, if any other wars can be found on the pages of secular history. — 5. Even wars called defensive, not a few of us regard as in all cases contrary to the gospel, and none of us allow them except as a last resort for the preservation of life; for, if any other expedient, any amount of injury short of our own destruction, will suffice, the lowest views of peace would not justify a resort to the sword. — 6. We think, also, that nations ought, like individuals, to regulate their intercourse by the gospel; and we have only to ascertain and apply its principles. — 7. Such an application of the gospel to international intercourse constitutes the sum of all the means we would employ in the cause of peace. — 8. We believe, too, that war can be banished entirely from Christian nations; but we think specific means indispensable for the purpose, and the use of them incumbent on all

the inhabitants of Christendom, especially on the professed disciples of the Prince of Peace.

We differ, then, only on a single point of this great cause—the moral character of wars strictly defensive. Even this difference is mainly theoretical; for we unite in condemning most of the wars *called* defensive, and can find very few that any friend of peace would attempt to justify. We may disagree concerning the strict inviolability of human life, on the subject of capital punishments, respecting the right of the magistrate to use the sword in suppressing mobs and insurrections; but these points form no part of our cause, and it is no more responsible for the views of its friends concerning them, than the cause of temperance is for the religious or political creed of its supporters. We are concerned solely with the intercourse of one government with another; and these questions belong not to the cause of peace, but to the internal operations of government, to its treatment of its own subjects.

IV. SPHERE AND MODE OF ACTION.—Christendom is our only field. Our efforts are restricted to countries blest with the light of revelation, and our hopes will be fully realized, when wars shall cease wherever Christianity prevails.

All our means for the accomplishment of this object are included in a right application of the gospel to the intercourse of nations. But communities are composed of individuals; and the pacific influences of the gospel must be brought to bear first upon individuals, in rectifying their views on this subject, and in forming such a public sentiment as shall discard the war-system, and introduce pacific expedients for the adjustment of all international disputes. Public opinion is the grand instrument; it does more to control Christendom than all her bayonets; and, could it through the civilized world be arrayed against this custom as it is now in New England against the kindred practice of duelling, rulers would soon find means enough to settle their differences without the sword.

We would take the best measures thus to change the war-sentiments of mankind; but we decline, for many reasons, the use of tests and pledges for this purpose. I. The pulpit we would place in the van of our auxiliaries; for it is in the power of ministers alone to revolutionize on this subject the views of all Christendom. To this duty we urge them by the strongest motives; for the living

voice is needed to waken inquiry, and prepare the way for all our other instrumentalities. — 2. The press, an engine of vast moral power, we would set and keep at work until, through books, and pamphlets, and tracts, and newspapers, and every class of periodicals, it shall speak in the ear of all reading communities on this subject. — 3. We would especially enlist churches of every name. We regard them as societies appointed by God himself for the universal spread of peace; and they should all examine this subject till their views are settled, and then let the world know what they think concerning the incompatibility of war with their religion. They should also train up all under their care in the principles of peace, pray much for its universal prevalence, and hold forth before the whole world the light of their own consistent example. Let them do only these things, and war would soon cease from Christendom forever. — 4. We would also solicit the aid of pious parents, of teachers in Sabbath schools, and instructors in all Christian seminaries of learning. Here are the chief nurseries of peace; and in these must one day be trained up a generation of such peacemakers as shall spontaneously keep the peace of the world. — 5. Still more do we rely on women. They mould the character of the young; and, if they will infuse the principles of peace into every mind under their care, wars must of necessity cease with the very next generation. — 6. The formation of peace societies we do not urge; but, wherever is found a degree of intelligence and interest sufficient to sustain them well, we would encourage a simple organization.

We insist on the *necessity of means*. God accomplishes no ends without them; and the means of his own appointment are just as necessary for the spread of peace as for the conversion of the world. Only such means we aim to use; and we would fain keep at work in this cause a system of operations very like those in the temperance reform. Agents, and tracts, and periodicals, and other instrumentalities, must be employed on a large scale; and these will require, not so much money as the leading enterprises of Christian benevolence, but far more than most persons suppose. It would cost some \$5,000 to put a single tract, at one cent apiece, in every family of New England alone, and about \$30,000 for the whole country, besides a still larger sum to sustain such other instrumentalities as the cause demands. These funds must

come, if at all, from the professed friends of peace; and the Christian community ought to form plans and habits of regularly contributing to this cause, as to kindred enterprises of benevolence and reform.

V. **POSSIBILITY OF ABOLISHING WAR.** — Our argument here is short. No fault of individuals or communities is incorrigible under the means of God's appointment; customs very like war, such as knight-errantry and judicial combats, have already been done away; certain kinds of war have actually been abolished, and even international war has lost some of its worst features, and undergone changes greater than would now suffice for its entire abolition; a vast variety of causes are at work through the world, sufficient under God for its ultimate extinction; and God has settled the question by promising an era when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

VI. **SUBSTITUTES FOR WAR.** — We would not leave nations without means of protection or redress; and, in recommending pacific expedients, we propose not the sacrifice, but the greater security of their rights, just as the substitution of law, with its courts and prisons, in place of private revenge, has every where increased the security both of person and property. There are better means for such ends than the sword. 1. *Negotiation.* Nations could, if they would, settle all their differences by amicable agreement among themselves; and, should public opinion require them to do so, war would seldom, if ever, occur. — 2. *Arbitration.* When the parties become too much excited to adjust the matter themselves, they may refer it to an umpire mutually chosen; and this expedient alone, if properly used, would prevent more than nine wars in ten. — 3. *Mediation.* When rulers withdraw from official intercourse, and think they must fight their quarrel out, a third power, friendly to both, may offer its services as mediator; an expedient frequently tried of late, rarely without success, and sufficient, if employed in season, to prevent more than forty-nine wars out of fifty. Christendom is fast coming to adopt these substitutes as her settled policy, and would do so very soon, should the people universally demand it. — 4. But the perfection of expedients would be a *congress of nations*. Nor would such a tribunal be an entirely new experiment; for its principle has been in occasional, successful operation for ages. It was adopted in the Amphictyonic Council of ancient

Greece; it has been at work, with well-nigh complete success, in the Confederacy of Switzerland, for more than five hundred years; and, in less than two centuries, there have been fifty congresses in Europe, all more or less on the principle of such a tribunal as we propose. The thing *can* be done, and *will* be, whenever the voice of Christendom shall demand it.

VII. TESTIMONIES TO THE CAUSE OF PEACE. — A distinguished English missionary in India attributes to us “the honor of inventing two of the most valuable institutions that ever blessed mankind, — the Peace Society, and the Temperance Society; and, if every American viewed them as I do, he would join them both immediately.” Dr. Reed, the well-known messenger from the churches of England, describes the cause of peace as “a field of service worthy of the church, worthy of angels,” and calls upon Christians to “glorify their religion by banding together as an army of pacificators.” Ecclesiastical bodies, representing nearly every Christian denomination in our country, have borne their testimony to this cause, — Congregationalists, both Unitarian and Orthodox, Baptists, Presbyterians, Dutch Reformed, Methodists, Free-will Baptists, and Christians. They “commend this cause to the Christian community as worthy of a place among the benevolent enterprises of the age,” and regard “the American Peace Society as eminently entitled to the cordial coöperation and support of all the churches of Christ.” They deem it “the duty of ministers to preach in favor of the cause of peace, as a prominent part of the gospel, and of Christians to pray for the spread of peace through the world.” They think, also, “that the subject of peace, being in its strictly evangelical principles and bearings a part of the gospel, ought to be discussed in the pulpit on the Sabbath, just like the other principles of the Bible;” and that “ministers should continue to preach, Christians to pray, and *all* to contribute in favor of universal and permanent peace.”

Disciple of Jesus! what will *you* do? Will you correct your own views and feelings? Will you try to rectify those of all the persons under your care or influence? Will you pray? Will you contribute? Will you do *all* you *can*? “Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God.”

SKETCH OF WAR :

WHAT IT IS, AND WHAT IT DOES.

FEW among us know much about the evils of war. Have you ever visited its camps and fleets, or witnessed its sieges and battles? Have you followed the march of its armies, or looked in upon the anguish of its hospitals? Have you seen its nameless vices, its savage barbarities, its countless hardships, dangers, and sufferings? Did you ever behold it firing villages, and sacking cities, and desolating province after province, and butchering men, women, and children, by thousands? If not, you know little of war; and we wish to furnish you with a brief sketch of its NATURE AND EFFECTS.

I. Mark, then, THE WASTE OF PROPERTY BY WAR. It not only demands for its support vast sums of money, but dries up the main sources of a nation's wealth. Its victims are mostly men in the vigor of life. It cripples almost every species of business. It cuts the sinews of enterprise in every department of gainful industry. Fields lie untilled; factories stand still; the shop and the counting-room are deserted; vessels rot at the wharves; every kind of trade is interrupted or deranged; immense masses of capital are withdrawn from use; the entire energies of a nation are turned into the channel of war, and its resources whelmed in this mighty vortex of ruin.

Look at the loss occasioned in the single department of commerce. This main source of wealth war dries up, and exposes to capture an incalculable amount of property on the ocean. Our exports and imports now (1836) exceed two hundred millions of dollars every year; and one half of all this, besides a great variety of products interchanged along our coast, would be liable in war to be seized by the enemy. The imports in the single city of New York amounted, during one quarter of 1835, to thirty-six millions of dollars; and a war suddenly occurring would probably have found afloat on the ocean more than twice that amount destined to the same port, and one or two hundred millions belonging to the whole nation. The commissioners appointed to adjust the demands of British merchants for property destroyed by Denmark alone during the late wars

of Europe, received claims to the amount of about twenty-five hundred millions of dollars! Such estimates as these would prove that the *direct* expenses of war, though immense, are a mere fraction, rarely more than a fourth part, of the sum total which it wastes.

But look at the enormous expenditures of war. Those of our last war have been variously estimated; but they could not have been less than *forty or fifty millions* of dollars every year. Our revolutionary war cost England *six hundred millions* of dollars; and in the wars occasioned by the French revolution, she spent *more than FIVE THOUSAND MILLIONS!* The public debt of Great Britain, incurred *solely* by war, is even now about *four thousand millions of dollars*; and that of all Europe amounts to nearly *eight thousand millions!* The wars of Christendom during only twenty-two years cost merely for their support not much less than **FIFTEEN THOUSAND MILLIONS OF DOLLARS!** Quadruple these sums by the indirect and incidental losses of war, and we shall have an amount that would almost tempt us to suspect figures themselves of falsehood, and facts of deception — a sum so vast that the bare interest upon it would be more than enough to defray the *necessary* expenses of governing every nation on earth, to furnish every family in the world with a Bible, to provide the means of common education for all its children, and to support one minister of the gospel for every thousand souls.

Seldom do the people inquire or imagine how much our own Republic spends for the war-system even in a time of peace. In 1827, our expenditures for war were about nine times as much as for all other purposes. In 1832, we expended for civil offices \$1,800,758; for intercourse with other nations, \$325,181; for miscellaneous objects, \$2,451,203; for the military establishment, \$5,446,035; for the naval service, \$3,956,320; for revolutionary pensions, \$1,057,121; for various other pensions, \$127,301; for the Indian department, \$1,352,420; for the national debt, \$17,840,309; more than *thirty millions and a half*, in one form or another, for war; *seventeen times as much as for the whole civil list*, and about *ten times as much as for all the other purposes of our government*. From 1791 to 1832, the aggregate of our expenditures, with less than three years of actual warfare, was \$842,250,891; and merely 37,158,047, *a twenty-third part of the whole*, were for the civil list, almost the only department that would be necessary, if the war-system were entirely abolished

II. But reflect on the LOSS OF LIFE BY WAR. The battle-field will by no means tell us the whole number of its victims. Cruel treatment, bad provisions, unhealthy encampments, forced marches, frequent exposures to extremes of heat and cold without shelter, and fatal diseases generated by such causes, destroy vastly more than the sword. Often has a single march cut off more than half of an army. The hardships of war shorten from ten to twenty years the life of those who escape the sword, and thus occasion an immense loss that is never reckoned in the usual estimates of its havoc.

But how vast the multitude of its *immediate* victims! At Borodino there perished in one day 80,000; and in the siege of Mexico more than 100,000 in battle, and more than 50,000 from the infection of putrefying carcasses. The Moors of Spain lost in one engagement with Christians 70,000, and in another 180,000, besides 50,000 prisoners. In the battle of Chalons there fell 300,000 of Attila's army alone; in ancient times it was no very uncommon slaughter for *one or two hundred thousand* to be left dead on a single field; and the Old Testament records an instance where *one side* lost 500,000.* We shudder at the thought of Alexander's sacrificing *three millions* of lives; but his successors occasioned the destruction of *twenty millions*, the Saracens, *sixty millions*, and the crusades alone, *forty millions of nominal CHRISTIANS*!!

III. Glance, now, at *some of the PERSONAL SUFFERINGS incident to war*. Think of the violence practised in procuring seamen and soldiers. Where the war-spirit is predominant, they are forced into the army and navy at the pleasure of their rulers, and doomed to all the hardships, perils, and sufferings of war, with little or no hope of release till death. Do you know how soldiers are generally *treated*? They are subjected to the most iron-hearted despotism on earth, to a bondage far worse than that of a Turkish peasant, or a domestic slave. They are at the mercy of every superior, from the commander-in-chief down to the pettiest officer. They have little or no protection against hourly abuse, insult, and violence, nor any adequate security for life itself against the lawless passions of officers seldom called to account in war for the worst treatment of soldiers. Their *punishment* is still more barbarous. 'Sailors are subject,' says a well-known writer, 'not only to a torrent of imprecations and curses, but to the boatswain's

* 2 Chron. xiii. 3—17.

cat-o'-nine-tails. The least complaint brings them to the gangway; and sometimes a sailor is sentenced to receive five hundred, and even a thousand lashes, to be inflicted day after day, as he may be able to bear them. He is attended at each whipping by a surgeon, who determines how much can be inflicted at once without immediate danger to life! Often does the flagellation proceed till the victim faints; and then he is respited, to renew his sufferings another day. I have often shuddered at the recital of whippings through the fleet, the keel-hauling, the spread-eagle, the gagging, the hand-cuffing, and other punishments inflicted on sailors who have been trepanned or forced into a service from which death is the only release.' The punishment of soldiers is equally cruel and shocking with that of seamen; but we will not describe flogging, the gauntlet, the picket, the wooden-horse, and other forms of punishment, the very thought of which is enough to make one's blood boil with indignation, or curdle with horror.

One instance, however, we will select from our own land. In 1814, a soldier was shot at Greenbush, New York, for going thirty or forty miles from the camp, without leave, to visit his wife and three small children. After the usual preliminaries in such cases, his coffin, a box of rough pine boards, was borne before him on the shoulders of two men to the place of execution. He wore, as a winding-sheet, a white cotton gown, having over the place of his heart the black image of a heart, as a mark for the executioners to aim at. His countenance was as pale as his winding-sheet, and his whole frame trembled with agony. His grave was dug, the coffin placed by its side, and the deserter, with a cap drawn over his eyes, required to kneel upon the lid. At this signal, the eight soldiers, drawn by lot for the bloody deed, stepped forward within two rods of their victim; and, at another signal from the officer, all fired at the same instant. The miserable man, with a horrid scream, leaped from the earth, and fell between his coffin and his grave. The sergeant, to insure immediate death, shot him through the head, holding his musket so near that the cap took fire; and there the body lay, with the head sending forth the mingled fumes of burning cotton and hair. The soldiers, after passing close by the corpse in a line to let every one see for himself the fate of a deserter, marched back to the merry notes of Yankee Doodle! and all the officers were immediately invited to the quarters of the commander, and treated with grog!!

Imagine the *sufferings incident to marches*. Trace the French army in the Russian campaign. On halting at night, the soldiers threw themselves down on the first dirty straw they could find, and there perished in large numbers with hunger and fatigue. From such sufferings, and from the infection of the air by putrefied carcasses of men and horses that strewed the roads, there sprang two dreadful epidemics, the dysentery and typhus fever. So fatal were these combined causes, that of 22,000 Bavarians, only 11,000 reached the Duna, though they had been in no action; and the flower of both the French and the allied armies perished. A division of the Russian army, amounting, at the commencement of the pursuit of the French, to 120,000 men, could not, on the frontier of the Duchy of Warsaw, muster 35,000; and a re-enforcement of 10,000, that had marched from Wilna, arrived with only 1500, of whom one half were the next day in the hospitals. Some battalions retained less than fifty men, and many companies were utterly annihilated!

The march of the French both to and from Moscow, was horrible beyond description. 'Overwhelmed with whirlwinds of snow,' says Labaume, 'the soldiers could not distinguish the road from the ditches, and often fell into the latter, which served them for a tomb. Others, eager to press forward, dragged themselves along. Badly clothed and shod, having nothing to eat or drink, groaning and shivering with the cold, they gave no assistance, and showed no signs of compassion to those who, sinking from weakness, expired around them. Many of these miserable creatures struggled hard in the agonies of death. Some, in the most affecting manner, bade adieu to their brethren in arms, and others with their last breath pronounced the name of their mother and their country. Stretched on the road, we could only see the heaps of snow that covered them, and formed undulations in our route like those in a grave-yard. Flocks of ravens flew over our heads croaking ominously; and troops of dogs, which had followed us all the way from Moscow, and lived solely on our bloody remains, howled around us, as if impatient for the moment when *we* should become their prey, and often contended with the soldiers for the dead horses which were left on the road.'

'Every day furnished scenes too painful to relate. The road was covered with soldiers who no longer retained the

human form. Some had lost their hearing, others their speech; and many, by excessive cold and hunger, were reduced to such a state of stupid frenzy, that they roasted the dead bodies for food, and even gnawed their own hands and arms. Some, too weak to lift a piece of wood, or roll a stone towards the fire, sat down upon their dead companions, and gazed with countenances unmoved upon the burning logs. These livid spectres, unable to get up, fell by the side of those on whom they had been seated. Many, in a state of delirium, plunged their bare feet into the fire to warm themselves; some, with convulsive laughter, threw themselves into the flames, and, with shocking cries, perished in most horrible contortions; others, in a state of equal madness, followed their example, and shared the same fate; while many were so maddened by the extremes of pain and hunger, that they tore the dead bodies of their comrades into pieces, and feasted on the remains.'

'The soldiers often fired in the morning the buildings in which they had lodged during the night; and on one occasion there were three large barns filled chiefly with wounded soldiers. From two of these they could not escape without passing through the one in front, which was on fire. The most active saved themselves by leaping out of the windows; but all those who were sick or crippled, not having strength to move, saw the flames advancing rapidly to devour them. Touched by their shrieks, some of the least hardened endeavored in vain to save them. We could see them half-buried under the burning rafters. Through whirlwinds of smoke, they entreated their comrades to shorten their sufferings by putting them to death; and from motives of humanity we thought it our duty to do so! But some still survived; and we heard them with feeble voices crying, "*Fire on us! fire on us! at the head! at the head! don't miss!*"

The sufferings of the wounded left after battle on the open field, or crowded into hospitals, are shocking. Fifty days after the battle of Borodino, no less than 20,000 of the slain were found lying where they had fallen; and the whole plain was strewed with half-buried carcasses of men and horses, intermingled with garments dyed in blood, and with bones gnawed by dogs and vultures. 'As we were marching over the scene of the battle,' says Labaume, 'we heard a piteous sound at a distance; and, on reaching the spot, we found a French soldier stretched on the

ground, with both his legs broken. "I was wounded," said he, "on the day of the great battle; and finding myself in a lonely place, where I could gain no assistance, I dragged myself with my hands to the brink of a rivulet, and have lived nearly two months on grass and roots, and a few pieces of bread which I found among the dead bodies. At night I have lain in the carcasses of dead horses; and with the flesh of these animals I have dressed my wounds."

Even a hospital is scarcely less terrible. An eminent surgeon, present in the hospitals after the battle of Waterloo, says, 'The wounded French continued to be brought in for *several successive days*; and the British soldiers, who had in the morning been moved by the piteous cries of those they carried, I saw in the evening so hardened by the repetition of the scene, and by fatigue, as to become indifferent to the sufferings they occasioned!'

'It was now the *thirteenth day* after the battle. It is impossible to conceive the sufferings of men rudely carried at *such* a period of their wounds. When I first entered the hospital, these Frenchmen had been roused and excited in an extraordinary degree; and in the glance of their eyes there was a character of fierceness which I never expected to witness in the human countenance. On the second day, the temporary excitement had subsided; and turn which way I would, I encountered every form of entreaty from those whose condition left no need of words to stir compassion: *Surgeon Major, oh! how I suffer! Dress my wounds! do dress my wounds!—Doctor, I commend myself to you. Cut off my leg! Oh! I suffer too much!* And when these entreaties were unavailing, you might hear, in a weak, inward tone of despair, *I shall die! I am a dead man!*'

In the hospitals of Wilna there were left more than 17,000 dead and dying, frozen and freezing. The bodies of the former were taken up to stop the cavities in the windows, floors, and walls; and in one corridor of the Great Convent, above 1500 were piled up transversely like pigs of lead or iron!!

An army after its capture is often doomed to every variety of suffering. A French army in Spain had no sooner grounded their arms, than multitudes were murdered in cold blood. Some were burnt alive, and all the survivors subjected to a series of such extreme privations and sufferings as thinned their ranks with fearful rapidity. 'Fa-

tigue and insufficient provision,' says one of the victims, 'rendered many incapable of rising after a night's halt, to renew their march, and dawn exhibited to us the stiffened limbs of numbers whom death had released from their troubles. The survivors were so gaunt and emaciated, that a poor fellow would sometimes drop to the earth in the extremity of weariness and despair. No effort was made to assist these sufferers; but they were either left behind to perish, or bayoneted on the spot. On our arrival at St. Lucar, we were thrown, some of us into prison-ships, and others into stinking casements. Here the extremity of our anguish exceeded all powers of description. With scarce strength enough to crawl to our detestable dungeons, many of us reached them only to lie down, and die broken-hearted; and the fare was so wretched as to be refused in many cases by men fainting with weariness, and famished with hunger. We were not only crowded together like cattle amidst vermin and pestilential effluvia, but treated with such unrelenting severity, that many of my companions sought refuge from their misery by plunging into the sea.'

'When landed on the desolate island of Cabrera, we were exposed to every species of privation. Without shelter, or sufficient clothing, or a regular supply of food, we sometimes resorted to grass and dust to answer the wants of nature. A great many died; and we buried them immediately in the sea under the horrible apprehension that, should their bodies remain before us, the savage longings of the cannibal would rise in our hearts. A cuirassier was in fact killed for food by a Pole, who was discovered and shot. He confessed he had before done the same by two other comrades.'

As the French army on their march to Moscow approached Rouza, 'we met,' says one of them, 'a great number of carts brought back by the cavalry, loaded with children, the aged, and the infirm. In our advance to the centre of the town, we found soldiers pillaging the houses, regardless of the cries of those to whom they belonged, or the tears of mothers, who, to soften their hearts, showed them their children on their knees. Those innocents, with their hands clasped, and all bathed in tears, asked only that their lives might be spared. In another instance we saw, on one side, a son carrying a sick father, and on the other, women pouring the torrent of their tears upon the infants whom they

clasped to their bosoms. They were followed by most of their children, who, fearful of being lost, ran crying after their mothers. Old men, seldom able to follow their families, laid themselves down to die near the houses where they were born. On our return from Moscow, we overtook crowds carrying off their infirm parents. Their horses having been taken from them by the troops, men, and even women, were harnessed to the carts which contained the wrecks of their property, and the dearest objects of their affection. The children were nearly naked, and as the soldiers approached them, ran crying to throw themselves into their mothers' arms.'

Still worse was the capture of Magdeburg, as related by Schiller in his history of the 'thirty years' war.' Exasperated by its long resistance, the commander of the besieging army, on entering it, abandoned the city to the unrestrained rage and lust of his soldiers; and 'a scene of horror ensued which history has no language, poetry no pencil, to portray. Neither the innocence of childhood, nor the helplessness of old age, neither rank, sex, nor beauty, could disarm the fury of the conquerors. Wives were dishonored in the arms of their husbands, and daughters at the feet of their parents! Nothing could afford any protection. Fifty-three women were found beheaded in a single church! Some of the soldiers amused themselves with throwing children into the flames, and others with stabbing infants at their mothers' breasts!! Heaps of dead bodies strewed the ground; streams of blood ran along the streets; and the city being fired at once in several places, the atmosphere soon glowed with such intolerable heat as compelled even the soldiers themselves to seek refuge in their camps. More than *five thousand* bodies were thrown into the river to clear the streets; there perished in all not less than *thirty thousand*; Magdeburg, one of the finest cities in Germany, was a heap of ashes; and the next day some of the few survivors were seen crawling out from under the dead, children wandering about with heart-rending cries in search of their parents, and infants still sucking the dead bodies of their mothers!' In gratitude to the *God of Peace!* for success in this work of blood and desolation, 'a solemn mass was performed the next day, and *Te Deum* sung amidst the discharge of artillery!!'

Do facts like these give an exaggerated view of war? No; they will hardly enable us adequately to conceive even

its ordinary atrocities and horrors. Such evils are not merely incidental to war; they are inseparable from any of its forms, and constitute its grand, essential elements. They are a part of the system. Misery is its object, or its means; and war, without a fearful waste of property, life, and happiness, is an utter impossibility. Its whole business is to plunder, and burn, and butcher by wholesale; and to talk of a war that did not perpetrate such atrocities, and inflict such miseries, would be as direct a contradiction in terms as to speak of vision without light, or of fire without heat.

Can you estimate the guilt, the folly, the madness of employing such an arbiter of international disputes as war? Burn villages, demolish cities, lay waste empires, send hundreds of thousands into an untimely grave, into a ruined eternity, all for the settlement of difficulties which can be adjusted only by an appeal to reason! What should we think of two neighbors who should propose to settle a point in dispute, not by reasoning the case between themselves, nor by referring it to an impartial jury, or to umpires mutually chosen, but by shooting at each other, and butchering each others' wives and children? Yet such is the war-system still supported by all Christendom; and, if the stealer of a horse or a coat deserves a prison, and the pirate who destroys but one vessel, or the assassin who murders a single victim, is deemed worthy of the gallows, what must be the criminality of nations in continuing a custom which multiplies such crimes and woes by thousands and by millions!

On whom do the evils of war fall? Are its guilty abettors the men that pay its expenses, bear its hardships, and suffer its countless woes? No; these come upon the *people*. It is their earnings that are wasted, their blood that is poured out like water, their dwellings that are burnt to ashes, their fathers and brothers, husbands and sons, that are driven away like cattle to be butchered by thousands; while the authors of all these evils, sitting aloof from the storm upon their sofas of ease and luxury, read without a sigh of the miseries they have themselves occasioned. How long will the *people* bear such cold-blooded oppression?

Tell us not that war is a necessary evil. Necessary for *whom*? For civilized, Christian men like ourselves? Are *we* unwilling to regulate our intercourse, or settle our disputes, without bloodshed? *Why* is war necessary? Merely because nations *choose* it; just as intemperance is necessary to the drunkard, piracy to the pirate, and duelling to

the duellist. There is no other kind of necessity for war; and it must cease of course whenever men shall resolve to have it cease. There is no more need of war in Christendom than there is of duels in New England; it would be just as easy for nations, if they chose, to settle all their disputes without the sword and the cannon, as it is for us to adjust ours without pistols and daggers.

But do you deem it impossible thus to change the war-choice even of Christendom? Human nature is as corrigible on this subject as upon any other; there is nothing to render the extinction of this custom impossible by the right use of the requisite means; and the promises of God make its ultimate abolition perfectly certain. 'It shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and all nations shall flow unto it; and then shall they beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they *learn* war any more.' Isa. 2:2-4, 9:4-9. Mic. 4:1-4.

But how is this promise to be fulfilled? By miracle? We can expect no more miracles. By some unparalleled interposition of Providence? God has promised no such interposition. Without the use of appropriate means? Such means are just as indispensable for the prevalence of peace as for the spread of the gospel.

But what are these means? Such an application of the gospel to the subject as shall revolutionize the war-sentiments of Christendom, fill every Christian community with deep abhorrence of this custom, and lead rulers to employ only pacific expedients in settling international disputes. And who shall use these means? We cannot rely on men of the world, except as occasional coadjutors; it is the appropriate work of Christians; and they must do it, or it never will be done. But how shall they do it? Is it enough for them merely to support and to propagate the present form of their religion? It has for ages tolerated the war-system, and suffered Christendom to remain a vast hot-bed of war. Will such a religion, if spread through the world, put an end to war? No sooner than a rum-drinking and a slave-holding Christianity would put an end to intemperance and slavery. *The gospel will abolish nothing which it sanctions and supports*; and, if men are not converted to peace, as fast as they are to God, such a conversion of the whole world could not insure the univer-

sal and permanent reign of peace. We must restore the pacific principles of the gospel, and incorporate them once more, where Christ and his apostles left them, in the faith and character of his disciples as a body, before the spread of Christianity will insure the abolition of war. The gospel is a sovereign remedy for all the moral maladies of our world; but it must be *applied* to war, before it can cure this deep and deadly gangrene of our race. It has not been applied for fifteen centuries; and so long as Christians persist in this neglect, we cannot expect to see peace coëxtensive with Christianity.

But do you ask what specific things must be done? Let every man cease from lending his countenance to the war-system in any way or degree, and every possible means be used to render it deeply and universally odious. Let every Christian examine the subject till his own views, feelings, and habits, are cast in the pacific mould of the gospel. Let the pulpit and the press proclaim, with trumpet-tongue, the folly, guilt, and horrors of war before every Christian community on earth. Let instructors in all Christian seminaries of learning, from the highest to the lowest, infuse the pacific principles of the gospel into the forming minds under their care. Let teachers in every Sabbath-school through the world do the same to their pupils. Let every parent train his children to a love of peace, and a deep, unmingled abhorrence of war. Let all classes, high and low, old and young, male and female, unite to bring this custom into general contempt and execration, as a mass of folly, sin, and misery. Such a process would soon bring war in Christendom to a perpetual end.

How much longer, then, will the friends of God and man slumber over this subject? Will they never open their eyes to the abominations and miseries of war, and combine their efforts to sweep it from every land blest with the light of revelation? Can they still lend their countenance to such a wholesale destroyer of property, and life, and virtue, and religion, and immortal souls? Disciples of Jesus, we leave these questions on your conscience before the God of peace. Have you done what you could? Are you now doing all that you can? If not, will you keep hold of the subject till you learn and do your whole duty as a follower of the Prince of peace?

TESTIMONIES AGAINST WAR.

WARS come solely because men choose to have them; and, could we change the choice of the world on this subject, the custom would soon die of itself. Men *can* put an end to it whenever they please; and we wish so far to revolutionize the war-sentiments of mankind that they will no longer tolerate this terrible scourge. It has always resulted from a public opinion grossly perverted; this opinion in favor of war must be radically changed, before peace can become permanent or general; and, among other means adapted to produce such a change, we wish, as the friends of temperance have done in their cause, to show you how men the most distinguished in all ages for their learning, wisdom, and virtues, have regarded the custom of war.

EMINENT PAGANS.

We could not expect the heathen to denounce a custom so emphatically their own; yet we find the wisest and best of them reprobating it in the strongest terms. MINUTIUS calls it "the part of a wild beast, not of man, to inquire how bite may be returned for bite, and evil for evil." CICERO speaks of war, "contention by violence, as belonging to the brutes," and complains bitterly of its effects on liberal arts, and peaceful pursuits. "All our noble studies, all our reputation at the bar, all our professional assiduities, are stricken from our hands as soon as the alarm of war is sounded. Wisdom itself, the mistress of affairs, is driven from the field. Force bears sway. The statesman is despised; the grim soldier alone is caressed. Legal proceedings cease. Claims are asserted and prosecuted, not according to law, but by force of arms."

SENECA, the great moralist of antiquity, is still more strong in his condemnation of war. "How are we to treat our fellow-creatures? Shall we not spare the effusion of blood? How small a matter not to hurt him whom we are

bound by every obligation to do all the good in our power! — Some deeds, which are considered as villanous while capable of being prevented, become honorable and glorious when they rise above the control of law. The very things which, if men had done them in their private capacity, they would expiate with their lives, we extol when perpetrated in regimentals at the bidding of a general. We punish murders and massacres committed among private persons; but what do we with wars, the glorious crime of murdering whole nations? Here avarice and cruelty know no bounds; enormities forbidden in private persons, are actually enjoined by legislatures, and every species of barbarity authorized by decrees of the senate, and votes of the people.”

WARRIORS.

The testimony of a warrior against his own profession is like the concessions of an enemy, or the confession of a criminal; but still we have heard a general of our own calling “a battle a hell,” and NAPOLEON himself, in moments of chagrin and serious reflection, denouncing war as “the business of barbarians.”

Sir WALTER RALEIGH, a scholar, a statesman, and a soldier, declares “there is no profession more unpropitious than that of warriors. Besides the envy and jealousy of men, the spoils, rapes, famine, slaughter of the innocent, devastations and burnings, with a world of miseries laid on the laboring man, they are so hateful to God, as with good reason did Monluc, the Marshal of France, confess, ‘that, were not the mercies of God infinite, it were in vain for those of his profession to hope for any portion of them, seeing the cruelties by them permitted and perpetrated are also infinite.’”

The Buonaparte family was a nursery of warriors; yet from LOUIS BUONAPARTE we have, after years of experience and reflection, this indignant testimony against war: “I have been as enthusiastic and joyful as any one else after victory; still I confess that even then the sight of a field of battle not only struck me with horror, but even turned me sick. And now that I am advanced in life, I cannot understand, any more than I could at fifteen years of age, how beings who call themselves reasonable, and who have so much foresight, can employ this short existence, not in loving and aiding each other, and passing through it as

gently as possible, but in striving, on the contrary, to destroy each other, as though time did not do this with sufficient rapidity. What I thought at fifteen years of age, I still think, that war, and the pain of death which society draws upon itself, are but organized barbarisms, an inheritance of the savage state, disguised or ornamented by ingenious institutions, and false eloquence."

We might quote WELLINGTON himself, the conqueror of Napoleon, deploring the evils of this custom, and expressing his willingness, "even by the sacrifice of his life, to prevent one month of war in a country to which he was attached;" but it is more refreshing to hear such a patriot-warrior as our own WASHINGTON "reflecting how much more delightful to an undebauched mind is the task of making improvements on the earth, than all the vain-glory which can be acquired from ravaging it by the most uninterrupted career of conquests. How pitiful, in the eye of reason and religion, is that false ambition which desolates the world with fire and sword, compared to the milder virtues of making our fellow-men as happy as their frail conditions and perishable natures will permit them to be! It is time for knight-errantry and mad heroism to be at an end."

Immediately after the battle of Germantown, Warner Mifflin, in behalf of the Quakers, carried to the opposing generals, Washington and Howe, the testimony of his brethren against war; and when Mifflin, after Washington was raised to the presidency of the United States, visited him in New York, the President, having received him with much respect, said, "Will you please, Mr. Mifflin, to inform me on what principles you were opposed to the Revolution?" "Yes, Friend Washington; on the same principle that I should now be opposed to any change in this government. *All that ever was gained by revolutions, is not an adequate compensation to the poor mangled soldier for the loss of life or limb*"—how much more truly he might have added, "for the loss of his soul, a gem of more value than all the kingdoms of this world." Washington, after some pause and reflection, replied, "Mr. Mifflin, I honor your sentiments; there is more in them than mankind have generally considered."

STATESMEN.

MACCHIAVEL himself denounces war as "a profession by which men cannot live honorably; an employment by

which the soldier, if he would reap any profit, is *obliged* to be false, and rapacious, and cruel. Nor can any man, who makes war his profession, be otherwise than vicious. Have you not a proverb, that *war makes villains, and peace brings them to the gallows?*”

LORD CLARENDON, illustrious in the annals of England, is very explicit in his denunciations of this custom. “Of all the punishments and judgments which the provoked anger of the divine providence can pour out upon a nation full of transgressions, there is none so terrible and destroying as war. A whole city on fire is a spectacle replete with horror; but a whole kingdom on fire must be a prospect much more terrible. And such is every kingdom in war, where nothing flourishes but rapine, blood and murder. We cannot make a more lively representation and emblem to ourselves of hell, than by the view of a kingdom in war.”

“They who allow no war to be lawful, have consulted both nature and religion much better than they who think it may be entered into to comply with the ambition, covetousness, or revenge of the greatest princes and monarchs upon earth; as if God had inhibited only single murders, and left mankind to be massacred according to the humor and appetite of unjust and unreasonable men. It is no answer to say, that this universal suffering is the inevitable consequence of war, however warrantably soever entered into, but rather an argument that no war can warrantably be entered into. It may be, upon a strict survey and inquisition into the elements and injunctions of the Christian religion, that no war will be found justifiable; and, at all events, what can we think of most of those wars which for some hundreds of years have infested the world so much to the dishonor of Christianity, and in which the lives of more men have been lost than might have served to people all those parts of the earth which yet remain without inhabitants?”

NECKER, the great French financier, exclaims, “With what impatience have I wished to discuss this subject, and to expatiate on the evils which always attend this terrible calamity! War, alas! impedes the course of every useful plan, exhausts the sources of prosperity, and diverts the attention of governors from the happiness of nations. It even suspends, sometimes, every idea of justice and humanity; and, instead of gentle and benevolent feelings, it substitutes hostility and hatred, the necessity of oppression, and the rage of desolation.”

“In every situation where men are impelled by circumstances, neither their first choice, nor their first impulse, is to be considered in this argument. We must study their sentiments in those moments when, distracted by a thousand excruciating pains, yet still lingering in existence, they are carried off in heaps from the fatal field where they have been mowed down by the enemy. We must study their sentiments in those noisome hospitals where they are crowded together, and where the sufferings they endure to preserve a languishing existence, too forcibly prove the value they set upon their lives, and the greatness of the sacrifice to which they had been exposed. We ought more especially to study their sentiments on board those ships on fire, in which there is but a moment between them and the most cruel death; and on those ramparts where subterraneous explosion announces, that they are in an instant to be buried under a tremendous heap of stones and rubbish. But the earth has covered them, the sea has swallowed them up, and we think of them no more. What unfeeling survivors we are! While we walk over mutilated bodies, and shattered bones, we exult in the glory and honor of which we alone are the heirs.”

“This subject is immensely important to every nation. War multiplies the calamities of mankind. Several states are already converted, as it were, into a vast body of barracks; and the successive augmentation of disciplined armies will be sure to increase taxes, fear and slavery in the same proportion.”

THOMAS JEFFERSON both wrote and acted with great decision in favor of peace. “I stand in awe,” he says in 1798, “at the mighty conflict to which two great nations,” (France and England,) “are advancing, and recoil with horror at the ferociousness of man. Will nations never devise a more rational umpire of differences than force? Are there no means of coercing injustice more gratifying to our nature than a waste of the blood of thousands, and of the labor of millions of our fellow-creatures? — Wonderful has been the progress of human improvement in other respects. Let us then hope, that the law of nature will in time influence the proceedings of nations as well as of individuals, and that we shall at length be sensible, that *war is an instrument entirely inefficient towards redressing wrong, and multiplies instead of indemnifying losses.* Had the money which has been spent in the present war, been

employed in making roads, and constructing canals of navigation and irrigation through the country, not a hovel in the Highlands of Scotland, or the mountains of Auvergne, would have been without a boat at its door, a rill of water in every field, and a road to its market-town. Were we to go to war for redress of the wrongs we have suffered, we should only plunge deeper into loss, and disqualify ourselves for half a century more for attaining the same end. These truths are palpable, and must in the progress of time have their influence on the minds and conduct of nations."

We might quote from a long list of English statesmen — BURKE, FOX, CANNING, MCINTOSH, and others; but a single paragraph from a speech of Lord BROUGHAM is all we have room to give. "My principles — I know not whether they agree with yours; they may be derided, they may be unfashionable; but I hope they are spreading far and wide — my principles are contained in the words which that great man, Lord Faulkland, used to express in secret, and which I now express in public — *Peace, PEACE, PEACE. I abominate war as unchristian. I hold it to be the greatest of human crimes. I deem it to include all others — violence, blood, rapine, fraud, every thing which can deform the character, alter the nature, and debase the name of man.*"

PHILOSOPHERS.

We need not quote largely from philosophers; but in the van of them all we will place the great philosopher of common sense, our own FRANKLIN, a stanch opposer of the war-system. "If statesmen," says he, "were more accustomed to calculation, wars would be much less frequent. Canada might have been purchased from France for a tenth part of the money England spent in the conquest of it; and if, instead of fighting us for the power to tax us, she had kept us in good humor by allowing us to dispose of our own money, and giving us now and then a little of her own by way of donation to colleges or hospitals, for cutting canals, or fortifying ports, she might easily have drawn from us much more by occasional voluntary grants and contributions, than ever she could by taxes. Sensible people will give a bucket or two of water to a dry pump, in order to get from it afterwards all they want."

"After much occasion to consider the folly and mis-

chiefs of a state of warfare, and the little or no advantage obtained even by those nations which have conducted it with the most success, I have been apt to think *there never has been, nor ever will be, any such thing as a good war, or a bad peace.* — All wars are follies, very expensive and very mischievous ones. When will mankind be convinced of this, and agree to settle their difficulties by arbitration? Were they to do it even by the cast of a die, it would be better than by fighting and destroying each other. — We daily make great improvements in natural philosophy; there is one I wish to see in moral — the discovery of a plan that would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats."

BENJAMIN RUSH, a name dear to science and patriotism, philanthropy and religion, wrote with great force against war, and was the first to suggest the idea of associated efforts for its abolition. In a very ingenious essay, he proposed "an office for promoting and preserving perpetual peace in our country," and recommended, among many other appropriate and horrific emblems of the war-office, that "there be in the lobby painted representations of all the common military instruments of death; and also human skulls — broken bones — unburied and putrefying dead bodies — hospitals crowded with sick and wounded soldiers — villages on fire — mothers in besieged towns eating the flesh of their children — ships sinking in the ocean — rivers dyed with blood — and extensive plains without a tree, or fence, or any object but the ruins of deserted farm-houses. Above all this group of woful figures, let the following words be inserted in red characters, to represent human blood — NATIONAL GLORY!!"

JEREMY BENTHAM, a peculiar but powerful mind, says, that "nothing can be worse than the general feeling on the subject of war. The church, the state, the ruling few, the subject many, all seem in this case to have combined to patronize vice and crime in their widest sphere of evil. Dress a man in particular garments, call him by a particular name; and he shall have authority, on divers occasions, to commit every species of offence — to pillage, to murder, to destroy human felicity; and, for so doing, he shall be rewarded. The period will assuredly arrive, when better instructed generations will require all the evidence of history to credit, that in times deeming themselves enlightened, human beings should have been honored with public approval in the very proportion of the misery they

caused, and the mischiefs they perpetrated ; that men there were, men deemed worthy of popular recompense, who for some small pecuniary retribution, hired themselves out to do any deeds of pillage, devastation and murder, which might be demanded of them ; and that such men-destroyers were marked out as the eminent and illustrious, as the worthy of laurels and monuments, of eloquence and poetry."

MEN OF LETTERS.

ERASMUS, the glory of his age, wrote against war with unrivalled beauty and force. "What infernal being, all-powerful in mischief, fills the bosom of man with such insatiable rage for war ! If familiarity with the sight had not destroyed all surprise at it, and custom blunted the sense of its evils, who could believe that those wretched beings are possessed of rational souls, who contend with all the rage of furies ? Robbery, blood, butchery, desolation, confound without distinction every thing sacred and profane."

"Behold with the mind's eye savage troops of men horrible in their very visage and voice ; men clad in steel, drawn upon every side in battle-array, and armed with weapons that are frightful in their clash and their very glitter. Mark the horrid murmur of the confused multitude, their threatening eyeballs, the harsh, jarring din of drums and clarions, the terrific sound of the trumpet, the thunder of cannon, a mad shout like the shrieks of bedlamites, a furious onset, a cruel butchering of each other ! See the slaughtered and the slaughtering, heaps of dead bodies, fields flowing with blood, rivers reddened with human gore !"

"I pass over, as comparatively trifling, the fields of grain trodden down ; peaceful cottages and rural mansions burnt to the ground ; villages and towns reduced to ashes ; innocent women violated ; old men dragged into captivity ; churches defaced and demolished ; every thing laid waste, a prey to robbery, plunder and violence. Nor will I mention the consequences of the justest and most fortunate war — the unoffending common people robbed of their little, hard-earned property ; the great laden with taxes ; old people bereaved of their children, more cruelly killed by the murder of their offspring than by the sword ; women far advanced in age, left destitute, and put to death in a worse form than if they had died at once by the point

of the bayonet; widowed mothers, orphan children, houses of mourning, and once affluent families reduced to extreme penury."

"Do you detest robbery and pillage? These are among the *duties* of war. Do you shudder at the idea of murder? To commit it with despatch, and by wholesale, constitutes the celebrated art of war. Do you regard debauchery, rapes, incest, and crimes of a dye still deeper than these, as foul disgraces to human nature? Depend upon it, war leads to all of them in their most aggravated atrocity. Is impiety, or a total neglect of religion, the source of all villany? Religion is always overwhelmed in the storms of war."

"The absurdest circumstance of all is, that you see in wars among Christian nations the cross glittering and waving on high in both the contending armies at once. What a shocking sight! Crosses dashing against crosses, and Christ on this side firing bullets at Christ on the other! Cross against cross, and Christ against Christ, and prayers at the same time from both armies to the same God of Peace!!"

Well does BURTON, Johnson's favorite author, ask, "Is not this a mad world? Are not these madmen who leave such fearful battles as memorials of their madness to all succeeding generations? What fury put so brutish a thing as war first into the minds of men? Why should creatures, born to exercise mercy and meekness, so rave and rage like beasts rushing on to their own destruction? So abominable a thing is war! And yet warriors are the brave spirits, the gallant ones of this world, the alone admired, the alone triumphant! These have statues, and crowns, and pyramids, and obelisks to their eternal fame!!"

THEOLOGIANs.

The early fathers of the church were unanimous in denouncing war as inconsistent with a profession of faith in Christ. "Custom," says TERTULLIAN, "can never sanction an unlawful act. And can a soldier's life be lawful, when Christ has pronounced that he who lives by the sword, shall perish by the sword? Can any one who professes the peaceable doctrines of the gospel, be a soldier?" Such views prevailed among all the ministers and churches of Christ during the purest era of our religion, and ceased not to regulate their conduct till near the fatal union of

Church and State, under Constantine, early in the fourth century.

JEREMY TAYLOR holds war to be incompatible with the gospel. "The Christian religion hath made no particular provision for the conduct of war, under a proper title; and, if men be subjects of Christ's law, they can never go to war with each other. As contrary as cruelty is to mercy, tyranny to charity, so is war and bloodshed to the meekness and gentleness of the Christian religion; and such is the excellency of Christ's doctrine, that, if men would obey it, Christians would never war one against another."

BISHOP WATSON exclaims, "Would to God that the spirit of the Christian religion would exert its influence over the hearts of individuals in their public capacity, as much as, we trust, it does over their conduct in private life! Then there would be no war. When the spirit of Christianity shall exert its proper influence over the minds of individuals, and especially over the minds of public men in their public capacities, war will cease throughout the Christian world."

CECIL assures us "there is something worse than the plunder of the ruffian, than the outrage of the ravisher, than the stab of the murderer. These are comparatively but the momentary evils of war. There is also a shocking moral appendage which naturally grows out of national conflicts. Instead of listening to the counsels of divine mercy, and concurring in the design of a kingdom of heaven set up on earth in 'righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost,' the spirit of warlike discord tends to entomb every such idea. It tends rather to set up something like *a kingdom of hell*, a reign of violence where destruction is the grand enterprise; where the means of death and desolation are cultivated as a science; where invention is racked to produce ruin, and the performance of it is ennobled by public applause. Moloch seems once more enthroned; while ambition, revenge and oppression erect their banners amidst groans and tears, amidst cities desolated, or smoking in their ashes."

ROBERT HALL, the first preacher, if not the first mind of his age, has filled many a page with strains of eloquent denunciations against war. "But how is it possible to give you an idea of its horrors? Here you behold rich harvests, the bounty of heaven, and the reward of industry, consumed in a moment, or trampled under foot, while famine and pestilence follow in the steps of desolation. There the

cottages of peasants given up to the flames ; mothers expiring through fear not for themselves, but their infants ; the inhabitants flying with their helpless babes in all directions, miserable fugitives on their native soil ! In another part you witness opulent cities taken by storm ; the streets, where no sounds were heard but those of peaceful industry, filled on a sudden with slaughter and blood, resounding with the cries of the pursuing and the pursued ; the palaces of nobles demolished, the houses of the rich pillaged, the chastity of virgins and of matrons violated, and every age, sex and rank mingled in promiscuous massacre and ruin."

"War is also the fruitful parent of crimes. *It reverses, with respect to its objects, all the rules of morality* It is *nothing less than* A TEMPORARY REPEAL OF THE PRINCIPLES OF VIRTUE. *It is a system out of which almost all the virtues are excluded, and in which nearly all the vices are included.* Whatever renders human nature amiable or respectable, whatever engages love or confidence, is sacrificed at its shrine."

"While the philanthropist is devising means to mitigate the evils, and augment the happiness of the world, the warrior is revolving in the gloomy recesses of his capacious mind, plans of future devastation and ruin. Prisons crowded with captives, cities emptied of their inhabitants, fields desolate and waste, are among his proudest trophies. The fabric of his fame is cemented with tears and blood ; and, if his name is wafted to the ends of the earth, it is in the shrill cry of suffering humanity, in the curses and imprecations of those whom his sword has reduced to despair."

CHALMERS, one of the first minds that Scotland ever produced, is very full on this subject, and truly says, that "the prophecy of universal peace will meet its accomplishment only by the activity of men, by the philanthropy of thinking and intelligent Christians. It is public opinion which in the long run governs the world ; and, while I look with confidence to a gradual revolution in the state of public opinion from the omnipotence of gospel truth working its silent but effectual way through the families of mankind, yet much may be done to accelerate the advent of perpetual and universal peace by a distinct body of men embarking their every talent and acquirement in the prosecution of this as a distinct object. This was the way in which, a few years ago, the British public were gained over to the cause of Africa ; and it is in this way, I apprehend, that

the prophecy of universal peace will receive a speedier fulfilment."

Well does JAMES, one of the most popular religious writers in England, deem "it high time for the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus to study the genius of their religion. *A hatred of war is an ESSENTIAL feature of practical Christianity*; and it is a shame upon what is called the Christian world, that it has not long since borne universal and indignant testimony against that enormous evil which still rages not merely among savages, but among scholars, philosophers, Christians and divines. Real Christians should come out from the world on this subject, and touch not the unclean thing. Let them *act* upon their own principles, and become not only the friends but the advocates of Peace. *Let ministers from the pulpit, writers from the press, and private Christians in their intercourse with each other and the world, inculcate a fixed and irreconcilable abhorrence of war.* LET THE CHURCH OF GOD BE A SOCIETY FOR THE DIFFUSION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF UNIVERSAL PEACE."

In view of such testimonies, we cannot regard the cause of Peace as a trivial or a friendless enterprise. The greatest and the best men of every age have given it their full sanction, their warmest wishes; all the glorified spirits above are its deeply interested patrons; God himself has taken it under his special care, and promised it eventual triumph through the world. It is the noblest enterprise that ever tasked the powers of man; and loudly does it call upon every friend of God and a bleeding race to come to its support.

Mark how far the extracts above go against war. They do not directly touch the vexed question concerning wars purely defensive; but they are strong against the whole war-system, and would, if carried into practice, entirely demolish this enormous engine of guilt, bloodshed and misery. Breathe the spirit and sentiments of these extracts into the people of Christendom; and you work such a change in public opinion as would ere-long banish this custom from every land blest with the light of the gospel. Such is the change which the friends of peace are laboring to produce; and fain would we entreat every lover of his country, his species, or his God, to lend this cause his utmost aid.

WAR AND THE BIBLE.

THE Bible is our only infallible guide; and by it every custom must eventually be tried. Many have already been brought to this test; and it is high time for Christians to look at war in the light of revelation.

Thou shalt have no other gods before me. War contravenes all such precepts. It sprang from paganism; its spirit is essentially pagan still; and its laws every where require soldiers to obey their officers rather than God himself. Does it not thus dethrone Jehovah from the hearts of an army? Are not soldiers notorious for their neglect of God? Can war be any thing else than a vast nursery of irreligion? Every man, whether a private, an officer, or even a chaplain, is bound by his oath to yield implicit obedience to his superiors. He is not permitted to follow his conscience. A British officer was once cashiered by Protestants for refusing to join in what he deemed the idolatries of Popery; nor must soldiers scruple, at the bidding of a superior, to commit the grossest outrages ever recorded in the annals of crime.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. War is a school of impiety and profaneness; blasphemy is the well-known dialect of the army and navy; you can hardly enter a camp or a war-ship without meeting a volley of oaths, or find a warrior on land or sea who does not habitually blaspheme the name of God. An eye-witness, speaking of one of our own armies, says we should not wonder at their frequent defeats, "if we could witness the drunkenness and debauchery from the general to the private, and hear them strive to outvie each other in uttering the most horrid imprecations and blasphemy, and ridiculing every thing like religion."

Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. War scorns to acknowledge any Sabbath. Its battles are fought, its marches continued, its fortifications constructed, all its labors exacted, all its recreations indulged, quite as much on this as any other day of the week. It is the chosen time for special and splendid reviews; all the millions of soldiers in Christendom are compelled to violate the Sabbath; and, where the war-spirit is rife, it will be found well nigh impossible to preserve, in any degree of vigor, this mainspring of God's moral government over our world.

Thou shalt not commit adultery. War is a hotbed of the foulest licentiousness. It is deemed the soldier's privilege; and, wherever an army is encamped, a war-ship moored, or a city taken, he is permitted to indulge his lusts at will. In 1380, some English troops, while wind-bound near Portsmouth, and waiting for provisions, forcibly carried off men's wives and daughters; and, among other outrages, their commander went to a nunnery, and demanded admittance for his soldiers; and, being refused, they entered by violence, compelled the nuns to go with them, and afterwards threw them into the sea! When an English man-of-war was accidentally sunk near Spithead, she carried down with her no less than six hundred lewd women; and amidst the fires of captured Magdeburg and Moscow were heard continually the wild, despairing shrieks of ravished mothers and daughters. War is a Sodom; and, could all its impurities be collected in one place, we might well expect another storm of fire and brimstone.

Thou shalt not steal. War is a system of legalized national robbery; the very same thing, only on a larger scale, and under the sanction of government, for which individuals are sent to the prison or the gallows. To plunder, burn, and destroy, is the soldier's professed business! At Hamburg, 40,000 persons were driven from their homes without clothes, money, or provisions, of which their enemies had despoiled them. "Out of a plentiful harvest," says a Saxon nobleman, "not a grain is left. The little that remained, was consumed in the night fires, or was next morning, in spite of tears and prayers, wantonly burned by the laughing fiends. Not a horse, not a cow, not a sheep is now to be seen." The French troops, on their return from Moscow, often destroyed every building for leagues together; and around Leipsic nothing was spared, neither the ox, nor the calf two days old, neither the ewe, nor the lamb scarcely able to walk, neither the brood-hen, nor the tender chicken. Whatever had life, was slaughtered; and even the meanest bedstead of the meanest beggar was carried off. All this accords with the laws of war; and every government, in its letters of marque and reprisal, licenses men to commit piracy at pleasure!

Thou shalt not kill. It is the very object, the main business of war to kill men. It is the most terrible engine ever contrived for the wholesale destruction of mankind; incomparably more destructive to life than the inquisition or the slave-trade, than famine, or pestilence, or any form

of disease that ever swept over the earth. Survey the butcheries of the battle-field — 50,000 at Eylau; 80,000 at Borodino; 300,000 at Arbela; 400,000 of the enemy alone by Julius Cæsar in a single engagement; more than 5,000,000 in the invasion of Greece by Xerxes; 1,600,000 by Jenghiz-khan in the district of Herat, 1,760,000 in two other cities with their dependencies, and, during the last twenty-seven years of his reign, an average of more than 500,000 every year! Look at the French butcheries in Spain or Portugal under Napoleon. Peaceful inhabitants massacred without distinction or mercy! “Often were the ditches along the line of their march,” says an eye-witness, “literally filled with clotted, coagulated blood as with mire; the dead bodies of peasants, put to death like dogs, were lying there horribly mangled; little naked infants of a year old or less, were found besmeared in the mud of the road, transfixed with bayonet-wounds; matrons and young women dead with cruel, shameful wounds; and priests hanged on the trees by the way-side like felons!!”

Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But can the soldier do this, and still continue his trade of human butchery? Love is said to be the fulfilling of the law *because it worketh no ill to his neighbor*; but the soldier is required, as a matter of alleged duty, to do his neighbor all the ill he can! He is hired for this sole purpose; and he *must* do it, or die himself for neglect of duty!! *Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them.* But would you like to have a gang of men burn your dwelling over your head, butcher your whole family, and then send a bullet or a bayonet through your own heart? This is the whole business of war; its grand maxim is to do unto others just what we would *not* have done to ourselves. *Avenge not yourselves.* Is not war a vast engine of vengeance? It proceeds in *all* cases on the principle of injuring others, either because they *have* injured us, or because we fear they *will*, unless we prevent it by injuring them in advance. *Love your enemies.* War requires and almost compels us to *hate* them. *Do good unto all men.* War does them *evil*, *only* evil. *Lay aside all malice.* War *cherishes* malice. *Overcome evil with good.* War overcomes evil *only with* evil. *Whoso smiteth thee on one cheek, turn to him the other also.* War bids us kill the man that smites us, or *attempts* to smite us.

Imagine a soldier repeating the Lord's prayer. *Our Father in heaven!* And does the soldier, while butchering men, women and children, think to resemble Him who send-

eth rain upon the evil as well as the good, and causeth his sun to rise alike on the just and the unjust? *Hallowed be thy name.* Hallow God's name by plunder and bloodshed! *Thy kingdom come.* That kingdom which consisteth in righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, come by theft and violence, by the bloody strife and countless miseries of war! *Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.* By hating, robbing, and killing his brethren! *Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.* Forgive by doing them all the injury in our power! Would soldiers like to be forgiven in this way — by God's making them as miserable as he can? Thus the soldier, if he prays consistently, must ask God to help him plunder, and burn, and ravage, and kill, and commit almost every species of wickedness! Should the pirate pray for success, would he not ask for the very same things?

Let us learn the soldier's duties (!) from *Suwarrow's Catechism*, a series of directions by that great general to his soldiers. "Push hard with the bayonet. The ball will lose its way; the bayonet never. The ball is a fool; the bayonet a hero. Stab once; and off with the Turk from the bayonet! Stab the second! Stab the third! A hero will stab half a dozen! If three attack you, stab the first, fire on the second, and bayonet the third!"

Are such things only *perversions* of war? No; they are inseparable from any of its forms; and as well might you talk of fire without heat, as of a war without fraud, and robbery, and murder, and misery by wholesale. Do you deem it possible for the deeds of war to be done from good motives, in a Christian spirit? What! burn villages, plunder cities, butcher men, women and children, send thousands at once into eternity in unforgiven guilt, all from motives acceptable to a God of peace and love! A *Christian* way to do *such* things! A way in which Paul or Christ would have done them!!

Now, tell us the difference between what are called *offensive* and *defensive* wars. Do they not both cherish the same spirit, employ the same means, perpetrate the same atrocities, and inflict the same miseries? Wherein do they differ? If government cannot license us to blaspheme God, and worship idols, can it authorize us to break those precepts of the Bible which every species of war *must* trample in the dust?

Reader, are you a disciple of the Prince of Peace? How then can you have any thing to do with such a system of wholesale robbery and murder? Are you a parent? Can you train your children to the love and practice of war? Are you a teacher? Can you instruct your pupils in the science of human butchery, or fill them with a thirst for the glory of plunder and bloodshed? Are you an ambassador of the Prince of Peace? Is it consistent for you to act as a military chaplain? Would you be chaplain to a horde of robbers, or a gang of pirates?

WAR CURABLE,

OR

THE POSSIBILITY OF ABOLISHING THIS CUSTOM.

THE evils of war none will deny ; but not a few seem to doubt the possibility of abolishing a custom so long-continued, so deeply rooted in the worst passions of mankind, and so universally wrought into the very texture of society and government. Our object is so good, they will not oppose us ; but they have so little faith in its practicability as to withhold their active co-operation, and even tell us, we might as well think to chain up the lightning, or hold down the earthquake, as dream of banishing war from such a world as ours.

This skepticism is not peculiar to the cause of peace. We can hardly name an enterprise of benevolence or reform, that was not obliged at its outset to encounter the same obstacle from multitudes even of good men. "How apt," says Dr. Rush, "are mankind to brand as visionary every proposition for innovation. There never was an improvement in any art or science, nor a proposal for meliorating the condition of man in any age or country, that has not been considered as an Utopian scheme." The present methods of treating the small-pox, fevers, and other diseases, were at first viewed, not only with distrust, but absolute horror ; and every one knows, that efforts in the cause of temperance, and for the abolition of the slave-trade, were for a time regarded as utterly visionary and hopeless. The use of the magnet in navigation, the application of steam to mechanical purposes, a multitude of inventions and improvements, now familiar as household words, were at first treated with utter incredulity and contempt. Our own Congress refused Fulton the use of the Representatives' Hall, to explain his scheme of applying steam to navigation. 'What,' said members of the French cabinet to Fulton, when soliciting their patronage, 'do you presume to think you can ever propel a boat by steam, at the rate of four miles an hour ?' 'Yes, indeed,' replied the enthusiast ; 'and if you'll furnish me the means, I will eventually reach even six miles

an hour.' The wise men of France turned their backs on the poor inventor, and, in less than twenty years, thousands of steam-vessels, moving at the rate not of six, but fifteen or twenty miles an hour, were every where proclaiming the enthusiast to have been far wiser than the skeptic, and infinitely more useful to mankind.

But what do the friends of peace seek to accomplish? Only the abolition of war among nations professedly Christian. Here is our whole object. We dream not of extending our efforts beyond the limits of Christendom; we rely for success entirely on the gospel as God's sovereign remedy for all the moral maladies of mankind; and our highest hopes will be realized when war shall be banished from every Christian land, and peace be made; as a part of our religion, to go hand in hand with the gospel over the whole earth, and the world thus be,—what it never yet has been in a single case, though it ought to have been in every case,—converted to peace as fast as it shall be to God.

Now, is such an object unattainable? Do you really think it impossible for peace to prevail wherever the gospel itself does? If so, where lies the impossibility? In the nature of man? Then show us in what part of his nature. In his intellect, his conscience, his heart? Has he any principle, any passion, any habit, that defies the utmost power of God's truth and spirit? No; none of his faults are absolutely incorrigible; and, if war be the work of men, it surely can be done away by a right use of the requisite means. To suppose the contrary would be a gross libel on human nature, and an impious limitation of His power who hath the hearts of all entirely in his hands, and doeth his pleasure alike in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth.

Let us look next at the nature of war itself, and see if we can find there any thing to forbid the possibility of its abolition. It is a custom; and all customs are from their very nature subject to the will of men, liable to change, and capable of being entirely reformed. These properties are essential to any custom, and include of course the possibility of its abolition.

I know very well how common it has been, if it is not still, to represent war, unlike any other custom, as a natural, necessary evil that can be resisted no better than a pestilence, a tempest, or an earthquake. Strange misconception! Did you ever hear of a war, without any human

agency, bursting upon mankind like lightning from the cloud, or like the eruptions of a volcano? Does it, like a tornado or the cholera, spring from causes beyond our control? A war without human hearts to will it, or human hands to carry it on! Is it not so entirely dependent on the will of men as to come and go just at their bidding? Is there any physical necessity which compels them, whether they will or not, to butcher one another? Such questions answer themselves, and prove that war comes solely from the wrong choice of men, and must of necessity cease whenever they shall choose to discard it. Can civilized, Christian nations never be persuaded to abstain from the wholesale butchery of one another as a means of settling their disputes? The advocates of war tell us they never can be; but we, relying on the corrigibility of human nature, fully believe they can be thus persuaded, and will be, under the influences of the gospel rightly applied.

But do you still plead for the necessity of war? Necessary for what? For the gratification of bad passions? But these passions may be restrained, or taught to gratify themselves in other ways than the wholesale butcheries of war. Necessary for the vindication of our rights, for the redress of our wrongs, for the protection of our interests? Better means than the sword for all these purposes are clearly possible, and fast coming to be adopted. Necessary for a nation's honor? The plea of the duellist; and, when public sentiment shall be thoroughly Christianized, it will be as disgraceful for a nation to wage war, as it is now in New England to fight a duel. Necessary for the safety of nations? All their danger arises from the war-system itself; and, were that system universally relinquished, there would be no aggression to resist. War necessary because nations have been so long accustomed to it? This argument would prove the impossibility of any reform, improvement or change. If war cannot be abolished because it has continued so long, then every form of idolatry, all the barbarous customs of our own ancestors, all the errors and sins of past ages, must have remained to this hour. War necessary because nations recognize no other arbiter of their disputes? The assertion is not strictly true at the present day, since they are at length beginning to employ other umpires; but, if it were true, it would not disprove the possibility of superseding this custom. Once individuals had no other means than brute violence for the redress of their wrongs,

or the adjustment of their difficulties; but, if that old practice of private wars gave place, ages ago, to codes and courts of law between individuals, it is equally possible for nations, if they choose, to provide similar methods for the settlement of their disputes without the effusion of blood.

Nor does society or government oppose any insuperable obstacles to the prevalence of peace. What if the spirit and principles of war are through the world wrought into the very texture of them both? So were a multitude of other customs that have already been banished from Christian and even from pagan lands. Society and government, each the work of men, are necessarily moulded to their will, and not only may, but absolutely must receive just such modifications as they shall choose. Only let them universally demand the change requisite for the permanent peace of the world; and such a change would soon pervade, as a matter of course, every society and government on earth.

Need we, then, despair in view of the influences which have for so many ages been leagued all over the globe in support of the war-system? True, these influences are exceedingly powerful; but they are all dependent entirely on the will of men; and such a change in their views and feelings as we seek to produce, would enlist every one of them on the side of peace. Only turn the popular current; and on its bosom war would ere-long float spontaneously from Christendom forever, just as the tide of a regenerated public sentiment has drifted away a variety of kindred practices.

But do you deem it impossible thus to revolutionize the war-sentiments even of Christendom? The history of man, the promises of God, and the acknowledged power of his gospel, all forbid such a supposition. True, the means requisite for this purpose, are not now in use to any great extent; but the Bible prescribes and provides such means; and, if the friends of God and man would only use them aright, we might confidently expect ultimate, if not speedy success.

Glance at the history of kindred reforms. Long was knight-errantry the admiration of all Christendom; but where is it now? Vanished from the earth; its very name a term of reproach; its memory living mainly in those works of genius which ridiculed its follies from the world. Nearly the same might be said of the crusades, and all wars of religion, the prosecution of which was once re-

garded as the highest service a Christian could render to the God of peace!

For ages did the trial by ordeal and judicial combat prevail. The accused was required to fight his accuser in single combat, or plunge his arm into boiling water, or lift a red-hot iron with his naked hand, or walk bare-footed over burning plough-shares, or pass through other trials equally severe and perilous. Such trials were conducted with ceremonies the most solemn; the ministers of religion were wont to be present; the Almighty was invoked to interpose in behalf of the innocent; and whoever escaped the ordeal unhurt, or came from the combat victorious, was said to be acquitted by "the judgment of God." This custom, sanctioned by every class in society, by the wisest monarchs, and the highest dignitaries in the church, prevailed for centuries all over Europe; nor is it more than two hundred years since it ceased entirely from Christendom.

Even matters of religion were submitted to this strange test. In the eleventh century, the question was agitated in Spain whether the Musarabic liturgy so long used there, or the one recommended by the See of Rome, contained the form of worship most acceptable to God. On this point a violent contest ensued between the Spaniards and the Popes; the nobles proposed to decide the controversy by the sword; the king seconded their suggestion, and the champions in full armor entered the lists. The Musarabic liturgy was victorious; but the vanquished party succeeded in procuring another and a different trial. A great fire was kindled; a copy of each liturgy was thrown into the flames; and it was agreed, that the one which stood this test, should be received in all the churches of Spain. The Musarabic still triumphed, and, if we may credit the writers of that age, came out of the fire unhurt, while the other was burnt to ashes.

But let us leave those dark ages, and come down to the dawn of the nineteenth century. Long had Christians themselves, apparently without remorse, and certainly without reproach, continued to engage in the slave-trade; and nearly all the apologies now pleaded for war, were then reiterated to justify that atrocious traffic in the bodies and souls of men. Prejudice, and passion, and interest, and inveterate custom, all clamored loud in its behalf, and covered with obloquy and reproach the few that dared to beard the monster in his very den. But humanity

and religion could bear it no longer ; and the fireside, the pulpit and the senate, the cottage and the palace at length rang in thunders of denunciation against the vampyre gorged for so many ages with the blood of a continent. A regenerated public opinion decreed its doom ; and the result is on record. The slave-trade is now regarded as piracy ; the slave-trader is put under the ban of the civilized world as fit only for the gallows ; and, though Africa still bleeds at many a pore from the same cause, yet that practice has doubtless received its death-blow.

It were easy to multiply examples ; but why allude to intemperance, and persecution, and witchcraft, and other evils already abolished, or put in a train which promises their ultimate abolition ? I need not surely specify any more cases ; for if such customs as knight-errantry, judicial combat, and the slave-trade have already been wholly, or but partially done away, is there no possibility of putting an end to war ? Is this custom, unlike any other, proof against the combined power of earth and heaven arrayed against it ?

Review, next, the meliorations of war itself. Bad as the custom still is, it has already lost more than half its primitive horrors, and undergone changes much greater than would now suffice to abolish it entirely. Its former atrocities are well nigh incredible. Belligerents employed whatever means would best subserve their purposes of conquest, plunder or revenge. They poisoned wells, and butchered men, women and children without distinction. They spared none. Prisoners they massacred in cold blood, or tortured with the most exquisite cruelty ; and, when unable to reduce a fortified place, they would sometimes collect before it a multitude of these victims, and, putting them all to the sword, leave their carcasses unburied, that the stench might compel the garrison to retire ! Such atrocities were practised by the most polished nations of antiquity. In Rome, prisoners were either sold as slaves, or put to death at pleasure. Kings and nobles, women and children of high birth, chained to the victor's car, were dragged in triumph through the streets, and then doomed to a cruel death, or left to end their days in severe and hopeless bondage ; while others less distinguished, were compelled as gladiators to butcher one another by thousands for the amusement of Roman citizens ! But such barbarities are indignantly discarded from the present war-system of Chris-

tendom; and if thus ten steps have already been taken—they confessedly have—towards abolishing this custom, is there no possibility of taking the six more that alone are requisite to complete its abolition?

Nor is even this all; for certain kinds of war have actually been abolished. Private or feudal wars, once waged between the petty chieftains of Europe, and frequently occasioning even more mischief than flows now from the collision of empires, continued for centuries to make the very heart of Christendom a scene of confusion and terror. There was no safety, no repose. Every baron claimed the right, just as nations now do, of warring against his neighbor at pleasure. His castle was his fortress, and every one of his vassals a soldier bound to take the field at the bidding of his lord. War was their business; and all Europe they kept in ceaseless commotion or alarm. The evil seemed intolerable; and the strongest influences of Christendom were arrayed against it. Checks were devised, and restrictions gradually imposed; the Royal Truce, and the Truce of God were introduced; associations were formed for promoting peace, and bonds for mutual security were given; the emperor and the pope, the magistrate and the priest, the ruler and the citizen, all combined against it, and succeeded, though not till after the lapse of four or five centuries, in exterminating a species of war as dreadful as any that ever scourged our world. And would not similar efforts bring international wars to an end?

Glance at some of the causes now at work to hasten such a result. I have not time even to name a tithe of these causes; it would require a volume to do any sort of justice to this part of our subject; and it must for the present suffice to know, that all the means of general improvement, all the good influences of the age, are so many handmaids to the cause of peace, and harbingers of its universal spread and triumph. The progress of freedom, and popular education;—the growing influence of the people, always the chief sufferers from war, over every form of government;—the vastly augmented power of public opinion fast becoming more and more pacific;—the spirit of free inquiry, and the wide diffusion of knowledge through presses, and pulpits, and schools;—the disposition to force old usages, institutions and opinions through the severest ordeals;—the various improvements which philanthropy, genius, and even avarice itself are every where making in

the character and condition of mankind;—the actual disuse of war, and the marked desire of rulers themselves to supersede it by the adoption of pacific expedients that promise ere-long to re-construct the international policy of the civilized world;—the pacific tendencies of literature, science, and all the arts that minister to individual comfort, or national prosperity;—the more frequent, more extended intercourse of Christians and learned men in different parts of the earth;—the wide extension of commerce, and the consequent interlinking over the globe of interests which war must destroy;—the rapid spread of the gospel in pagan lands, the fuller development of its spirit in Christendom, and the more direct, more efficacious application of its principles to every species of sin and misery;—all the enterprises of associated benevolence and reform, but especially the combined efforts made to disseminate the principles of peace, to pour the full light of heaven on the guilt and evils of war, and thus unite the friends of God and man every where against this master-scourge of our race;—such are some of the influences now at work in behalf of universal and permanent peace.

Nor have these causes been at work in vain. “Already is the process begun, by which Jehovah is going to fulfil the amazing predictions of his word. Even now is the fire kindled at the forges where swords are yet to be beaten into plough-shares, and spears into pruning-hooks. The teachers are already abroad who shall persuade the nations to learn war no more. If we would hasten that day, we have only to throw ourselves into the current, and we may row with the tide. There may be here and there a counter-current; but the main stream is flowing steadily on, and the order of Providence is rolling forward the sure result.”

The gospel, rightly applied, is amply sufficient for such a result. It is God’s own power at work for the world’s eventual deliverance from all forms of error, sin and misery. There is no passion it cannot subdue, no vice it cannot reform, no evil custom it cannot abolish, no moral malady it cannot cure, no inveteracy of error or sin from which it cannot reclaim. Its history, as well as its nature, proves its power; and a libel would it be on God himself to suppose his chosen instrument for a world’s spiritual renovation, inadequate to the task of exterminating war from every and blest with its heavenly light.

On this point God has taken care to leave no room for

doubt. Expressly, repeatedly has he promised, that 'the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of his name, even as the waters cover the sea; that the kingdoms of this world shall all become the kingdom of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ;' and then 'shall they beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall no longer lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' Thus has God promised the world's eventual pacification as explicitly as he has the world's conversion, or even the-salvation of any believer in Jesus; and we must either discard the whole Bible, or believe in the possibility, the absolute certainty of universal and permanent peace.

It is not incumbent on us to show *how* these prophecies, any more than how the other promises of God, are to be fulfilled; and yet it were easy to point out a variety of expedients that might, with safety and success, take the place of war. There is in truth no more need of this custom among Christian nations than there is of paganism itself. They could, if they would, settle all their difficulties without war as well as the members of a church can theirs without duels. There is no impossibility in the case. Substitutes far better than the sword for all purposes of protection and redress, might be made to supersede entirely the alleged necessity of war between nations, just as codes and courts of law did the practice of war between individuals.

Let us analyze this plea of necessity. Men in our Southern States, insist on the necessity of duelling; but are they really compelled, whether they will or not, to shoot, and stab, and hew each other down in cold blood? There is no such compulsion in the case; they *must* solely because they *will*. And why will they? Why does excited passion at the South vent itself in duels? Custom there has hewn out this channel of blood into which excited passion flows. But why in New England does the same degree of passion never lead to duels? Public opinion here frowns upon the duellist as a cool, calculating murderer. Yet is human nature the same in South Carolina that it is in Massachusetts; the whole difference arises from the different education of the two communities; and, were all mankind educated to regard war as we at the North do the kindred custom of duelling, nations would no more dream of venting their passions, or settling their disputes by war, than Christians do theirs by duels.

Mark the result in both customs. What settles a quarrel between duellists? Not the shots or stabs interchanged, but the explanation subsequently given and accepted. They fight merely to make it honorable to explain; and that explanation, should custom so decide, might come just as well before as after fighting. So in war, the fighting, in every case of civilized warfare, is only preliminary to steps for settling the dispute on grounds of equity and reason. Nations, like duellists, fight solely to render it honorable, or themselves willing to negotiate, or refer, or employ some other pacific expedients that might be used even more successfully before the war than after it.

We cannot here dwell on these substitutes for war—*negotiation*, where the parties adjust their own difficulties without the aid of others; *arbitration*, when they refer the points in dispute to an umpire; *mediation*, when a third power friendly to both, offers its services as mediator; or, better than all, *a congress of nations*, designed first to frame a specific, authoritative code of international law, and next to apply that law, and adjudicate whatever cases might be voluntarily referred to its decision. Here are substitutes enough, all founded on the principle of amicable agreement between the parties themselves, or that of reference to a third party mutually chosen; expedients essentially the same with those which are so generally adopted by men of sense and virtue in social life; expedients that have in past ages been occasionally employed by nations with signal success; expedients that are certainly possible, and, if so, render war entirely unnecessary, except from the wrong choice of men.

But is there no possibility of changing this choice? Is Christendom itself, with its Bibles, and Sabbaths, and churches, its preachers of peace, and all its instrumentalities for the reformation of mankind, such a kennel of blood-hounds as never to be won from the love of mutual butchery? Let us bring the question home to your own bosom. Will *you* acknowledge *yourself* to be such an insatiate blood-leech, that you never can, never will give up war? No; you abhor the custom, and would gladly supersede it entirely by better methods for the adjustment of national difficulties. Go to your neighbor; and will he not readily respond to these views? Go through the land, traverse the civilized world; and how few could you find that did not feel, or might not easily be made to feel, your own abhor-

rence of war, and desire for peace. Where then is the impossibility of changing the war-choice of mankind? Is there no power in the family, the school, or the church, none in the press, or the pulpit, none in civilization, or Christianity, to reclaim the inhabitants even of Christendom from their love of war, and persuade them to adopt other means than the sword for the settlement of their disputes?

True, such a result we do not expect, as no man in his senses can expect any moral result, without the use of appropriate means. The moral suasion of the gospel, the power of Christian truth and love, must be applied long and well to this custom. Light must be poured upon it from reason and history; its enormous guilt must be set forth in the full blaze of revelation; its immeasurable evils for time and eternity, must be spread as far as possible before every class in the community; and such a process of exposure must be continued, until the mass of minds in every Christian land shall come to regard this relic of a bloody and barbarous paganism with a portion of God's own unmingled abhorrence. Christians must as a body gird themselves in earnest for this work as peculiarly their own; preachers of the gospel must enforce its pacific, just as they do any of its other truths, and pour down upon this mass of crime and misery a flood of heaven's own light; the press must be made to teem with facts, and arguments, and appeals in behalf of this cause; teachers in all our schools must instil the sentiments of peace into the young minds under their care; and all pious parents must carefully guard their own children against the manifold delusions of war, and let them sport with no more of its toys, and listen to no more of its songs, and gaze at no more of its pictures or glittering armor, and be present at no more of its fascinating displays, and witness no more of its pomp, parade or splendor, but honestly teach them to regard every shred of this custom as steeped in pollution, blood and tears.

All this *can* be done; and, if done, God's promised blessing would make sure the result. Let the gospel, wherever preached, be rightly applied to this custom; let the press be fully enlisted in behalf of this cause; let every minister of the Prince of Peace do his whole duty on this subject; let Christians of every name all come up to this work as one man, and put forth their utmost energies; let associations, if necessary, be formed, and scores of selected advocates plead, and the friends of humanity all rally with their gifts, and prayers, and personal efforts for the

use of such means as God hath appointed for the spread of peace co-extensive with our peaceful religion; let books, and tracts, and pamphlets, and periodicals, full of stirring facts, and of logic all on fire, be scattered far and wide in every city and town, in every village, hamlet and habitation; let every church, every Sabbath and common school, every academy and college, every seminary of learning, from the highest to the lowest, every fire-side in Christendom, become a nursery of peace, to train up a whole generation of peace-makers; let all these hold up war before every class in the community as a giant offender against God, as the master-scourge of our world; and could this or any other custom long stand before such an array of influences?

Such are the instruments which the friends of peace have begun to employ against war; and the God of peace has crowned their efforts with a degree of success, even greater in proportion to the means used, than in any other enterprise now before the community. Scarce a tenth part as much has been done for this cause as for any other; and yet have we already (1844) reached results vastly important, and prospects still more cheering. Our own country has been saved from several wars that threatened it; the general peace of Europe has, for a wonder, been preserved for nearly thirty years; public sentiment on this subject is widely different from what it was even at the beginning of the present century; difficulties which would once have plunged nations in blood, are now adjusted with scarce a thought of resorting to arms; negotiation, reference, and mediation, are actually taking the place of war, and gradually effacing the traditional belief of its necessity; the leading cabinets of Christendom seem disposed to adopt these substitutes as their settled, permanent policy; and this course, if continued only half a century longer, will probably supersede in time the whole war-system, by accustoming nations to settle their disputes in essentially the same way that individuals now do theirs.

It *can* be done. Give us the means, and it SHALL be done. Let us have not a tenth, nor even a hundredth, but only a thousandth part of the money and moral power now wasted upon the war-system even in peace; and we will, with the promised aid and blessing of God, set at work such a train of influences as shall ere-long banish this custom from every Christian land, or so far neutralize its power as to leave only its skeleton to show future ages what the monster was!

FOUR ASPECTS OF WAR.

I. DOES WAR FORGIVE?—A friend of peace once asked a general on a muster-field, ‘What do you mean by this array of swords, muskets and cannon?’—“We mean to be avenged on our enemies, should they insult or invade us.”—‘But we are bound to *forgive* our enemies, should they injure us.’—“So we will,” said the general.—‘But, if you really forgive them, what do you want of swords, rifles and cannon?’—“To stab and shoot them.”—‘But, if you forgive them, how could you at the same time shoot and stab them?’—“I think,” said the general, “I can feel forgiveness in my heart towards my enemy, while I am shooting and stabbing him. Can I not?”—‘If you can, you take a queer way of showing it. How can you show your forgiveness by swords and guns?’—“I am sure,” he replied, “it’s more than I can tell.”—‘Perhaps,’ said the peace-man, ‘you have the art of shooting and stabbing your forgiveness into the hearts of your enemies; and it may be the object of your review to perfect yourselves in this art. Is it so?’—“I think,” replied he very honestly and truly, “we are more likely to perfect ourselves in the art of *killing* them.”

‘Could you,’ inquired a peace-man of a military officer, ‘could you, after a battle in which you had stained your hands with the blood of your brethren, ask God to forgive you *as* you had forgiven your enemies?’—“I am not a Christian,” said he, “nor do I profess to forgive the wrongs done to me and my country; but I know I should be a hypocrite and a blasphemer, if I should ask God to forgive me *as* I had forgiven my enemies, after I had been killing them. When I ask Him to forgive me *as* I have my enemies, I will cease to kill them, or to encourage others in doing so.”

II. CAN WE RECONCILE WAR WITH CHRISTIANITY?—Let us put the main aspects of the two side by side, and see how far they agree. Christianity saves men; war destroys them. Christianity elevates men; war debases and degrades them. Christianity purifies men; war corrupts and defies them. Christianity blesses men; war curses them. God says, thou shalt not kill; war says, thou *shalt* kill. God says, blessed are the peace-makers; war says, blessed are the war-makers. God says, love your enemies; war says, hate them. God says, forgive men their trespasses; war says, forgive them *not*. God enjoins forgiveness, and forbids revenge; while war scorns the former, and commands the latter. God says, resist not evil; war says, you may and must resist evil. God says, if any man smite thee on one cheek, turn to him the other also; war says, turn *not* the other cheek, but knock the

smiter down. God says, bless those who curse you ; bless, and curse not : war says, curse those who curse you ; curse, and bless not. God says, pray for those who despitefully use you ; war says, pray *against* them, and seek their destruction. God says, see that none render evil for evil unto any man ; war says, be sure to render evil for evil unto all that injure you. God says, overcome evil with good ; war says, overcome evil with evil. God says, if thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him drink : war says, if you do supply your enemies with food and clothing, you shall be shot as a traitor. God says, do good unto all men ; war says, do as much evil as you can to your enemies. God says to all men, love one another ; war says, hate and kill one another. God says, they that take the sword, shall *perish* by the sword ; war says, they that take the sword, shall *be saved* by the sword. God says, blessed is he that trusteth in the Lord ; war says, cursed is such a man, and blessed is he who trusteth in swords and guns. God says, beat your swords into ploughshares, your spears into pruning-hooks, and learn war no more ; war says, make swords and spears still, and continue to learn war—until all mankind have ceased from learning it, i. e., fight, all of you, until all of you stop fighting !!

III. THE SOLDIER AND THE LORD'S PRAYER.—Let us, said the celebrated Erasmus more than three centuries ago, let us imagine we hear a soldier among these *fighting* Christians saying the Lord's Prayer just before battle. OUR FATHER! says he. O, hardened wretch! can you call God Father, when you are just going to cut your brother's throat?—*Hallowed be thy name.* How can the name of God be more impiously *unhallowed* than by mutual bloody murder among his sons?—*Thy kingdom come.* Do you pray for the coming of *his* kingdom, while you are endeavoring to establish an earthly despotism by spilling the blood of God's sons and subjects?—*Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.* His will in heaven is for PEACE ; but you are now meditating WAR.—*Give us this day our daily bread.* How dare you say this to your Father in heaven at the moment you are going to burn your brother's corn-fields, and would rather lose the benefit of them yourself than suffer him to enjoy them unmolested?—*Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us.* With what face can you pray thus when, so far from forgiving your brother, you are going with all the haste you can, to murder him in cold blood for an alleged trespass which, after all, is but imaginary?—*Lead us not into temptation.* And do you presume to deprecate temptation or danger—you who are not only rushing into it yourself, but doing all you can to force your brother into it?—*Deliver us from evil.* You pray to be *delivered from evil*, that is, from the evil being, Satan, to whose impulses you are now submitting yourself, and by whose spirit you are guided in contriving the greatest possible evil to your brother?

IV. WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A PROFESSED SOLDIER AND A HIRED ASSASSIN?—Let us state the case. Every

reader in America remembers the "Salem Tragedy." Joseph and Francis Knapp, distant relatives of a rich old gentleman in Salem by the name of White, instigated Richard Crowninshield, by the offer of a thousand dollars of the plunder, to kill the old man, and seize his treasures. Crowninshield, entering the house of his victim at midnight, and creeping softly up stairs to the room where he was sleeping, struck him over the head with a bludgeon, and then turning down the clothes, stabbed him several times in the heart with a dagger. Every body called him a hired assassin; and he would have been hung as an atrocious murderer, if he had not in his prison hung himself. The two Knapps were tried, convicted and hung for hiring Crowninshield to assassinate Mr. White.

Here is a clear case of hired assassination; and wherein does it differ from the profession of a soldier? Doubtless there is *some* difference; but in what does it consist, and to what does it amount? How far are the two professions or acts alike?

Let us look at the facts. Here is a nation of ten, twenty or fifty millions, that hire you as one of their soldiers to kill whomsoever they may wish to have killed, and promise to give you, besides your food and clothing, some ten or twenty cents a day. The nation, indignant that the Chinese spurn their opium, or that the Afghans reject their favorite ruler, or that the Seminoles will not give up their lands, the inheritance of fifty generations, to some avaricious white men, order you to go and kill them, burn their dwellings, and butcher, without distinction or mercy, thousands of unoffending men, women and children.

We see now the facts in the two cases; and what is the difference? The deed is the same, except that in one case a single man was killed, and in the other thousands, or scores of thousands. The motive, too, is essentially the same—with the employers, self-aggrandizement; with the hired agents, pay. The difference, for there is some, will not redound much to the soldier's credit over the assassin. The soldier hires himself to millions of men called a nation; Crowninshield hired himself to only *two* men. The soldier hires himself out to kill *whomsoever* the nation may wish to have killed at *any* time; the assassin engaged to do a *specified act*, to kill a *single* man at a given time, and that man named beforehand. The soldier is hired to kill by the month or year; the assassin was hired by the job. The soldier is a day-laborer in the work of blood; the assassin is a jobber at the same trade. The assassin is better paid than the soldier; for the former was promised a thousand dollars for killing one man, while the latter might kill a hundred in a day without getting half a dollar for the whole. The soldier agrees to kill any and all whom the nation may bid; and, if required to shoot his own father or mother, brother or sister, wife or child, he must shoot them, or be shot himself; whereas the assassin, had he refused to kill the old man according to agreement, would not himself have been liable to be hung. The soldier makes a fearful bargain; for, though aware that, if he refuse to kill any whom the nation may bid him kill, he must

himself be put to death, he nevertheless enters into the bloody compact, not knowing but he may be ordered to shoot or stab his own parents, wife or children. Not so bad the assassin's bargain. Had Crowninshield engaged to kill at any time any body whom the Knapps might wish to have killed, with the understanding that he should himself be put to death if he ever refused to kill any one they should bid, there would be a pretty close analogy between his case and that of the professed soldier. But the assassin's position was not so terrible. The soldier must kill whomsoever his employers may bid him kill, or the terms of his contract make him liable to be shot or hung himself.

Now, let every reader judge between the two, and tell us, if he can, why a hired assassin, like Crowninshield, should be hung as a monster of wickedness, while the soldier, hired by twenty millions to do the *same* deed *by wholesale*, is admired and eulogized *as a hero*? To kill *multitudes* at the bidding of millions, is deemed patriotic, glorious, Christian, worthy of songs, and eulogies, and monuments; but to kill *one* man at the bidding of another one, is denounced as base, infamous, diabolical, deserving of the gallows, of eternal infamy. Well did Bishop Porteus say,

“ One murder makes a villain ;
Millions, a hero.”

Will the professed soldier *never* be classed with the hired assassin? How much longer will men of any principle, conscience or self-respect, hire themselves out to the work of robbery and murder? How long will professed Christians, or any Christian community, respect or even tolerate the military profession, the trade of human butchery?

JESUS CHRIST.—My kingdom is *not* of this world; if my kingdom *were* of this world, then would my servants *fight*.

IRENÆUS, A. D. 180.—Christians have changed their swords into instruments of peace; *and they know not how to fight*.

TERTULLIAN, A. D. 197.—Can one who professes the peaceable doctrine of the gospel, be a soldier? Jesus Christ, by disarming Peter, disarmed every soldier afterwards; for custom can never sanction a wrong act.

JEREMY TAYLOR.—As contrary as cruelty is to mercy, tyranny to charity, so is war to the meekness and gentleness of the Christian religion.

ROBERT HALL.—*War reverses all the rules of morality*. It is nothing less than A TEMPORARY REPEAL OF THE PRINCIPLES OF VIRTUE.

LORD BROUGHAM.—I abominate war as unchristian. I hold it to be the greatest of human crimes. I deem it to include all others—violence, blood, rapine, fraud, every thing which can deform the character, and debase the name of man.

UNIVERSAL PEACE.

BY REV. DAVID BOGUE, D. D., LONDON.*

"IN the last days it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine, and under his fig-tree; and none shall make them afraid; for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it."†

Here is a prophetic sketch of the millennium. During that period, "nation shall not lift up sword against nation." Universal harmony will prevail. No desire of conquest will then be found. Contented with their own territory, none will seek to encroach on their neighbors' lands. Over the face of the whole earth, peace shall reign, and the nations shall form a holy brotherhood, emulous to promote each other's prosperity and happiness. The art of murdering will then cease; "they shall learn war no more." No naval nor military colleges shall then exist; no time, no labor, no skill be employed to teach the stripling and the recruit how to fight, and how to wound and slay. The study then among Christ's disciples will be after the example of their Master, "who came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

So discordant is this description with the general sentiments, and feelings, and practice of mankind in the present day, that some may still be inclined to disbelieve the existence of such a state, and be ready to exclaim with the voice of incredulity, "it is impossible." The spirit of God, foreseeing this obduracy of heart, in order to remove every doubt, inspired the prophet Micah to add these omnipotent words, "For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken

* This tract is taken from one of a series of DISCOURSES ON THE MILLENNIUM, delivered in 1813 when Napoleon was at the acme of his career. Dr. Bogue, born in Scotland 1750, settled in London 1774, and removed in 1777 to the superintendence of the Missionary Seminary at Gosport, died in 1825, one of the best men of his age, and a master-spirit in starting and sustaining the great enterprises now at work for the world's conversion.—AM. ED.

† Micah iv. 1—4.

it." He whom the word of the faithful God will not satisfy, has no higher evidence to receive, and must be left to the curse of his unbelief; but surely every Christian must say, "the Lord hath spoken, and I believe his word."

Let your heart, Christian, sweetly repose on this delightful scene; for wearied and harassed you must be with the din of arms, with the sight of slaughter, and the widely extended range of human misery. Turn your eyes away from the hateful spectacle, and look forward to the joyful season, when war shall be unknown but in tradition; and when all the nations of the world shall dwell together in peace and love. Now the aim of every ruler in Christendom is to do all the injury in his power to the nations with which he is at war. Now men of the most gigantic and highly cultivated minds, are employing all their energies, night and day, to invent methods by which slaughter and desolation may be most widely scattered. Now hundreds of thousands of men are enduring fatigues, suffering privations, and exposing themselves to dangers and deaths beyond what words can express, to carry the plans of others into execution, by spreading destruction as extensively as possible.

How solacing is it to look forward to the period predicted in the passage we have quoted from the prophet! Then the rulers of the world, while their first cares are employed for the happiness of their own people, will also extend their concern to other nations, and strive to promote their welfare and prosperity as widely as they can. Then men of superior talents will exercise them in endeavoring to make discoveries by which other countries as well as their own may reap essential benefit. Then the energies of our youth will be engaged in the peaceful occupations of domestic life; and such as leave their native land, will endeavor to promote the happiness of the regions to which they go.

But still some may ask, "How can these things be?" So different is that state of things from the present, or from any which the world has yet exhibited, that it may appear to some a mere chimera, a Utopian dream. But let such persons weigh the following considerations:

1. The natural result of the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel. Hear its language. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind: This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.* Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you.† Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him

* Matt. xxii. 37, 38, 39.

† Matt. v. 43, 44.

drink ; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."* Of the spirit and commands of the Gospel, these passages furnish a fair specimen, and teach us what Christians ought to be. Do these encourage or even permit a disciple of Jesus to take away the precious life of the inhabitant of another country, more than of one of his own, or indeed to injure him in the smallest degree? If all mankind were under the influence of these principles, would they not produce universal peace?

2. The nature of Christianity will be better understood in all its parts. When the religion of Jesus was first propagated in the world, some of its doctrines and precepts were peculiarly in opposition to the sentiments and dispositions both of the Jews and Gentiles, and hence they were either rejected or perverted. Against these corruptions several of the Epistles of the New Testament are directly levelled ; but alas ! too many of them have retained their influence to the present day. This has been especially the case with respect to that love which the disciples of Christ ought to bear to the whole human race ; and particularly as to the manner in which Christians, considered in their relation as subjects of civil society, ought to demean themselves towards the members of other communities, or subjects of other governments. How many Christians, who, acting as individuals, would be filled with horror at the thought of taking away the life of a man of another country, can, when acting as members of the commonwealth, put to death men of other lands without remorse, and even glory in the deed ! The obligation of the followers of Jesus to the exercise of universal love and good-will, will then be both clearly understood and deeply felt. It will be ascertained, that individual accountableness runs through every relation in which man can be placed ; that a Christian cannot lend his influence or his energies to execute the designs of caprice, avarice, ambition or revenge ; and that when mixed with a hundred thousand of his species, he is no more justified in taking away the life of a man of another country for those ends, than if he acted by himself alone.

3. In consequence of such a change of views, the true spirit of the Gospel will be imbibed by every Christian individual ; and the number of these individuals will be so great, as to comprehend the generality of mankind. To love the whole family of Adam, and to manifest this love to them in every relation, both public and private, will be the predominant temper in civil society. To abstain from doing injury to men of other countries, will have equal authority over his conscience, as not to commit adultery, and not to be guilty of sacrilege. To exercise benevolence towards all, and to endeavor, by every means in his power, to promote the happiness of all, will be accounted of like obligation by the Christian, as loving his brothers and sisters, and honoring his father and his mother.

* Rom. xii. 19, 20, 21.

4. Those evil principles which now reign in the hearts of the mass of mankind, and which are the causes of war, shall be then destroyed. "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even from your lusts that war in your members?"* But what are those lusts of which the Apostle speaks? Are they a peculiar form of malignity? Has the evil spirit first kindled them in the flames of hell, hastened with them to earth, and thrust them still burning into the heart of one whom he had before marked as fit for his purpose on account of his singular wickedness? No such thing. They are only the ordinary passions of the human heart—pride, ambition, caprice, false honor, avarice, sensuality, malice, envy and hatred. These lusts raging in the breast of a mean man, form a drunkard, an adulterer, a thief, a robber, or an assassin; when they operate with all their strength in the bosoms of the rulers of the world, they produce war and slaughter. Let these evil passions be subdued, and "wars will cease unto the ends of the earth, the bow will be broken, the spear cut asunder, and the chariot burned in the fire." That such will be the case, we may naturally conclude, when it is considered, that in the place of those hateful lusts, love to God and love to man, meekness, humility, forgiveness of injuries, and ardent benevolence to every thing human, will fill the soul, and bear absolute sway over all its powers.

5. These principles will regulate the conduct of nations in all their intercourse with each other. Multitudes of *individuals* in their transactions with their fellows, have acted under the influence of the precepts of the Gospel; but to individuals the operation of them has been confined. No *nation* has yet administered a system of government according to Christian principles, or pursued a regular succession of political measures under the influence of the spirit of Christian benevolence.†

An objection has been often raised, that if a nation were to act upon these principles, and refuse to go to war, it would soon be swallowed up by other nations. In answer to this, let the following things be considered:

1. No instance of this pacific spirit in a community has yet

* James iv. 1.

† We may quote the example of Pennsylvania, which settlement was established, and long conducted on Gospel principles. See Clarkson's Life of Penn. The Edinburgh Review, in their critique of this work, say, in allusion to Penn's celebrated Treaty with the Indians, "Such indeed was the spirit in which the negotiation was entered into, and the corresponding settlements conducted, that for the space of more than seventy years, and so long indeed as the Quakers retained the chief power in the government, the peace and amity which had been thus solemnly promised and concluded, never was violated; and a large, though solitary example afforded of the facility with which they who are really sincere and friendly in their views, may live in harmony with those who are supposed to be peculiarly fierce and faithless."

occurred in the history of the world ; no proof can therefore be brought against it from facts. It is an untried system. Long has the method of nation injuring nation been practised, and practised without any lasting good effect. Let men now try the way of abstaining from injury, and of conferring benefits, and thus heap coals of fire upon the heads of their enemies. It cannot possibly succeed worse ; but it *may* have unspeakably happier results.

2. A person of a humble, pacific spirit, leads the most quiet life. Is it not seen, that an inoffensive deportment, especially when united to uprightness and sanctity, preserves its possessor from many quarrels in which others are involved, and from many injuries which the quarrelsome sustain ? But why should it not be so with nations too ? Like causes produce like effects ; and if nations were as exemplary in those virtues as individuals are, as careful to avoid giving offence, and as slow in taking it, the number of their wars would be astonishingly diminished. If the most peaceable have recourse to law for the redress of grievances, why could not a council of modern Amphictyons be established in Europe to settle *national* disputes ? Surely the benign spirit of the Gospel should long ere now have taught Christendom to adopt an institution of which the pagan wisdom of ancient Greece set them so charming and instructive an example.*

3. The hitherto untried exercise of active benevolence by such a nation, would tend still more effectually to preserve peace and prevent war. There have been individuals who, by adding to dignity and sanctity of personal character a course of unwearied compassion for the distressed, have risen to so high esteem, that the very worst of men have felt an awe of reverence even for their name, and been afraid not only to do them an injury, but even to offer them an insult. Why should not this be the case also with communities ? It would, if they pursued a similar conduct. Great Britain has often sent fleets, and fire-ships, and bombs, and armed men to burn and destroy cities, and put the defenders to death. The natural consequence has been, that multitudes of them have been slain ; numerous families of peaceable inhabitants, consisting of fathers and mothers, sons and daughters, and infants at the breast, have been buried under the ruins of their dwellings, or dashed to pieces in the streets, while the surrounding country has been mournfully desolated. What is the effect of this warfare ? Every survivor's heart is filled with hatred of the invaders, burns with revenge, and transmits the same spirit as an inheritance to his children. Let us suppose that, instead of such an armament, our rulers were to commission ships laden with corn, and clothes, and money, at only half the amount of expense, and to accompany the gift with a letter to the government of a neighboring country to this effect : "Through the goodness of God, we have had an

* Here is the germ of our plan for a Congress of Nations ; a substitute for war contemplated by the friends of peace *from the first* See our Tracts and Volumes on the subject.—AM. ED.

abundant harvest; and hearing that you have not, we send a present of corn to the widows and the fatherless, the orphan, the blind, and the lame. As many of them may be unprovided with raiment for the inclemency of winter, accept the clothing which will be delivered to you by our fleet, and divide among those who are in the greatest distress, the money which our messengers carry in their hands." What influence would such conduct have upon the people of that country? Would it leave any sting behind in their souls? No. It would conciliate the esteem and affection of all. Tell them after this, "Britain wishes to injure you." No, they would say, it cannot be; it is impossible that the people of that land should desire to do us harm. Command them to buckle on their armor, and wage war with the English. They would answer, "We cannot fight *them*; the weapons would drop from our hands; we love them too well to hurt them; continue in peace." If any State would act in this way to its neighbors, it would have no enemies.

4. A nation so much under the influence of the Gospel as to feel the obligation to live at peace with its neighbors, would diffuse, in a considerable measure, the same spirit among them. No people can arrive at so exalted a state of wisdom and goodness, without making a powerful impression on all the countries around. By diplomatic characters, the principles would be conveyed into the cabinets of the rulers of these countries, propagated in conversation by travellers in ten thousand respectable domestic groups, and, above all, disseminated in books through the mass of the people by converts to the cause. The natural force of these principles will recommend them to men of intelligence, their excellence to philanthropists, and their claims of submission from the authority of God, to all who regulate their conduct by the Divine will. Hence there would be a progress towards the spirit of peace in every land. From the growth of the pacific principle in neighboring regions, the facility of living at peace would be astonishingly increased; and the wise and happy nation, determined to act on the maxims of the Gospel, would find its difficulties diminished from year to year, and its system of love gaining ground from day to day! O that *our* country would set the example to the world, and commence the reign of peace on earth, and good-will towards men of every land!

5. To all these considerations, add the existence and nature of divine Providence. Is it at all unreasonable to suppose, that a nation uniformly acting according to the pacific principles of the Gospel, would experience the peculiar protection of the great Governor of the world? How remarkable, in this respect, was his care over Israel of old, when they faithfully kept his covenant and his testimonies! During the time of the theocracy, it was only when they rebelled against God that they felt the scourge of war, and the hostile rage of the people around them. Is it irrational to conceive, that if any one country were to be regulated in all its domestic measures, and in all its foreign relations, by the spirit of

the Gospel, it would be the peculiar charge of God, and enjoy the smiles of his approbation, and the guardianship of his providence, in a degree hitherto unknown? Individuals will have rewards and punishments dispensed to them in a future state; but there nations, as such, will have no existence. Is it improper then to argue, that virtuous and pious nations will consequently have their reward in the present world? And what is more reasonable than to conclude, that on a nation, the lover and advocate of peace, the God of peace will bestow the blessings of peace?

But another objection is frequently brought forward. "If the love of peace, producing the most determined enmity to war, be the spirit of Christianity, and the very essence of one part of its principles, how comes it to pass, that so little of it has appeared in the dispositions, the deportment, or the writings of persons professing to be the disciples of Christ?" The following considerations will, I hope, furnish a satisfactory answer:

That there has been, in the minds of the mass of persons professing Christianity, a gross ignorance of this feature of the Gospel, is too evident to be denied; and we can sufficiently account for its existence from a variety of causes operating with mighty force upon the human heart in its deep and malevolent depravity. To the spirit of peace, the prejudices of education are all opposed. The books which the scholar learns to read, were in general written under the influence of that ferocious depravity. They teach the child to hate or despise every nation but his own; they represent war as the theatre of glory; they tell him to rejoice in the miseries inflicted on the people of another country by those of his own; and they render him passionately ambitious to wear the ensanguined laurels of victory, by achieving something in the work of destruction which will be above the common standard. Unhappy youth! who receives such lessons from his master and his books, and has his soul so early contaminated, and his principles polluted in their source! Though he may afterwards become a Christian, how seldom are these unchristian sentiments eradicated from his breast!

The spirit of the men of the world has likewise had considerable influence in preventing the growth of the spirit of peace. Hitherto, those who deny themselves, take up their cross, and follow Christ, have been few in number compared with the ungodly; and their strength has not lain among those classes in society which, pre-eminent in rank, wealth, and literature, sway the public mind almost without control. On this account, not only the sentiments of Christians have had little weight, but they themselves have sustained no small injury from the influence of those exalted personages, especially in reference to the subject before us. This I consider as one very powerful cause of the unchristian spirit of the disciples of Jesus in respect to war.

An unhappy misconception of the Jewish economy has also led many into error respecting the doctrine of Christianity on this

point. The state of that people was singular. The land of Canaan was their inheritance by the free gift of Jehovah himself; and they were authorized by him to take possession by extirpating the nations that inhabited it, whose iniquities were full. Afterwards, when this land, the heritage of the Lord, was invaded, they were commanded to go to war, and expel the invaders with the edge of the sword. All this is peculiar to that people, and has no parallel in the history of mankind. From not attending to this difference of circumstances, many Christians have conceived themselves justified in being the advocates of war, and bound to approve the wars in which their country was engaged, supposing theirs was like Canaan of old, God's favorite land. Hence they have made Jehovah a party in their quarrels. How large a portion of the disciples of Christ have been hereby led astray from the pacific spirit of the Gospel! Should I not rather say, how small is the number of Christians who have *not* been drawn away from the simplicity of Christ, and have escaped the contagion of this Jewish spirit which has for ages overspread and defiled the Christian Church.

From the prevalence of a pagan spirit, multitudes that profess Christianity have lost sight of the peaceful genius of the Gospel, and become the advocates of bloodshed and of war. The ancient writers of Greece and Rome are the idols of modern times in most countries in Europe. To the generous youth in the middle and superior classes of society, they are the books of education in our public schools. And in what veneration are they held! From them, among other evils, the youth imbibe a pagan morality that, far from being peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, more resembles that from beneath, "which is earthly, sensual, devilish." This morality, instead of inculcating humility, meekness, benevolence and peace,—those essential attributes of the Gospel,—is selfish, proud, ambitious, savage, hates other nations, despises the mass of mankind, and seeks distinction and honor on the field of battle. With such sentiments have the greater part of statesmen and nobles come from the school and college into the senate and the cabinet. Such is the morality most commonly found in the speeches of public men; and the maxims generally recommended, accord much more with the sentiments of the Grecian and Roman classics, than with the spirit of Christ. From the influence of such a morality, millions of the youth of Europe have been brought to an untimely grave. But instead of a paragraph, a volume would be necessary to delineate all the evils which have sprung from the prevalence of a pagan morality in the higher walks of life. From them it has descended to the humbler stations of society, and thus has pervaded the general mass of the community. From these sources have flowed the ignorance and the dislike of the pacific spirit of the Gospel, and the approbation and ardent love of war, which have so much dishonored the Christian name.

If peace be the doctrine of the New Testament, how much is it to be lamented, that multitudes who profess to be Christians, are opposed to it both in sentiment and in practice. If we trace wars to their origin, the apostle James tells us what that is; and it is so bad, that it ought not to find one advocate among those who name the name of Jesus. But alas! the generality of them enter as keenly into the quarrels of nations, as any of the men of the world can. Yet surely the influence of Christian principles, the feeling of that love which is due to all the children of men, and the awful thought of multitudes of immortal souls being hurried unprepared to the tribunal of God, should repress this spirit, and produce an unquenchable desire of peace on earth.

But what is still more to be bewailed, ministers of Christ, who ought to be patterns of peace and love, have drunk into the spirit of war, and sought to make their God a party in every contention in which their country happened to be engaged. They pray to him for victory over its enemies; they give him thanks when ten or twenty thousand of their foes are destroyed, and in louder strains, if still more have been slain; and in their discourses to their flock, they endeavor to inspirit them to battle and to bloodshed. How displeasing to God must such conduct be! How greatly is he dishonored by it! What miseries does war bring on the bodies, and especially on the souls of men; and these not prevented, but encouraged, by persons who profess to love God with all their heart, and their neighbor as themselves.

We have reason to bless God, that the number of those Christians who perceive and feel their obligations to seek the peace of mankind, is increasing from day to day. In the first ages of the Church, there were some who understood this to be the doctrine of the Gospel. At the Reformation, it had also its advocates; but they unhappily appended to it other sentiments which were unfounded, and thus detracted from the weight of their testimony to peace. Since that time, none have been so faithful witnesses to the pacific spirit of the religion of Jesus as the Quakers; and, had all the rulers of Christendom been of that denomination for the last hundred and fifty years, the oceans of blood shed in wars would have had no existence. And how much happier a countenance would Europe have worn than she now wears! For more than a century after their rise, few besides themselves adopted their peaceful creed; but of late, it has been embraced by considerable numbers among every sect; and there is reason to conclude, that if it has made converts in the most unfavorable circumstances, its progress will be rapid when the state of the world, by the restoration of peace, shall be more congenial to its claims.

All the disciples of Christ should imbibe the spirit of peace. It displays unspeakable mercy in God, that while individuals, who have been made partakers of his grace, maintain sentiments injurious to his honor, and the happiness of man, he should yet compassionately hold communion with them. But these unchristian

opinions certainly prevent them from enjoying those full communications which God would otherwise impart. Let these old things which belong to the old man, be done away, and all things become new. Understand your calling, brethren. It is from darkness into marvellous light, that ye may shine as lights in the world, that ye may do no harm to any person of any country, but all the good in your power to all mankind. This was the spirit of your Master and of his religion; let it be yours; and let the ardor and universality of your benevolence continually increase.

Above all, let the ministers of Christ be men of peace, and advocates for the peace of the world. If *we* seek to inflame the malevolent passions of the soul, who shall be found to cool them? The people of the world talk of glory from victory and conquest; but we know that honor and happiness can arise only from doing the will of God, and living in subjection to him, and in peace with men. Let us tell the world so, and call them away from their angry contests for mastery to dwell in love. O that those who preach to emperors and kings, to ministers of state, to senates and to parliaments, would lift up their voice like a trumpet, and proclaim to them from the great Jehovah, and from Jesus Christ who shed his blood to save sinners from misery, that the religion of the New Testament is a religion of peace; and that for the blood of every man slain in war, the Almighty Ruler of the universe will demand an account from those who direct the affairs of nations.

The co-operation of all enlightened Christians to diffuse these benevolent principles, would do much to promote the peace of the world. The great changes in the moral world, which are pregnant with happiness to man, are to be brought about only by the most vigorous exertions of moral principle in the breast of the wise and the good. It is from the operation of such principles, that the peaceful state of the world is to be produced; and these principles must be disseminated by those in whose hearts they reign. Few they may be at first; but the number will continually increase. Let every one consider what he can do to promote the grand work, and let him do it without delay. He that has nothing else, has a tongue to plead the cause of peace in his domestic circle, and infuse his sentiments into the minds of his neighbors too, his acquaintances, and those he meets with in the way. Another can write clearly and forcibly; let his letters to his friends bear testimony to his zeal, and let him compose tracts to enlighten society on the subject. A third has a talent for poetry; let him in tuneful numbers touch the reader's heart with a delineation of the miseries of war, and the blessings of peace. A fourth possesses wealth; let him give his money to purchase these publications, and spread them far and wide. A fifth is a man of genius, and could in a fuller and more elaborate treatise give an extensive as well as an impressive view of the doctrine; let him consecrate his powers to this service in honor of the Prince of Peace. A sixth

has the eloquence of Apollos, and can stand up in a public assembly, arrest the attention, and move the heart of every hearer; let him cry aloud, and merit the title of the orator of peace. The ministers of Christ from the pulpit, (and it is no improper theme for that hallowed place,) can lead their audience to a sight of the sources of wars,—those lusts which war in our members,—unveil their deformity, and display the charming beauties of peace on earth, and good-will to men.

To collect the force of all these into one centre from which the rays of light and heat may be emitted in every direction with more powerful energy, is a thing of high importance. This effect an association will produce; and as we live in an age of societies to combine individual efforts for public benefit, why should not one be formed for promoting peace among the nations of the earth? * The subject, every one will allow, merits all the attention that can be given it. O that God would call forth some wise, pious, enlightened, ardent philanthropist, who shall form this determination in his heart, and carry it into execution!—"To convince mankind that Christianity forbids war, to banish the idea of its lawfulness from their creed, and the love of its practice from their hearts, and to make all men seek peace with their whole soul, and pursue it with all their might, till it establish an universal reign over human nature, shall be the grand object of my existence on earth." And how exalted an object of benevolence would he choose: The suffering of the tenants of a prison-house, in comparison with the miseries of war, is but as the anguish of a single family pining away and dying for want, when placed by the side of a whole populous province desolated by famine which has consumed all its inhabitants. Even the more extensive calamities of the African slave trade, drawn up in array before the ravages, and tortures, and horrors of war, are but like the hill Mizar compared to Lebanon. What blessings will not descend on the man who devotes himself to the destruction of this monstrous foe of human happiness!

The influence of the female sex is universally acknowledged and felt. I want that influence to diffuse peace and love over the face of the earth. I scarcely know how to address myself to respectable matrons who, after nursing their sons with the tenderest affection, send them away to the work of desolation, and rejoice at their success, when they make women like yourselves widows, and their children fatherless, or overwhelm an aged father and mother with sorrow, because their boy perished in the field by your young hero's sword; and then they praise God for what their sons have done! A thousand times rather would I that God had said concerning me, "write this man childless," than that a son of mine had ever imbrued his hands in the blood of man his brother.

* This was written before the formation of Peace Societies.—
Am. Ed.

A greater number of celebrated female writers than the present, no age has produced. But what grave essay in prose, or what poetic effusion of yours, do we find to bring war into disgrace, and to awaken the horror of every feeling heart against its miseries and its crimes? In which of your works have you come forth as the advocates of humanity, and the champions of peace? Tell me, that I may withdraw the censure. You are silent; you blush at this reproach, and well you may:—they may justly be the most burning blushes that ever reddened the female cheek. Had you employed your tender eloquence in the cause of humanity and peace, ten thousands of ingenuous youths, whose hearts' blood was poured out on the ground, and whose faces were bloodless and pale in death, as they lay in the open field, had been spared, and now adorning both the domestic circle and society with their presence and their affection. To speak thus grieves me to the heart; but I am compelled to do it, for there are seasons when truth must be spoken, however painful it may be both to the speaker and the auditor. You blush for your neglect; but I must have more than blushes; I want fruits meet for repentance. My earnest wish is to see you become the determined foes of war, and the most ardent friends of peace. I long to hear you plead with all your souls (and who can plead like you?) for the harmony of the world, and peace among the nations. If every intelligent, pious and benevolent female would engage heart and hand in the work, the success would be great beyond conception.

Oh! if all the ministers of the Gospel would unite in this labor of love, and work of peace, what wonders would be done! What an amazing change for the better would be produced! Shall I bring arguments to convince, or motives to induce you to lift up your voice for the peace of the world? I will not bring one. If you refuse your aid, "go, strip yourselves of the robes of office, depart and officiate at the altars of some savage idol who delights in slaughter and blood." But why do I speak thus? Surely none of you, my brethren, will refuse to come forth to the help of the Lord against so mighty a foe of human happiness, but will each endeavor to excel every other in maintaining the honor of the Prince of Peace, and strive that there may not be an individual in his flock who has not imbibed the principles of peace. Such a union of efforts will, through the divine blessing, infallibly gain the day; and in prayer for this blessing, let every heart be continually lifted up to the God of all grace!

MILITARY DISCIPLINE.

From a system like that of war, we can expect nothing but cruelty in the treatment of its agents as well as its victims. Neither kindness nor lenity is compatible with its spirit, its principles or its aims. It is the law of violence dictated by malice, and executed by revenge; and an intimate acquaintance with its operations, whether in a time of war or of peace, would fill a benevolent mind with disgust and horror. I shall not describe in detail the different kinds of punishment, but only give from eye-witnesses a general view of their barbarous and brutal severity.

Such testimony, like the rum-seller testifying against his own business, is given with reluctance. "But for my desire," says one of these witnesses,* "to present the reader with a true exhibition of life on board a British man-of-war, it would be my choice to suppress these disgusting details of cruelty in punishment. This, however, is impossible; I must either draw a false picture, or describe them."

"Our short passage from Gravesend to Spithead gave opportunity for one of those occurrences which are a disgrace to the naval service of any nation—a flogging. A poor fellow had fallen into the very sailor-like offence of getting drunk. For this the captain sentenced him to the punishment of four dozen lashes. He was first placed in *irons* all night; and the irons used for this purpose were shackles fitting round the ankles, through the ends of which was passed an iron bar some ten or twelve feet in length, with a padlock at the end of the bar to hold the prisoner securely. Thus placed in 'duress vile,' he was guarded by a marine until the captain bade the first lieutenant prepare the hands to witness the punishment. Upon this, the lieutenant transmitted the order to the master at arms. He then ordered the grating or hatch full of square holes, to be rigged; and it was placed accordingly between the main and spar decks, not far from the mainmast.

"While these preparations were going on, the officers were dressing themselves in full uniform, and arming themselves with their dirks; and the prisoner's messmates carried him his best clothes, to make him appear in as decent a manner as possible, in the hope of thus moving the feelings of the captain favorably towards the prisoner. This done, the hoarse, dreaded cry of 'All hands ahoy to witness punishment!' from the lips of the boatswain, peals along the ship as mournfully as the notes of a funeral knell. At this signal the officers muster on the spar deck, the men on the main deck. Next came the prisoner; guarded by a

* SAMUEL LEECH, in his *Thirty Years from Home*.

marine on one side, and the master at arms on the other, he was marched up to the grating. His back was made bare, and his shirt laid loosely upon his back, when the two quarter-masters proceeded to seize him up; that is, they tied his hands and feet with spun-yarns, called the seizings, to the grating. The boatswain's mates, whose office it is to flog on board a man-of-war, stood ready with their dreadful weapon of punishment, the cat-o'-nine-tails. This instrument of torture was composed of nine cords, a quarter of an inch round, and about two feet long, the ends whipt with fine twine. To these cords was affixed a stock, two feet in length, covered with red baize. The reader may be sure that it is a most formidable instrument in the hands of a strong, skilful man. Indeed, any man who should whip his *horse* with it, would commit an outrage on humanity, which the moral feeling of any community would not tolerate; he would be prosecuted for cruelty; yet it is used to whip *MEN* on board ships of war!

"The boatswain's mate is ready, with coat off, and whip in hand. The captain gives the word. Carefully spreading the cords with the fingers of his left hand, the executioner throws the cat over his right shoulder; it is brought down upon the now uncovered shoulders of the *MAN*. His flesh creeps; it reddens as if blushing at the indignity; the sufferer groans; lash follows lash, until the first mate, wearied with the cruel employment, gives place to a second. Now two dozen of these dreadful lashes have been inflicted; the lacerated back looks inhuman; it resembles roasted meat burnt nearly black before a scorching fire; yet still the lashes fall; the captain continues merciless. Vain are the cries and prayers of the wretched man. 'I would not forgive the Savior,' was the blasphemous reply of one of these naval demi-gods, or rather demi-fiends, to a plea for mercy. The executioners keep on. Four dozen strokes have cut up his flesh, and robbed him of all self-respect; there he hangs, a pitied, self-despised, groaning, bleeding wretch; and now the captain cries, forbear! His shirt is thrown over his shoulders; the seizings are loosed; he is led away, staining his path with red drops of blood; and the hands, 'piped down' by the boatswain, sullenly return to their duties. Such was the scene witnessed on board the *Macedonian*, on the passage from London to Spithead; and such, substantially, is every punishment scene at sea, only carried sometimes to a greater length of severity."

"It is generally understood," says Rev. J. C. WEBSTER in his account of his voyage across the Atlantic in one of our war-ships,* "that the word of a commanding officer is law. He can punish at will; his authority is well nigh absolute; for the process of redress for a common sailor, under any ordinary circumstances, by an appeal to a court-martial, would be so tardy and dubious, as hardly to be considered a qualification of the statement that the system is one of unlimited despotism. From the time Jack signs

* Advocate of Peace, vol. iv. p. 48.

his shipping papers, during a three or four years' cruise, till he is discharged, he virtually surrenders his own free agency. He is kept like a criminal within the walls of a prison during most of the time; and I have known it to be with the utmost difficulty that a boy could get liberty to go on shore in a foreign land, and see a mother or sister whom he had not seen for years. No confidence is placed in Jack, and so none is begotten in him towards his officers.

"The summary and barbarous practice of flogging upon the bare back is the means used to secure obedience to the laws. The principal offences for which this penalty is incurred are, want of cleanliness, intoxication, stealing, neglecting the watch, desertion, and disobedience of a superior officer. And sometimes Jack suffers deservedly, and sometimes he does not; for it requires but little ingenuity in a superior officer to get a man flogged for the satisfaction of a mere personal grudge. When I went upon deck before breakfast, I seldom failed to see some poor fellow smarting under the boatswain's lash at the gangway. The instrument used is a handle twelve inches long, with nine thongs attached to one end. When we lay at Portsmouth, Eng., several men sought an opportunity to desert the ship; most of them were retaken, and put in irons until we had gone to sea again. On the morning of the twelfth of July, I heard the order throughout the ship of 'all hands to witness punishment.' I had no disposition to witness the barbarous process; but even in the cock-pit I was not out of the reach of the sound of the lash, and the cries of the wretched sufferers. Seven men received three dozen lashes each, and one, who proved to be a ring-leader of the rest, four dozen."

"One night," says McNALLY,* "it fell calm; and the officer of the deck ordered the fore-castle men and fore-top men to man the fore clew garnets and buntlines, and stand by to haul up the fore-sail. The word was given, and the sail hauled up, but not so quickly as he wished it to be. The yards were braced sharp up and, as there was no wind, the fore tack and sheet blocks caught in the lee fore rigging, on the ratlines, and a man had to clear them. Nothing, however, would be taken as an excuse; and he flogged the whole watch of the fore-castle and fore-top men, giving them one dozen each, and ordered them forward to set the sail again. It was set, and they were ordered to man the clew garnets and buntlines, to haul it up again. The lee clew caught in the rigging as before, and he flogged them all again. Once more the sail was set, and hauled up with the same results; in fact, it was a moral impossibility to run the lee clew right up, as the heavy blocks would catch in the rigging; and the men were flogged three times in less than one hour. There were eleven in the fore-top, and twelve on the fore-castle, making twenty-three men, punished with three dozen each, for no offence under heaven.

* *Evils and Abuses in the Naval Service, &c.*, as quoted in the *Advocate of Peace*, vol. iii. p. 188 et seq.

“During the three years’ cruise of the *Fairfield*, I do not believe a single day elapsed that punishment by flogging did not take place. At that time there was a custom in the service, directly contrary to law, whereby any officer of the deck could inflict punishment. This was not with the *cat*, as the law directs, but with what is termed a *colt*, a piece of eighteen-thread ratline, or one-inch rope, which generally has one or two hard twine whippings upon each end. Twelve lashes with this, over a thin frock or shirt, gave greater pain, and bruised the flesh more than the *cat* would have done; and it was with this instrument that the deck officers of the *Fairfield* punished the men, and there was no limit to the number of lashes, but just as many as it might please the officer to order—sometimes one dozen, and at other times three. Such punishment frequently brought the blood through the shirt, and often left the flesh black for two or three weeks, and then yellow for as many more, before it healed perfectly.

“Never let citizens in the Northern States rail at slavery, or the punishment inflicted on slaves, or say that it is wrong, so long as their own sons, their own flesh and blood, their own seamen, their own free citizens, and the men to whom they look for protection in case of war, are daily subject to the same treatment as the southern slaves. The late John Randolph openly declared in the legislative halls of Congress, that he had witnessed, in a few months, more flogging on board the man-of-war that carried him to Russia, than had taken place during ten years on his plantation, where there were five hundred slaves.

“I was on board the *Lexington* from 1821 to 1824. The captain was a kind man, but often very passionate, and, when so, very unjust. He allowed no punishment on board except what he inflicted himself; but he sometimes went far beyond the law in punishing petty offences. When we were at the Falkland Islands, the men were put on allowance in consequence of the provisions on board being likely to run short. Having gone from a warm climate to a cold one, their appetites increased, and made the allowance too little; and this created a ferment among the crew. One day they had been called aft, and a vehement lecture read them by the captain; they were sent forward, and one man made some remark, which was overheard by the lieutenant, who immediately reported it to the captain. All hands were instantly called to witness punishment. The marines were turned out with fixed bayonets, and the captain brought a pair of ship’s pistols from the cabin, loaded with ball cartridges, which he laid upon the capstan. The man was then ordered to strip, which he did without a murmur, as he knew that to attempt to appease the captain, would be like trying to stop the sea from raging. He was seized up, and received twenty-four lashes without a stop. The weather was extremely cold, being in so high a latitude; but the man bore his punishment in silence; his lips writhed, but no complaint escaped him. He was taken down, and warned not to grumble about provisions again, under penalty of receiving twice the number of

lashes. He spoke not; but those who looked upon his calmness, knew that it was the calmness of resolution. Had Captain D. lived until that man returned to the United States, it would have been bad for both of them. This punishment was inflicted directly contrary to law, for it declares that a captain shall punish only a private, and this man was a petty officer; he shall not punish beyond twelve lashes, and yet he inflicted twenty-four.

“About the same time a more severe punishment took place. Wm. McIntire, a tailor, who was employed by the captain in his cabin, had persuaded one of the cabin boys to give him some of the captain’s brandy, which the steward missed, and reported. The man was not drunk; but he had drunk the brandy, and for so doing was brought to the gangway, and punished with three dozen lashes upon the bare back. It was his first and last flogging; he did not long survive it; it sank deep into his heart, and he never more held up his head. He sleeps the sleep of death on the bleak barren Falkland Islands, far from his home and friends. I dare the medical men that were on board that ship, to say that he did not die in consequence of the flogging he received, the victim of cruelty and oppression.”

“The worst species of punishment,” says Leech, “is *flogging through the fleet*. This is never inflicted without due trial and sentence by a court-martial, for some aggravated offence. After the offender is thus sentenced, and the day arrives appointed by his judges for its execution, the unhappy wretch is conducted into the ship’s launch—a large boat—which has been previously rigged up with poles and grating, to which he is seized up; he is attended by the ship’s surgeon, whose duty it is to decide when the power of nature’s endurance has been taxed to its utmost. A boat from every ship in the fleet is also present, each carrying one or two officers and two marines fully armed. These boats are connected by tow lines to the launch.

“These preparations made, the crew of the victim’s ship are ordered to man the rigging, while the boatswain commences the tragedy. When he has administered one, two or three dozen lashes, according to the number of ships in the fleet, the prisoner’s shirt is thrown over his gory back; the boatswain returns on board, the hands are piped down, the drummer beats a mournful melody, called the rogue’s march, and the melancholy procession moves on. Arriving at the side of another ship, the brutal scene is repeated, until every crew in the fleet has witnessed it, and from one to three hundred lashes have lacerated the back of the broken-spirited tar to a bleeding pulp. He is then placed under the surgeon’s care, to be fitted for duty—a *ruined man*—broken in spirit! all sense of self-respect gone, forever gone! If he survive, it is only to be like his own brave bark, when winds and waves conspire to dash her on the pitiless strand, a wretched, hopeless wreck; a living, walking shadow of his former self.

“No plea of necessity can be successfully urged in behalf of whipping men; for, if subordination is expected to follow such

terrible examples, I know, from my acquaintance with the sufferers themselves, that the expectation is vain. One of two results always follows—the victim either lives on, a lone, dark-minded, broken-spirited man, despising himself, and hating every one, because he thinks every one hates him; or he lives with one fearful, unyielding purpose, a purpose on which he feeds and nourishes his galled mind, as food affords life and energy to his physical constitution. That purpose is REVENGE. I have heard them swear—and the wild flashing eye, the darkly frowning brow, told how firm was the intent—that if ever they should be in battle, they would shoot their officers. I have seen them rejoice over the misfortunes of their persecutors, but more especially at their death. That it has frequently led to mutiny, is well verified. I have known such severity to result in actual murder. While we lay at Lisbon, a sergeant of marines, on board a seventy-four, made himself obnoxious by repeated acts of tyranny. Two marines determined upon his death. One night, unperceived by any, they seized him, hurried him to the gangway, and pitched him overboard. The tide was running strong; and the man was drowned! But for themselves, his fate would have remained a secret until the day of judgment; it was discovered by an officer, who accidentally overheard them congratulating each other on their achievement. He betrayed them. A court-martial sentenced them. They were placed on deck with halters on their necks. Two guns were fired; and when the smoke cleared away, two men were seen dangling from the fore-yard-arm.

“The case of our ship’s drummer will illustrate the hopelessness of our situation. Being seized up for some petty offence, he demanded, what no captain can refuse, to be tried by a court-martial, in the hope, probably, of escaping altogether. The officers laughed among each other; and when, a few days afterwards, the poor, affrighted man offered to withdraw the demand, and take six dozen lashes, they coolly remarked, ‘The drummer is sick of his bargain.’ He would have been a wiser man, had he never made it; for the court-martial sentenced him to receive two hundred lashes through the fleet—a punishment ostensibly for his first offence, but really for his insolence (?) in demanding a trial by court-martial. Such was the administration of justice (?) on board the Macedonian.”

The men on board a man-of-war are continually exposed to such treatment. “With my return to active service after my sickness,” says Leech, “came my exposure to hardships, and, what I dreaded still more, to punishment. Some of the boys were to be punished on the main deck; the rest were ordered forward to witness it, as usual. Being so far aft that I could not hear the summons, I remained, as a matter of course, at my post. The hawk-eye of the lieutenant missed me, and in a rage he ordered me to be sent for to receive a flogging for my absence. Excuse was in vain; for such was the fiendish temper of this brutal officer, he only wanted the shadow of a reason for dragging the poor

helpless boys of his charge to the grating. While I stood in trembling expectation of being degraded by the hated cat, a summons from the captain providentially called off our *brave* boy-flogger, and I escaped. The *offence* was never mentioned afterwards. The reader can easily perceive how such a constant exposure to the lash must embitter a seaman's life."

Mark the severity visited upon the slightest offences. "A midshipman named Gale, a most rascally, unprincipled fellow, found his pocket handkerchief in possession of one of the crew. He charged the man with stealing it. It was in vain that the poor wretch asserted that he found it under his hammock. He was reported as a thief; a court-martial sat upon him, and returned the shamefully disproportionate sentence of three hundred lashes through the fleet, and one year's imprisonment! Nor was that sentence a dead letter; the unhappy man endured it to the letter. Fifty were laid on alongside of the Macedonian, in conformity with a common practice of inflicting the most strokes at the first ship, in order that the gory back of the criminal may strike the more terror into the crews of the other ships. This poor tortured man bore two hundred and twenty, and was pronounced by the attending surgeon unfit to receive the rest. Galled, bruised, and agonized as he was, he besought him to suffer the infliction of the remaining eighty, that he might not be called to pass through the degrading scene again; but this prayer was denied! He was brought on board, and when his wounds were healed, the captain, Shylock-like, determined to have the whole pound of flesh, ordered him to receive the remainder!"

"I have heard," says the late William Ladd, "the captain of a British man-of-war order one of his men to receive a dozen lashes for having on *blue* trowsers. Sailors are subject every moment of their lives, not only to a torrent of imprecations and curses, but to the boatswain's cat-o'-nine-tails. The least complaint brings them to the gangway; and not unfrequently is a sailor sentenced to receive five hundred and even a thousand lashes, to be inflicted day after day as he may be able to bear them. He is attended at each whipping by a surgeon to determine how much he can bear without immediate danger to life; and often does the flagellation proceed till the victim faints, and then he is respited to renew his sufferings another day. This account I had from a British surgeon. I have often shuddered at the recital of the whippings through the fleet, the keel-hauling, the spread eagle, the gagging, the hand-cuffing, and other punishments inflicted on sailors who have been trepanned or forced into a service from which death is the only release."*

Nor is the punishment of soldiers much less revolting. "One day," says the same writer, "I was on parade when preparation was making for a kind of punishment called the *gauntlet*. All the soldiers of the regiment were placed in two ranks facing each

* Essays on Peace and War, No. 22

other, and about five feet apart. To each soldier was given a stick three feet long, or more. I could not bear to stay and witness the execution; but I was afterwards informed that the culprit, stripped naked to his waist, and his hands tied before him, was marched between the ranks, preceded by a soldier walking backwards with a bayonet at the sufferer's breast, to keep him from going too fast. In this way he was struck once by every soldier, officers going down on the outside of the ranks to see that each man did his duty! and, if any one was merely suspected of not laying on hard enough, he received over his own head a blow from the officer's cane. Sometimes the criminal has to retrace his steps; and, as a regiment consists of six hundred or a thousand men, and some German regiments of two thousand, he must receive from twelve hundred to two or even four thousand blows! The punishment often proves fatal; and to such a pitch of despair were those soldiers carried by their sufferings, that many of them committed suicide; and one poor fellow shot himself near my lodgings."

"Flogging is certainly a tremendous punishment. The delinquent is stripped to the waist, tied up by his hands, and then flogged with a whip having nine lashes, with three knots each, so that each stroke makes twenty-seven wounds; if a capital sentence is awarded, he receives nine hundred and ninety-nine of these stripes; and, at every twenty-five strokes, the drummer, who inflicts them, is changed, in order to insure a more energetic enforcement of the penalty. This punishment occurs very frequently in the English army, drunkenness and other acts of insubordination being often punished with from one to two hundred lashes."*

"One wintry morn," says another eye-witness, † "when the bleak wind whistled along the ranks of a regiment paraded to see corporal punishment inflicted, every eye was turned in pity towards the delinquent"—his offence was drunkenness—"until the commanding officer, with stentorian lungs, cried out, 'Strip, sir.' The morning was so bitterly cold, that the mere exposure of a man's naked body was itself a severe punishment. When the offender was tied, or rather hung, up by the hands, his back, from intense cold and previous flogging, exhibited a complete black-and-blue appearance. On the first lash, the blood spirted out several yards; and, after he had received fifty, his back from the neck to the waist, was one continued stream of blood. When taken down, he staggered, and fell to the ground. The poor man never looked up again; his prospects as a soldier were utterly destroyed; and so keenly did his degradation prey upon his spirits, that he at length shot himself in his barrack-room."

I will now give a specimen from our own country. A surgeon, stationed during the war of 1812-14 at Greenbush, N. Y., says, "One morning several prisoners confined in the provost guard-house, were brought out to hear their sentences. Some wore the

* The testimony of a warrior, quoted in the *Harbinger of Peace*, vol. i., p. 281

† *ib.*, p. 279.

marks of long confinement, and upon all had the severity of the prison house stamped its impression. They looked dejected at this public exposure, and anxious to learn their fate. I had never seen the face of any of them before, and only knew that a single one had been adjudged to death. Soon as their names were called, and their sentences announced, I discerned, by his agony and gestures, the miserable man on whom that sentence was to fall—a man in the bloom of youth, and the fulness of health and vigor.

“Prompted by feelings of sympathy, I called next morning to see him in his prison. There, chained by his leg to the beam of the guard-house, he was reading the Bible, trying to prepare himself, as he said, for the fatal hour. I learned from him the circumstances of his case. He was the father of a family, having a wife and three young children, thirty or forty miles distant from the camp. His crime was desertion; and his only object, he declared, was to visit his wife and children. Having seen that all was well with them, it was his intention to return. But, whatever his intention, he was a deserter, and, as such, taken and brought into the camp, manacled. The time between the sentence and its execution was brief; the authority in whom alone was vested the power of reprieve or pardon, distant. Thus he had no hope, and requested only the attendance of a minister of the gospel, and permission to see his wife and children. The first part of the request was granted; but whether he was permitted or not to see his family, I do not now remember.

“Dreading the hour of his execution, I resolved, if possible, to avoid being present at the scene. But the commander sent me an express order to attend, that I might, in my official capacity of surgeon, see the sentence fully executed. The poor fellow was taken from the guard-house, to be escorted to the fatal spot. Before him was his coffin—a box of rough pine boards—borne on the shoulders of two men. The prisoner stood, with his arms pinioned, between two clergymen. A white cotton gown, or winding sheet, reached to his feet. It was trimmed with black, and had attached to it, over his heart, the black image of a heart—the mark at which the executioners were to aim. On his head was a cap of white, also trimmed with black. His countenance was blanched to the hue of his winding sheet, and his frame trembled with agony. Our procession formed, we moved forward with slow and measured steps to the tune of a death march, (Roslin Castle,) played with muffled drums, and mourning fifes. The scene was solemn beyond the power of description; a man in the vigor of life *walking* to his grave—to the tune of his own death march—clothed in his burial robes—surrounded, not by friends assembled to perform the last sad offices of affection, and to weep over him in the last sad hour, but by soldiers with bristling bayonets and loaded muskets, urged by stern command to do the violence of death to a fellow soldier. Amid reflections like these, we arrived at the place of execution, a large open field, in whose centre a heap of earth, freshly thrown up, marked the spot of the deserter's grave. On this field the whole force then at the can-

tonment was drawn up in the form of a hollow square, with the side beyond the grave vacant. The executioners, eight in number, had been drawn by lot. No soldier would volunteer for such a duty. Their muskets had been charged by the officer of the day, seven of them with ball, the eighth with powder alone. Thus each may believe that *he* has the blank cartridge, and therefore has no hand in the death of his brother soldier—striking indications of the nature of the service.

“The coffin was placed parallel with the grave, and about two feet distant. In the intervening space, the prisoner was directed to stand. He desired permission to say a word to his fellow soldiers; and thus standing between his coffin and his grave, he warned them against desertion, continuing to speak until the officer on duty, with his watch in his hand, announced to him in a low voice, *Two o'clock, your last moment is at hand—you must kneel on your coffin.* This done, the officer drew down the white cap, so as to cover the eyes and most of the face of the prisoner. The kneeling was the signal for the executioners to advance. They had before, to avoid being distinguished by the prisoner, stood intermingled with the soldiers who formed the line. They now came forward, marching abreast, and took their stand a little to the left, about two rods distant from their living mark. The officer raised his sword. At this signal, the executioners took aim. He then gave a blow on a drum which was at hand; the executioners all fired at the same instant. The miserable man, with a horrid scream, leaped from the earth, and fell between his coffin and his grave. The sergeant of the guard, a moment after, shot him through the head, holding the muzzle so near that his cap took fire; and there the body lay upon the face, the head emitting the mingled fumes of burning cotton and burning hair. The whole line then marched by the body, as it lay upon the earth, the head still smoking, that every man might behold for himself the fate of a deserter.

“We then started on our return. The whole band struck up, with uncommon animation, our national air, (*Yankee Doodle*), and to its lively measures we were hurried back to our parade ground! Having been dismissed, the commander of the post sent an invitation to all the officers to meet at his quarters, whither we repaired, and were treated to a glass of gin and water!”

I will quote a recent case from England. “On the 29th of June, 1839, the Tower of London and its environs were thrown into great excitement by the flogging of two privates, for *insulting non-commissioned officers!* One was sentenced to receive one hundred lashes with the cat-o'-nine-tails, and the other one hundred and fifty. The time chosen was ten o'clock; the place the most public in the Tower. The first man brought out, was a fine young man, named Jarman, whose crime was insulting his sergeant. He was secured to the halberts by thin cords, which severely cut his flesh; and the dreadful and beastly infliction commenced. He received his punishment without uttering a word or a groan, although the punishment was unusually severe, the drummers being changed every ten lashes, instead of twenty-five as heretofore, and the cat,

the instrument of punishment, very heavy. After he had received the hundred lashes, or nine hundred stripes, his back presented a mangled appearance, and the blood poured down his person.

“As soon as the first man left the square, the second man, Slade, a much slighter person than the other, was called to the front. He was sentenced to receive one hundred and fifty lashes, or one thousand three hundred and fifty stripes. It was evident he did not possess the nerve of the other man; he shook so violently that he was scarcely able to pull his jacket off, and his terror was evident to all. Upon being tied up, he shook from head to foot; and the moment he was struck, he began to shriek loudly, and earnestly called out ‘mercy, mercy!’ which were heard very distinctly all over the Tower. The cat fell with double force on his back, owing to its being wetted with the blood of the other man. Slade no sooner began to call out than the drums were beaten to stifle his cries, and re-echoed among the walls. When about seventy or eighty lashes had been inflicted, the poor fellow’s head fell on his shoulder, and it was supposed he had fainted; but such was not the case, as the commanding officer walked up to the triangle, and on looking him in the face, he ordered the drummer to proceed. At this time, with the exception of the drummers who were selected to flog, it took all the others to secure him, his back being literally cut to pieces from his neck to his loins. His cries for mercy were unavailing, until one hundred lashes had been inflicted, when it was found he was unable to bear any more. He was led away between two of his comrades, a truly shocking spectacle of suffering humanity. Several men fainted away; and we could mention the names of several officers who did have humanity enough to loosen the stocks and coats of several privates. Many clerks and others of the ordnance department, witnessed part of the punishment, but, to use their own words, were unable to stand it out. The lady of the resident governor happened to go to her window, and, hearing the cries of Slade, fell into hysterics, and the whole family were for some time in great confusion. Several respectable civilians expressed their indignation, and said they would not live in the Tower, if such scenes were repeated.”

In other countries, military punishments are often still more barbarous; but I will quote only a single case similar to those of England and the United States. “Shortly,” says Campbell, writing from Algiers, “after we reached the ground where the French deserter’s fate was to be enacted. From the prison-gate we saw come forth a company, their drums muffled with crape, and the victim in the centre on foot, followed by the horse and cart that were to carry back his dead body. After his sentence had been read by the commanding officer, he made his last speech to the troops, more than a thousand in number, drawn up around him: ‘Comrades, what my sentence of death has told you is all true, except that it has unjustly called me the chief conspirator in this late desertion. For I seduced nobody into it; on the contrary, I was persuaded into it by others. The motive of my crime was merely an intense desire to see my father’s family in Italy; and now

blood is to be shed, and my brains scattered on the ground, because my heart yearned for a sight of my brothers and sisters! Soldiers who are to shoot me, do your duty quickly, and do not keep me in torment.'

"He then stepped forward some paces; eleven musket shots laid him low, though he jumped up before he fell, when the balls pierced him; the twelfth soldier, going up to him as he lay on the ground, fired close into his head. You will not wonder that my tears at this crisis blinded me; and when I denied them, I could not see the victim. I said to Lagondie, 'Where is he?' 'Look there,' he answered, pointing with his finger; 'don't you see a red stripe on the ground?' And sure enough I saw it; his red pantaloons made one part of the stripe, and his bleeding head and body the other. All the troops defiled around him. We came down to the spot; but before we reached it, the body had been removed in a cart, and nothing remained but some blood and brains, and a portion of his skull."

These examples will speak for themselves; but I must beg the reader to note a few points—the frequency, as well as the excessive severity of these punishments; the slight offences for which many of them were inflicted; the despotic power vested in officers; the exposure of privates without a screen to the fury of their passions; the utter want in most cases of a fair trial, or any trial at all; and the impossibility of obtaining any redress even for the most outrageous cruelties practised upon them by superiors.

Nor can it be said that these enormities are foreign or obsolete; for every one of the foregoing examples has been taken from the nineteenth century, and from the most enlightened nations in Christendom!. They are inseparable from war; some of the very writers I have quoted, plead their necessity as a justification of their severity; and, if we wish an end put to such brutal outrages, we must abolish the whole war-system.

In the name, then, of religion and humanity, we ask if a custom which legalizes such savage barbarities, and in the very heart of Christendom, insists, even under the blaze of the nineteenth century, that it cannot exist without them, shall be continued by men calling themselves worshippers of a God of love, and followers of the Prince of peace! Shall baptized poetry and eloquence still eulogize this offspring of a pagan barbarism? Shall the press still fawn upon it, and the pulpit still justify it, and real Christians lend it the support of their example, and the sanction of their prayers? Will pious parents train up their own sons for the service of such a Juggernaut? Will the young in their thoughtlessness, or the unfortunate in their desperation, expose themselves, as they must by enlistment, to the certainty of such despotic and brutal treatment through life? Will men of any sense or self-respect much longer lend themselves as its victims or its tools? Christianity, civilization, humanity, common sense, and common decency, all, all answer, *no, no*.

ERASMUS ON WAR.

IF there is in the affairs of mortal men any one thing which it is proper uniformly to explode, and incumbent on every man by every lawful means to avoid, to deprecate, to oppose, that one thing is doubtless WAR. There is nothing more unnaturally wicked, more productive of misery, more extensively destructive, more obstinate in mischief, more unworthy of man, as formed by nature, much more of man professing *Christianity*. Yet, wonderful to relate! war is undertaken, and cruelly, savagely conducted, not only by unbelievers, but by Christians. Nor are there ever wanting men learned in the law, and even divines, who are ready to furnish firebrands for the nefarious work, and to fan the latent sparks into a flame. Hence war is considered so much a thing of course, that the wonder is, how any man can disapprove of it; so much sanctioned by authority and custom, that it is deemed impious to have borne testimony against a practice in its principle most profligate, and in its effects pregnant with every kind of calamity.

If any one considers the organization and external figure of the body, will he not instantly perceive that Nature, or rather the God of Nature, created the human animal not for *war*, but for *love* and *friendship*; not for mutual *destruction*, but for mutual *service* and *safety*; not to commit *injuries*, but for acts of *reciprocal beneficence*? Man she brought into the world naked, weak, tender, unarmed, his flesh of the softest texture, his skin smooth, delicate, and susceptible of the slightest injury. There is nothing observable in his limbs adapted to fighting, or to violence. Unable either to speak or walk, or help himself to food, he can implore relief only by tears and wailing; so that from this circumstance alone might be collected, that man is an animal born for that love and friendship which is formed and cemented by the mutual interchange of benevolent offices. Moreover, Nature evidently intended that man should consider himself indebted for the boon of life, not so much to herself as to the kindness of his fellow man; that he might perceive himself designed for social affections, and the attachments of friendship and love. Then she gave him a countenance not frightful and forbidding, but mild and placid, imitating by external signs the benignity of his disposition. She gave him eyes full of affectionate expression, the indexes of a mind delighting in social sympathy. She gave him arms to embrace his fellow creatures. She gave him lips to express a union of heart and soul. She gave him alone the power of laughing, a mark of the joy of which he is susceptible. She gave him tears, the symbol of clemency and compassion. She gave him also a voice, not a menacing and frightful yell, but bland, soothing and friendly. Not satisfied

with these marks of her peculiar favor, she bestowed on him alone the use of speech and reason; a gift which tends more than any other to conciliate and cherish benevolence, and a desire of rendering mutual services; so that nothing among human creatures might be done by violence. She implanted in man a hatred of solitude, and a love of company. She sowed in his heart the seeds of every benevolent affection, and thus rendered what is most salutary, at the same time most agreeable.

Now view with the eyes of your imagination, savage troops of men, horrible in their very visages and voices; men clad in steel, drawn up on every side in battle array, armed with weapons, frightful in their crash and their very glitter; mark the horrid murmur of the confused multitude, their threatening eye-balls, the harsh jarring din of drums and clarions, the terrific sound of the trumpet, the thunder of the cannon, a noise not less formidable than the real thunder of heaven, and more hurtful, a mad shout like that of the shrieks of Bedlamites, a furious onset, a cruel butchering of each other! See the slaughtered and the slaughtering! heaps of dead bodies, fields flowing with blood, rivers reddened with human gore!

Meanwhile I pass over the corn-fields trodden down, peaceful cottages and rural mansions burnt to the ground, villages and towns reduced to ashes, the cattle driven from their pasture, innocent women violated, old men dragged into captivity, churches defaced and demolished, every thing laid waste, a prey to robbery, plunder and violence! Not to mention the consequences ensuing to the people *after* a war even the most fortunate in its event,—the poor, unoffending common people robbed of their little hard-earned property; the great laden with taxes; old people bereaved of their children, more cruelly killed by the murder of their offspring, than by the sword, happier if the enemy had deprived them of the sense of their misfortune, and life itself, at the same moment; women far advanced in age, left destitute, and more cruelly put to death, than if they had died at once by the point of the bayonet; widowed mothers, orphan children, houses of mourning, and families, that once knew better days, reduced to extreme penury.

Peace is at once the mother and the nurse of all that is good for man; war, on a sudden, and at one stroke, overwhelms, extinguishes, abolishes, whatever is cheerful, whatever is happy and beautiful, and pours a foul torrent of disasters on the life of mortals. Peace shines upon human affairs like the vernal sun. The fields are cultivated, the gardens bloom, the cattle are fed upon a thousand hills, new buildings arise, riches flow, pleasures smile, humanity and charity increase, arts and manufactures feel the genial warmth of encouragement, and the gains of the poor are more plentiful. But no sooner does the storm of war begin to lower, than what a deluge of miseries and misfortune seizes, inundates, and overwhelms all things within the sphere of its action! The flocks are scattered, the harvest trampled, the husbandman butchered, villas and villages burnt, cities and states that have been

ages rising to their flourishing state, subverted by the fury of one tempest, the storm of war. So much easier is the task of *doing harm* than of *doing good*; of *destroying* than of *building up*!

To these considerations add, that the advantages derived from *peace* diffuse themselves far and wide, and reach *great numbers*; while in *war*, if any thing turns out happily, the advantage redounds only to a *few*, and those unworthy of reaping it. One man's safety is owing to the destruction of another. One man's prize is derived from the plunder of another. The cause of rejoicings made by one side, is to the other a cause of mourning. Whatever is unfortunate in war is severely so indeed, and whatever, on the contrary, is called *good fortune*, is a *savage and a cruel good fortune*, an ungenerous happiness, deriving its existence from another's wo. Indeed, at the conclusion, it commonly happens that both sides, the victorious and the vanquished, have cause to deplore. I know not whether any war ever succeeded so fortunately in all its events, but that the conqueror, if he had a heart to feel, or an understanding to judge, as he ought to do, repented that he ever engaged in it, at all.

Such and so great are the evils which are submitted to, in order to accomplish an end, itself a greater evil than all that have preceded in preparation for it. We thus afflict ourselves for the noble end of enabling ourselves to afflict others. If we were to calculate the matter fairly, and form a just computation of the cost attending war, and that of procuring peace, we should find that peace might be purchased at a tenth part of the cares, labors, troubles, dangers, expenses, and blood, which it costs to carry on a war. But the object is to do all possible injury to an enemy! A most inhuman object! and consider, whether you can hurt him essentially without hurting, by the same means, your own people. It surely is to act like a madman to take to yourself so large a portion of certain evil, when it must ever be uncertain how the die of war may fall in the ultimate issue.

Where are there so many and so sacred obligations to perfect concord, as in the Christian religion? Where so numerous exhortations to peace? One law Jesus Christ claimed as his own peculiar law; it was *the law of love or charity*. What practice among mankind violates this law so grossly as war? Examine every part of his doctrine, you will find nothing that does not breathe peace, speak the language of love, and savor of charity; and as he knew that peace could not be preserved unless those objects for which the world contends with the sword's point were considered as vile and contemptible, he ordered us to learn of him to be meek and lowly. He pronounced those happy who held riches in no esteem. He prohibited resistance of evil. In short, as the whole of his doctrine recommended forbearance and love, so his life taught nothing but mildness, gentleness, and kind affection. Nor do the apostles inculcate any other doctrine; they who had imbibed the purest spirit of Christ, and were filled with sacred draughts from the fountain head. What do all the epistles of

Paul resound with but PEACE, long-suffering, charity? What else do all the writers in the world who are truly Christian?

But let us observe how Christians defend the madness of war. If, say they, war had been absolutely unlawful, God would not have excited the Jews to wage war against their enemies. But the Jews scarcely ever waged war, as the Christians do, against each other, but against aliens and infidels; we Christians draw the sword against Christians; they fought at the *express command of God*; we at the command of our own passions.

But even Christians urge, that the laws of nature, of society, of custom and usage, conspire to dictate the propriety of repelling force by force, and defending life, and money too. So much I allow. But Gospel Grace, of more force than all these laws, declares in decisive words, that we must do good to those who use us ill, and should also pray for those who design to take away our lives. All this, they tell us, had a particular reference to the apostles; but I contend that it also refers to all Christian people.

They also argue that, as it is lawful to inflict punishment on an individual delinquent, it must be lawful to take vengeance on an offending State. The full answer to be given to this argument would involve me in greater prolixity than is now requisite; and I will only say, that the two cases differ widely in this respect: He who is convicted *judicially*, suffers the punishment which the *laws* impose; but in *war*, each side treats the other as guilty, and proceeds to inflict punishment, regardless of law, judge or jury. In the former case, the evil falls only on him who committed the wrong; in the latter case, the greatest part of the numerous evils falls on those who deserve no evil at all,—on husbandmen, on old people, on mothers, on orphans and defenceless females.

But the objector repeats, "Why may I not go and cut the throats of those who would cut our throats, if they could?" Do you then deem it a disgrace that any should be more wicked than yourself? Why do you not go and rob thieves? They would rob you, if they could. Why do you not revile them that revile you? Why do you not hate them that hate you? Do you consider it as a noble exploit for a Christian, having killed in war those whom he thinks wicked, but who still are men for whom Christ died, thus to offer up victims most acceptable to the Devil, and to delight that grand enemy in two respects, first, that a man is slain at all, and next, that the man who slew, is a Christian?

If the Christian religion be a fable, why do we not honestly and openly explode it? Why do we glory in its name? But if Christ is "the way, the truth, and the life," why do all our plans of conduct differ so far from his instructions and example? If we acknowledge Christ to be our Lord and Master, who is love itself, and who taught nothing but love and peace, let us exhibit his model in our lives and conversation. Let us adopt the love of peace, that Christ may recognize his own, even as we recognize him to be the Teacher of Peace.

THE RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN,

OR

SPECIMENS OF WAR AMONG NOMINAL CHRISTIANS IN THE
NINETEENTH CENTURY.

NAPOLEON'S career was a pretty fair illustration of war among civilized, nominally Christian men; and from his last great campaign (1812) in Russia, we may learn what war ever has been, and ever must be—a mass of evils, a tissue of suffering and woe to nearly all concerned, to the victors as well as the vanquished. The events of that campaign were recorded on the spot by many eye-witnesses; and Labaume, from whose narrative most of the following statements are taken, himself one of the actors in that long and terrible tragedy, says, “it was by the light of burning Moscow that I described the pillage of that city; it was on the banks of the Berezina that I traced the narrative of that fatal passage. It is scarcely possible to conceive the difficulties I had to surmount, in making my memoranda. Compelled to struggle with the most imperious necessity, benumbed with cold, and tormented with hunger, I was a prey to every kind of suffering. Uncertain, at the rising of the sun, whether I should see his setting rays, and in the evening doubtful of witnessing another day, every thought was absorbed in the desire of living to preserve the remembrance of what I had seen. Animated by this feeling, I wrote the events of the day every evening, before a bad fire, under a temperature twenty degrees below the freezing point, and surrounded by the dying and the dead. I made my pens from the quills of the raven, with the same knife that I used in cutting up horse-flesh for my food; and a little gunpowder, mixed up in the hollow of my hand with melted snow, supplied the place of ink and inkstand.”

For this grand enterprize, designed to be the crowning one of his life, Napoleon had mustered full half a million of men, no less, according to some writers of credit, than 494,000 *effective* troops; nor is it a high estimate to suppose, that a million, if not more, were engaged on both sides as combatants in that desperate and disastrous struggle. On the 22d of June, he issued from Wilkowiaki his proclamation of war; but, passing over the two first months of the campaign, we will quote a few specimens of its subsequent progress:

SMOLENSK.—After an obstinate battle, (Aug. 19,) the Russians set fire to the city, and retreated, leaving the streets and squares covered with their dead and wounded. “The next day,” says Labaume, “we entered Smolensk by the suburb on the bank of the river, marching in every direction over ruins and dead bodies. The palaces still burning, presented to our view only walls half

destroyed by the flames ; and thick among the smoking fragments lay the blackened carcasses of the inhabitants who had perished in the fire. The soldiers had taken possession of the few remaining houses, whilst the proprietor, bereft of an asylum, stood at his door, weeping the death of his children, and the loss of his fortune. The churches alone afforded some consolation to the wretched beings who had no longer a shelter. The cathedral, celebrated throughout Europe, and highly venerated by the Russians, became the refuge of those who had escaped the conflagration. In this church, and around its altars, lay whole families stretched upon rags. Here we saw an old man in the agonies of death, casting his last look towards the image of the saint whom he had all his life invoked ; and there, an infant whose cries the mother, worn down with grief, was endeavoring to hush, and, as she gave it the breast, bathed it in her tears."

BORODINO.—"Before day-break, (Sept. 7,) the two armies were drawn up in order of battle. *Two hundred and sixty thousand men* waited, in awful suspense, the signal to engage. At six o'clock, the thunder of the artillery broke the dreadful silence. The battle soon became general, and raged with tremendous fury. The fire of two hundred pieces of cannon enveloped the two armies in smoke, and, mowing down whole battalions, strewed the field with the dead and wounded. The latter fell to expose themselves to a fate still more terrible. How agonizing their situation! Forty thousand dragoons crossing the field in every direction, trampled them under foot, and dyed the horses' hoofs in their blood. The flying artillery, in rapid and alternate advance and retreat, put a period to the anguish of some, and inflicted new torments on others who were mangled by their wheels. A redoubt in the centre of the Russian army was several times taken and retaken with desperate slaughter, but finally remained in possession of the French. The interior of the redoubt presented a frightful scene ; the dead were heaped on each other, and among them were many wounded whose cries could not be heard. Night separated the combatants, but left **EIGHTY THOUSAND MEN** dead on the field!

"In traversing next day the elevated plain on which we had fought, we were enabled to form an estimate of the immense loss sustained by the Russians. A surface of about nine square miles in extent, was covered with the killed and wounded, with the wreck of arms, lances, helmets and cuirasses, and with balls as numerous as hail-stones after a violent storm. In many places the bursting of shells had overturned men and horses ; and such was the havoc occasioned by repeated discharges, that *mountains* of dead bodies were raised. But the most dreadful spectacle was the interior of the ravines, where the wounded had instinctively crawled to avoid the shot. Here these unfortunate wretches, lying one upon another, destitute of assistance, and weltering in their blood, uttered the most horrid groans. Loudly invoking death, they besought us to put an end to their excruciating torments.

“As we drew near Rouza, two days after, we met a great number of carts brought back by the cavalry. It was afflicting to see them loaded with children, with the aged and the infirm; and we grieved to think how soon the horses and carts, which formed the whole fortune of those ruined families, would be divided among the troops. In our advance to the centre of the town, we saw a crowd of soldiers pillaging the houses, regardless of the cries of those to whom they belonged, or of the tears of mothers who, to soften the hearts of their conquerors, showed them their children on their knees; those innocents, with their hands clasped, and bathed in tears, asked only that their lives might be spared.

“We could judge of the consternation that reigned in the capital, by the terror with which we had inspired the peasantry. No sooner were they informed of our arrival at Rouza, and of the barbarous manner in which we had treated the inhabitants, than all the villages on the road to Moscow were instantly abandoned; many of the fugitives, driven to desperation, set fire to their houses, their country seats, and to the corn and hay just gathered in. Discouraged by the fatal and useless resistance of the militia of Rouza, the greater part of them threw down the pikes with which they had been armed, and hastened to conceal themselves, with their wives and children, in thick forests at a distance from our route.”

Moscow.—“As we drew near the city, (Sept. 15,) we observed that it had no walls. We saw nothing to indicate that the capital was inhabited; and the road by which we arrived, was so deserted, that we did not see a single Muscovite, or even a French soldier. We found neither soldiers nor inhabitants in the part of the city we were to occupy; a death-like silence reigned in the forsaken quarters; the most intrepid were intimidated by the loneliness. We marched with timid steps through this dismal solitude, often stopping to look behind us; for our imaginations, overpowered by the magnitude of our conquest, made us every where apprehensive of treachery.”

In conformity with the desolating plan of the campaign, the ruin of the ancient capital of the Czars had been determined. The criminals confined in the different prisons, received their liberty on condition of setting fire to the city as soon as it should be in the possession of the French army. In order to insure its destruction, the engines, and every means by which the fire might have been extinguished, were removed or destroyed. The Exchange was the first building that fell a prey to the flames. The stores contained an immense quantity of the most valuable commodities of Europe and Asia; and the cellars were filled with sugar, oils and resin, which burnt with great fury. The French endeavored to check the progress of the devouring element, but they soon discovered that their efforts were vain. The fire, breaking out in different quarters of the city, and increased by a high wind, spread with dreadful rapidity.

“A great part of the population had concealed themselves in

their houses, from the terror caused by our arrival ; but they left them as the flames reached their asylums. Fear had rendered their grief dumb ; and as they tremblingly quitted their retreats, they carried off their most valuable effects, while those of more sensibility, actuated by natural feelings, sought only to save the lives of their parents or their children. On one side we saw a son carrying a sick father ; on the other, women who poured the torrent of their tears on the infants whom they clasped in their arms. They were followed by the rest of their children, who, fearful of being lost, ran crying after their mothers. Old men, overwhelmed more by grief than by the weight of years, were seldom able to follow their families ; and many of them, weeping for the ruin of their country, lay down to die near the houses where they were born. The streets, the public squares, and especially the churches, were crowded with these unhappy persons, who mourned as they lay on the remains of their property, but showed no signs of despair. The victors and the vanquished were become equally brutish ; the former by excess of fortune, the latter by excess of misery.

“ The hospitals, containing more than TWELVE THOUSAND WOUNDED, began at length to burn. The heart recoils at the disaster which ensued. Almost all those wretched victims perished ! The few still living, were seen crawling, half-burnt, from the smoking ashes, or groaning under the heaps of dead bodies, and making ineffectual efforts to extricate themselves !

“ It is impossible to depict the confusion and tumult that ensued, when the whole of this immense city was given up to pillage. Soldiers, sutlers, galley-slaves and prostitutes, ran through the streets, penetrated the deserted palaces, and carried off every thing that could gratify their insatiable desire. The generals received orders to quit Moscow ; and the soldiers, no longer restrained by that awe which is always inspired by the presence of their chiefs, gave themselves up to every excess, and to the most unbridled licentiousness. No retreat was safe, no place sufficiently sacred, to secure it from their rapacious search. To all the excesses of lust, were added the highest depravity and debauchery. No respect was paid to the nobility of blood, the innocence of youth, or the tears of beauty.

“ Dismayed by so many calamities, I hoped that the shades of night would veil the dreadful scene ; but darkness, on the contrary, rendered the conflagration more terrible. The flames, which extended from north to south, burst forth with greater violence, and, agitated by the wind, seemed to reach the sky. Clouds of smoke marked the track of the rockets that were hurled by the incendiary criminals from the tops of the steeples, and which, at a distance, resembled falling stars. But nothing was so terrific as the dread that reigned in every mind, and which was heightened in the dead of the night by the shrieks of the unfortunate creatures who were massacred, or by the cries of young females who fled for refuge to the palpitating bosoms of their mothers, and whose

ineffectual struggles only served to inflame the passions of their violators. Many of our soldiers fell victims to their own rapacity, which induced them to brave every danger. Excited by the love of plunder, they rushed into the midst of the fire and smoke, wading in blood, and trampling on the dead bodies, while the ruins and pieces of burning wood fell upon their murderous hands. Perhaps all would have perished, had not the insupportable heat at length compelled them to take refuge in their camp."

"The French troops, as they poured into the devoted city," says Porter, "had spread themselves in every direction in search of plunder; and in their progress they committed outrages so horrid on the persons of all whom they discovered, that fathers, desperate to save their children from pollution, would set fire to their places of refuge, and find a surer asylum in the flames. The streets, the houses, the cellars, flowed with blood, and were filled with violation and carnage."

"Part of our troops," continues Labaume, "took up their quarters (Sept. 17) at the castle of Peterskoe; and on their march, they overtook crowds of inhabitants carrying off their infirm parents, with all they had rescued from their burning houses. Their horses having been taken from them by the troops, men, and even women, were harnessed to the carts which contained the wrecks of their property, and the dearest objects of their affection. Those interesting groups were accompanied by children who were nearly naked, and whose countenances were imprinted with a sorrow uncongenial to their age. If the soldiers approached them, they ran crying to throw themselves into their mothers' arms. Without assistance or shelter, they wandered in the fields, or took refuge in the woods.

"After the lapse of more than a month from our entrance into Moscow, the order for retreat was given; and on the 22d of October, Moscow was completely evacuated. On the 24th, the Russians attacked us at Malo Jaroslavetz; and the battle, which began at four o'clock in the morning, lasted till nine at night. The next day, the town was no longer standing, and we could discover the streets only by the heaps of dead bodies with which they were strewed. On all sides we saw human heads and scattered limbs crushed by the artillery that had passed over them. Many of the sick and wounded had quitted the fight to take refuge in the houses, which were now reduced to heaps of ruins, and under the burning ashes appeared their half-consumed remains. The few who had escaped the flames, having their faces blackened, and their clothes and hair burnt, presented themselves before us, and in an expiring tone uttered cries of the deepest anguish. On seeing them, the most ferocious were moved with compassion, and, turning away their eyes, could not refrain from tears.

"As we advanced, (Oct. 30,) the country appeared yet more desolate. The fields, trampled by thousands of horses, seemed as though they had never been cultivated; and the forests, thinned by the long residence of the troops, partook of the devastation.

But the most horrible sight was the multitude of dead bodies, which had been fifty-two days unburied, and scarcely retained the human form. My consternation was at its height on finding, near Borodino, the 80,000 men who had been slaughtered there, lying where they fell. The half-buried carcasses of men and horses covered the plain, intermingled with garments stained with blood, and bones gnawed by the dogs and birds of prey, and with the fragments of arms, drums, helmets and cuirasses.

“Were I to relate all the calamities that sprung from this atrocious war, my narrative would be too long; but if I wished from one instance to convey an idea of the rest, it would be from that of the three thousand prisoners we brought from Moscow. During the march, having no provisions to give them, they were herded together like beasts, and were not allowed on any pretext to quit the narrow limits assigned them. Without fire, perishing with cold, they lay on the bare ice. To appease their ravenous hunger, they seized with avidity the horse-flesh which was distributed to them, and for want of time and means to dress it, ate it quite raw; and I have been assured, though I dare not believe it, that when this supply failed, many of them ate the flesh of their comrades who had sunk under their miseries.

“Whilst the retreating army drank the cup of unmingled gall, its course was marked by outrages of unrestrained cruelty and vindictive rage. The first division, on leaving the quarters where they had slept the preceding night, generally consigned them to the flames, as well as the towns and villages through which they passed. The few houses that escaped their ravages, were burnt by the second division; and in the ruins were entombed soldiers and peasants, children wantonly murdered, and young girls massacred on the spot where they had been violated. For one hundred and fifty miles from Moscow, not a single building was left undemolished!”

PASSAGE OF THE VOP, Nov. 8.—“The bed of the river was choked by the carriages, cannon, and the numerous bodies of men and horses drowned in attempting the passage. The cries of those who were crossing; the consternation of others who were preparing to cross, and were every moment precipitated with their horses down the steep and slippery bank into the stream; the distraction of the women, the screams of the children, and the despair of even the soldiers, rendered this passage a scene so afflicting, that the remembrance is still dreadful to those who witnessed it.

“Our soldiers had scarcely quitted the river, when the Cossacks, no longer meeting any obstacles, advanced to where they found many poor wretches who from the state of their health had not been able to cross the river. Although our enemies were surrounded with booty, they stript their prisoners, and left them naked on the snow. From the opposite bank we saw these Tartars dividing their bloody spoils.

“The last night had been dreadful. To form an idea of its

rigors, it is necessary to conceive an army encamped on the snow, in the depth of a severe winter, pursued by an enemy to whom it could oppose no effective resistance. The soldiers, without shoes, and almost destitute of clothing, were enfeebled by hunger and fatigue. Seated on their knapsacks, they slept on their knees. From this benumbing posture they rose only to broil a few slices of horse-flesh, or to melt some pieces of ice. They were often without wood, and to keep up a fire, demolished the houses in which the generals were lodged. When we awoke in the morning, the village had disappeared; and in this manner towns that were standing entire in the evening, formed the next day one vast conflagration."

Nov. 15.—"Whole teams, sinking under their fatigues, fell together, and obstructed the way. More than *thirty thousand horses* perished in a few days. All the defiles that were impassable for the carriages, were strewed with arms, helmets, cuirasses, broken trunks, portmanteaus, and clothes of every kind. At intervals we saw trees, at the feet of which the soldiers had attempted to light fires, but had expired in making these useless efforts to warm themselves. They were stretched by dozens around the green branches which they had in vain endeavored to kindle; and the number of dead bodies would have blocked up the road, if we had not employed men to throw them into the ruts and ditches.

"These horrors, so far from exciting our sensibility, only hardened our hearts. Having no longer the power of exercising our cruelty on our enemies, we turned it on each other. The best friends were estranged; and whoever experienced the least sickness, was certain of never seeing his country again, unless he had good horses and faithful servants. Preserving the plunder of Moscow was preferred by most to the pleasure of saving a comrade. We heard around us the groans of the dying, and the plaintive voice of those who were abandoned; but all were deaf to their cries, and, if any one approached them when on the point of death, it was for the purpose of stripping them, and searching whether they had any remains of food.

"The next morning, (Nov. 17,) we left Liadoui before day-break, and were, according to custom, lighted by the fire of the buildings which began to burn. Among the burning houses were three large barns filled with poor soldiers, chiefly wounded. They could not escape from two of these, without passing through the one in front, which was on fire. The most active saved themselves by leaping out of the windows; but all those who were sick or crippled, not having strength to move, saw the flames advancing rapidly to devour them. Touched by their shrieks, some, who were least hardened, endeavored in vain to save them; but we could scarcely see them half buried under the burning rafters. Through whirlwinds of smoke, they entreated us to shorten their sufferings by depriving them of life; and, from motives of humanity, we thought it our duty to comply with their wishes (!!) As there were some who still survived, we heard them with feeble

voices crying, *'Fire on us! fire on us! at the head! at the head! don't miss!'* ”

THE PASSAGE OF THE BEREZINA, NOV. 27.—“ They who from weariness and ignorance of danger, were less eager to cross the river, endeavored to light a fire, and to repose from their fatigues. In these bivouacs we saw to what a degree of brutality excess of misery will lead. We there saw men fighting for a morsel of bread. If any one, benumbed with cold, drew near a fire, the soldiers to whom it belonged inhumanly drove him away; and, if a parching thirst forced you to beg a drop of water from him who had a full bowl, the refusal was always accompanied with abuse. We often heard even men of education, who had been friends, quarrelling for a handful of straw, or for a part of the dead horse they were attempting to cut up. This campaign was the more frightful, as it demoralized our characters, and gave birth to vices till then unknown to us; they who had been generous, humane and upright, became selfish, avaricious, cruel and unjust.

“ There were two bridges, one for the carriages, the other for the infantry; but the crowd was so great, and the approaches so dangerous, that the throng collected on the bank of the Berezina, became incapable of moving. In spite of these difficulties, some who were on foot saved themselves by their perseverance; but about 8 o'clock in the morning, the bridge reserved for the carriages having broken down, the baggage and artillery advanced to the other, and attempted to force a passage. Then began a frightful contest between the infantry and the cavalry, in which many of them perished by the hands of their comrades; and a still greater number were suffocated at the foot of the bridge, where the carcasses of men and horses obstructed the road to such a degree, that to approach the river, it was necessary to climb over the bodies of those who had been crushed. Some of them were still alive, and struggling in the agonies of death. In order to extricate themselves, they caught hold of those who were marching over them; but the latter disengaged themselves with violence, and trampled them under their feet. Whilst they contended with so much fury, the following multitude, like a raging wave, incessantly overwhelmed fresh victims.

“ In the midst of this dreadful confusion, the Russians made a furious attack on the rear-guard; and in the heat of the engagement, many balls fell on the miserable crowd that for three days had been pressing round the bridge, and even some shells burst in the midst of them. Terror and despair then took possession of every heart anxious for self-preservation; women and children, who had escaped so many disasters, seemed to have been preserved to experience a death still more deplorable. Leaving their carriages, they ran to embrace the knees of the first person they met, and implored him with tears to take them to the other side. The sick and wounded, seated on the trunk of a tree, or supported on crutches, looked eagerly for some friend that could assist them; but their cries were lost in the air,—every one thought only of his own safety.

“On seeing the enemy, those who had not crossed, mingling with the Poles, rushed towards the bridge; artillery, baggage, cavalry and infantry, all endeavored to pass first. The strong throw the weak into the water, and trampled under foot the sick and wounded whom they found in their way. Many hundreds were crushed under the wheels of the artillery; and others, who had hoped to save themselves by swimming, were frozen or drowned in the river. Thousands and thousands of hopeless victims, notwithstanding these sorrowful examples, threw themselves into the Berezina, where they nearly all perished in convulsions of grief and despair.

“The division of Girard succeeded by force of arms in overcoming all the obstacles that retarded their march, and, scaling the mountain of dead bodies that obstructed the road, gained the opposite shore, where the Russians would soon have followed them, if they had not immediately set fire to the bridge.

“Many of those who were left on the other bank with the prospect of the most horrible death, attempted to cross the bridge through the flames; but midway they threw themselves into the river to avoid being burnt. At length, the Russians having made themselves masters of the field of battle, our troops retired; the passage of the river ceased, and the most tremendous uproar was succeeded by a death-like silence.

“It was now December. The cold was intense; the wind howled frightfully; and, towards the close of the day, the darkness was illumined by the numerous fires of the enemy who occupied the hills of Zemin. At the feet of these heights, groaned our companions, devoted to death; never had they experienced moments so dreadful as on this disastrous night. All the horrors that can be conceived by the imagination, would convey but a faint impression of what they endured. The elements, let loose, seemed to have combined to afflict all nature, and to chastise man. The conquerors and the conquered were overwhelmed with sufferings. The former, however, had enormous piles of burning wood, whilst the latter had neither fire nor shelter; their groans alone indicated the spot that contained so many unfortunate victims.

“At every step (Dec. 5) we saw brave officers supported on pine branches, covered with rags, with their hair and beards matted with icicles. Those warriors, once the terror of our enemies, and the conquerors of two-thirds of Europe, having lost their noble mien, dragged themselves slowly along, and could not obtain a look of pity even from the soldiers they had commanded. Their situation was the more deplorable, as whoever had not strength to march, was abandoned; and every one who was abandoned, in one hour afterwards was a dead man. Every bivouac presented us the next day with the appearance of a field of battle. Whenever a soldier sunk from fatigue, his next neighbor rushed on him, and stripped him of his clothes, even before he was dead. Every moment we heard them begging the aid of some charitable

hand. 'My comrades,' exclaimed one with a heart-rending voice, 'help me to rise; deign to lend me a hand to pursue my march.' All passed by without even regarding him. 'Ah, I conjure you not to abandon me to the enemy; in the name of humanity grant me the trifling assistance I ask; help me to rise.' Instead of being moved by a prayer so touching, they considered him as already dead, and began to strip him; and then we heard his cries, 'Help! help! they murder me! Why do you trample me under your feet? Why do you take from me the remainder of my money and my bread? You even take away my clothes!' If some officer, urged by generous feelings, did not arrive in time to prevent it, many in the like situation would have been assassinated by their own comrades.

"The road was covered (Dec. 8) with soldiers who no longer retained the human form, and whom the enemy disdained to take prisoners. Every day furnished scenes too painful to relate. Some had lost their hearing, others their speech, and many, by excessive cold and hunger, were reduced to such a state of stupid frenzy, that they roasted the dead bodies for food, and even gnawed their own hands and arms. Some, who were too weak to lift a piece of wood, or to roll a stone towards the fire, sat down upon their dead companions, and with an unmoved countenance, gazed upon the burning logs. When they were consumed, these livid spectres, unable to get up, fell by the side of those on whom they had been seated. Many, in a state of delirium, plunged their bare feet into the fire just to warm themselves; some, with a convulsive laugh, threw themselves into the flames, and with shocking cries, perished in the most horrible contortions; while others, in a state of equal madness, followed their example, and shared the same fate!" "Multitudes," says Porter, "lost their speech, others were seized with frenzy, and many were so maddened by the extremes of pain and hunger, that they tore the dead bodies of their comrades into pieces, and feasted on the remains!"

"Every day's march," adds Labaume, "presented us with a repetition of the mournful scenes I have faintly sketched. Our hearts, completely hardened by such disgusting pictures, lost all sensibility. We were reduced to a state of brutality that left us no feeling but the instinct of self-preservation."

Thus far Labaume, an eye-witness of all he relates; and Alison, in his history of the same campaign, quotes statements not less terribly graphic. "On Sunday forenoon I found a crowd collected round a car in which some wounded soldiers had just returned from Russia. No grenade or grape could have so disfigured these victims of the cold. One of them had lost the upper joints of all his ten fingers, and he showed us the stumps. Another wanted both ears and nose. More horrible still was the look of a third, whose eyes had been frozen; the eyelids hung down rotting, the globes of the eyes were burst, and protruded from their sockets. It was awfully hideous; but a spectacle yet more dreadful was to present itself. Out of the straw in the bottom of a car, I now

beheld a figure creep painfully, which one could scarcely believe to be a human being, so wild and distorted were the features; the lips were rotted away, and the teeth stood exposed; he pulled the cloth from before his mouth, and grinned upon us like a death's head."

"The battle of Eylau was fought in the depth of winter, amidst ice and snow, under circumstances of unexampled horror. The loss on both sides was immense; and never in modern times had a field of battle been strewn with such a multitude of slain. On the side of the Russians 25,000 had fallen, of whom above 7000 were already no more; on that of the French, upwards of 30,000 were killed or wounded, and nearly 10,000 had left their colors, under pretence of attending to the wounded. Never was a spectacle so dreadful as the field presented on the following morning. Above 50,000 men lay in the space of two leagues, weltering in blood. The wounds were, for the most part, of the severest kind, from the extraordinary quantity of cannon balls which had been discharged during the action, and the close proximity of the contending masses to the deadly batteries which spread their grape at half-musket shot through their ranks. Though stretched on the cold snow, and exposed to the severity of an arctic winter, they were burning with thirst, and piteous cries were heard on all sides for water, or assistance to extricate the wounded from the heaps of slain, or the load of horses by which they were crushed. Six thousand of these noble animals encumbered the field, or, maddened with pain, were shrieking aloud amid the stifled groans of the wounded."

Thus far we have sketched almost exclusively the losses of the French and their allies; nor did the Russian army fare much better. During their retreat, a ducat, then worth five dollars, was thankfully given for a single horse-shoe; and so fatal were the combined effects of hardship, disease and battle, that the Russians lost in some cases three-fourths, and in others nearly nine-tenths of their troops! Some entire battalions did not retain fifty men, and many companies were left without a single one! A mere fraction of the victims perished by the sword; and, as the final result to the Russians, their army, amounting at the commencement of the campaign to hundreds of thousands, could muster at the close only eighteen thousand!!

All this besides the unreckoned and well-nigh countless victims among the people. The number of these, it would be vain to conjecture; but from the nature of the case, as well as from what we have already quoted, it must have been immense. The statements of Labaume are terrible; and their truth is fully confirmed by such writers as Sir Robert Wilson, who says, "in the roads, men were collected round the burning ruins of their cottages, which a mad spirit of destruction had fired, picking and eating the burnt bodies of fellow men, while thousands of horses were moaning in agony, with their flesh mangled and hacked to satisfy the cravings of a hunger that knew no pity. In many of the sheds,

men scarcely alive, had heaped on their frozen bodies human carcasses which, festering by the communication of animal heat, had mingled the dying and the dead in one mass of putrefaction."

Such is war ;—war not by pagans or savages, but by men calling themselves Christians ; war not in the dark ages, but in the nineteenth century ; war in the perfection of its skill, and the zenith of its glory ;—a campaign of one hundred and seventy-three days in the heart of Christendom ! What is the result ? Of five hundred thousand men who started under Napoleon, scarcely twenty thousand returned, so that the French alone must have lost, in soldiers and attendants, full half a million ; and, should we reckon the loss of the Russian army but half as great, and suppose only an equal number of incidental victims among the people, both of which estimates are probably much below the truth, we reach the astounding result of *more than A MILLION LIVES sacrificed in less than six months of a single campaign !*

But the Russian campaign was only one of the many wars consequent on the French Revolution. During those wars, the levies of soldiers in France exceeded *four millions*, and not less than *three millions* of these, on the lowest calculation, perished in the field, the hospital or the bivouac. If to these we add, as we unquestionably must, at least an equal number out of the ranks of their antagonists, it is clear that not less than *six millions* of human beings perished by war in the course of twenty years, in the very heart of civilized Europe, at the commencement of the nineteenth century of the Christian era ! But even these stupendous numbers give us no adequate idea of the destruction of human life directly consequent on the wars of the revolution and the empire. We must add the thousands who perished from want, outrage and exposure, and the hundreds of thousands who were subsequently swept away by the ravages of that pestilence which took its rise amid the retreat from Russia, and the crowded garrisons of the campaign of 1813, and for several years afterwards desolated in succession every country of Europe. And even when we have summed up and laid before us, in all the magnitude of figures, the appalling destruction of life here exhibited, we can still gather only a faint conception of the sufferings and the evils inflicted by this awful scourge.

Patriots, philanthropists, Christians, must such a custom still continue ? Is there no remedy ? Yes, a sovereign one that needs only a right application. The gospel, rightly applied, would put an end to the atrocities and horrors of war forever. Will you not then aid in making such an application without delay ? In this work are Peace Societies engaged ; and will you not give them all the countenance and support in your power ?

UNION IN PEACE,

OR

THE BASIS OF CO-OPERATION IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE.

UNION is indispensable to every cause, but to none more so than to that of peace. Aiming at the entire abolition of war, a custom wrought from time immemorial into the texture of every society and government on earth, it obviously requires the co-operation of all that desire, for any reason, to see an end put to a scourge so terrible. The difficulty of securing such co-operation, arises mostly from the diversity of views among its friends. Some of them are extremely radical, avowing the unlawfulness of all physical force, and denying the right of one man to punish, coerce, or even rule another;—positions to which no peace society has ever been committed, and which our own has always regarded as foreign to its object. Others, assuming the strict inviolability of human life, oppose war mainly as a wholesale violation of this simple, comprehensive principle;—a principle adopted by a portion of the friends of peace, but never recognized by the leading peace societies as the basis of our cause. A third class, outnumbering both the former, discard this principle, yet deem all war contrary to the gospel;—the ground taken by those societies which are esteemed the most radical. There is still a fourth class, probably more numerous than all the foregoing, who think it right for nations to draw the sword in strict self-defence, that is, when their only alternative is to kill or be killed, yet hold the *custom itself* in deep abhorrence, and sincerely desire its abolition.

Here, then, are four classes of peace-men; and we need the co-operation of them all; but how can we secure it? By constructing a platform on which they can all consistently work together for the accomplishment of their common purpose—the abolition of war. On this point alone, they perfectly agree; and, since their object is the same, we propose to let them all labor for it, each in his own way, without making one responsible for the views of another.

Let us learn wisdom from enterprises of a kindred nature. The friends of humanity, when united for the suppression of the slave-trade, labored for that as their only object; and all the doctrines they taught, as well as their efforts of every kind, were so many *means* to that *end*. Their aim was not to propagate a sentiment, but to produce a result; and, in reaching that result, they wielded as instruments a great variety of principles. So the friends of temperance aim only at a result. True, we hear much about the *doctrine* of temperance; but what does it mean? Solely abstinence from intoxicating drinks;—not strictly a doctrine, but a deed; not theory, but practice, or theory carried into practice. It is not the

object of temperance to teach a principle or doctrine, but to produce a specified result, the entire disuse of whatever can intoxicate; and all its doctrines and facts, all its arguments and appeals, are only so many *means* to this *end*.

Just so in the cause of peace. Our *sole* aim is *the abolition of war*. We seek not, as our object, to establish a doctrine or principle, but to obtain a given result. We use a variety of means; but none of them constitute our object. We urge a multitude of principles; yet none of these, nor all of them together, can be said to be the end at which we aim. That end is a result,—something to be done,—the entire extinction of war from the world; and all our doctrines, and arguments, and facts, and appeals, and efforts of every kind, are only so many auxiliaries to that sole, ultimate purpose of our enterprise.

Let us now see on what terms the friends of other causes have united. They have required, not perfect uniformity of views, but only cordial, active co-operation for the attainment of their common object. If a man would from *any* motives unite with them in putting an end to the slave-trade or intemperance, he was welcomed as a coadjutor, and left to take such views, and urge such arguments, as he himself felt most, and therefore thought likely to make the best impression upon others. Every cast of mind was to be met; and hence all were not only permitted, but desired to press each his own favorite arguments upon men of kindred stamp.

Here is sound good sense; nor do we see why it should not be applied to peace, and all its professed friends be allowed to retain their present views, and still co-operate for their common object. There are points of coincidence between them sufficient for this purpose. They are one in their desires for the abolition of war; they agree in most of their views touching peace, and differ only on one or two points; they would, in laboring for their common cause, use essentially the same means; and the diversity in their modes of exhibiting the subject, is in fact necessary to reach with the best effect all the variety of minds that we wish to enlist.

Let us illustrate this last thought. One man, deeply impressed with the superiority of moral over physical power, and conceiving Christianity to be a system of moral influences for the good of mankind, regards all use of brute force by one man towards another as unchristian, and chooses to oppose war from this simple, fundamental, far-reaching principle. It is indeed a broad sweep of generalization; but such a mode of reasoning suits his mind, and will perhaps suit some others equally well. Our society does not adopt this principle; but, if we have no responsibility for it, and it proves more successful than any other in arraying certain minds against war, we cannot object to *their* using it for such a purpose.

Now, take the other extreme. Here is a Christian or philanthropist who has been trained to look upon *defensive* war as right; nor is he likely soon, if ever, to renounce that belief; yet he holds the *custom* in deep, unfeigned abhorrence, and ardently longs to see an end put to this crying sin, and curse, and shame of

Christendom. To this conclusion he comes from such views as he deems consistent with the right of drawing the sword in self-defence. He knows the guilt and evils of war. He deploras its waste of property, and its havoc of human life; its sack of cities, its plunder of provinces, and its devastation of empires; its baleful influence on art, and science, and general improvement, on freedom, morality and religion, on all the great interests of mankind for two worlds; its pride and lust, its rapacity and revenge, its wholesale robberies and murders, its vast and fearful complication of vices and crimes. Such aspects of war rouse him against the custom. Still he does not regard *all* war as unchristian; and shall we, for such a reason, thrust him from the ranks of peace? Shall we make *our* views a test for *him*, and insist that none shall labor for peace except in *our* way?

Let us now glance at the two intermediate classes of peace-men. Both believe that the gospel condemns all war, but reach this conclusion from different premises. One argues from the strict inviolability of human life; a principle which sweeps away not only war, but capital punishment, and the right of government to take life even for its own support; while the other reasons from principles of the gospel which do not in his view forbid the taking of life in such cases. Now, which of these two classes shall set up their modes of reasoning as a standard for *all* the friends of peace? Our society prefers the latter mode; but, because we dislike his mode, shall we spurn from our cause one who loves peace, and hates war as much as we do? Shall we let none oppose war except in our way? Is it wise for Saul to force his own armor upon David, or for the stripling shepherd to insist, because he had slain Goliath with his simple sling and stone, on arming all the hosts of Israel with that weapon alone?

The cause of peace, then, ought to be prosecuted with the same liberality as other enterprises, and all its friends be permitted, without rebuke or suspicion, to promote it in such ways as they respectively prefer. The test should be, not the belief of this or that dogma, but *a willingness to co-operate for the entire abolition of war*; and all that will do this, and just as far as they do it, should be regarded as friends of peace. If any doctrine be required as a test, let it be the broad principle on which the first General Peace Convention in London (1843) was constituted, *viz., that war is inconsistent with Christianity, and the true interests of mankind*. We grant that this language is indefinite, allowing a pretty free play of the pendulum; but this is just what we want in order to meet the diversity of opinion among the friends of peace. We can *make* it express the belief of *all* war unchristian; but it *pledges* us only to a condemnation of the custom. To this principle there can be no objection from any one willing to labor for the abolition of war; and hence the test of principle would in fact be the very test of action on which alone we insist. We ask men to abolish war; and, if they gird themselves in earnest for this work, we would let them do it in their own way, nor quarrel with them about their motives.

For such a course, it were easy to find a multitude of arguments. We need not repeat, that it is the same with that adopted in all kindred enterprises ; but we may add, that it would relieve the cause of peace from much superfluous responsibility, and many irrelevant objections. It is in fact responsible only for the conclusion, *that war ought to be abolished* ; but our opponents, the advocates or apologists for war, instead of meeting us on this point alone, assail us, for the most part, on questions either extraneous or unessential. Such issues are false and fruitless ; for the only point in dispute is not, whether the Bible sanctions civil government, or capital punishment, or the taking of life in any case, or the use of physical force by one person against another, but *whether WAR ought for ANY reason to be abolished*. To this conclusion alone is the cause of peace pledged ; nor can it fairly be held accountable for objections urged against such modes of reasoning as assert the inviolability of human life, or conflict with the legitimate internal operations of government, or justify any kind of war.

Thus would responsibility be left in every case to rest where it properly belongs. We do not ourselves feel bound to answer objections drawn either from the advocacy of defensive war, or from that species of non-resistance which denounces all forms of human government. We do not argue against war from either of these extremes ; and only those who do, should be held responsible for them. The same might be said of other modes of reasoning ; let those who use them, meet their appropriate objections. The cause of peace is not accountable for any of them, because none of them are essential to its sole aim. Whatever may be thought of any arguments used by its friends, few will deny that war ought to be abolished ; and for this conclusion alone is the cause itself fairly responsible.

The course we recommend, would also secure for our cause the greatest variety of argument and influence. There are all sorts of minds to be convinced ; and it is well to provide a corresponding variety of arguments. No single class of peace-men can meet the wants of all. A few, fond of elementary, comprehensive truths, would be pleased with the broad principle, that the gospel discards all physical force ; but such logic will reach only a small portion of mankind, and be scouted by the rest as extreme radicalism. More will be influenced by the doctrine of the strict inviolability of human life ; yet this principle will satisfy no considerable part of society. The class of peace-men who argue against all war from such precepts of the gospel as bid us love our enemies, return good for evil, and give the other cheek to the smiter, will make far more converts ; but a number greater than all the rest, will be attracted to our cause by those who dwell chiefly on the general wickedness and evils of war. These varieties of argument converge to the same result,—the abolition of war ; and the cause of peace should be so managed as to secure, if possible, the co-operation of them all.

Nor can we discover the justice of excluding *any* class of peace-

men. If any, which of the four? The high non-resistant who regards all human government as sinful because resting in the last resort on brute force? He deems himself the best, if not the only consistent peace-man. Shall we then refuse the right hand of fellowship to those who believe it wrong for man under any circumstances to take the life of his fellow? Few, if any, can be stancher friends of peace. Shall we next discard those who admit the lawfulness of taking life in *some* cases, but deem all war contrary to the gospel? Such was William Penn himself; and such are probably the greater part of our most active and efficient friends. Shall we, in fine, exclude all that believe war strictly defensive to be right, yet condemn the custom itself, and are willing to labor for its abolition? Then must we strike from our list far the largest number of our co-workers, and commit the injustice of supposing them to have no heart for this enterprise of patriotism, philanthropy and religion. Many of these men are honest, active friends of our cause. Such was Noah Worcester himself, long after he became the pioneer of peace in modern times. Such, too, was William Ladd, who labored as zealously before as after he embraced the doctrine of all war contrary to the gospel. Such was Dr. Channing to the end of his life. Such are multitudes, whom we cannot spurn from us without equal injustice to them, and injury to our cause. They may need a deeper, clearer insight into its pacific principles; and the course we propose would be the likeliest way of bringing them ere-long to regard all war as unchristian; but, should they never reach that point, they may still render invaluable aid in the work of banishing war from the world.

We might, also, plead general precedent. The friends of peace, whatever their theories, have in fact acted, for the most part, on the principle for which we contend. In America, they have, with hardly an exception, proceeded on the plan of inviting the co-operation of all, whatever their views respecting wars termed defensive, who are willing to use means for abolishing the custom itself. Such have been, from the first, a vast majority of our co-workers; not our warmest, but our real friends; and, had we refused the co-operation of all such persons, we should never have even started in this enterprise, since its very originators were only moderate peace-men. Such, too, has been the practice, we believe, of all kindred societies in Europe. So it *should* be; for the strong friends of peace are not its *only* friends. Others love it as truly as we do; and we deem it wrong to deny them the credit of unfeigned interest in the cause, or the privilege of an honorable co-operation.

We wish, moreover, to influence those who guide the helm of state. How shall this be done? Not one in a thousand of them deems *all* war unchristian. Upon such men it would be quite useless to urge the extreme doctrines of peace; and, if we reach them at all, it must be through its moderate friends and moderate arguments.

Such a course would, likewise, obviate many causes of jealousy and collision among the friends of peace. All their strength ought

to be spent against their common foe ; but no small part of their time and energies has hitherto been wasted in disputes among themselves on points not essential to their object.

Nor can we well imagine any valid objection to a course so liberal. Shall we be told, 'it erects no standard, fixes no principle?'—It provides all the standard, all the principle necessary for our purpose. Such a course goes against the whole war-system; and what else do the friends of peace, as such, aim to abolish? It goes for the entire abolition of war, for universal and permanent peace; and can the strongest friend of our cause ask for more?

'But such a course would not introduce the *right* standard.'—What class of peace-men, to the exclusion of all the rest, shall determine what *is* the right standard? Whichever should, the others might complain; but the course we suggest, would leave them all to urge their respective views with entire freedom. Thus every aspect of the subject would be exhibited, all its arguments and illustrations exhausted; and every man's views would have a fair chance, and go for what different minds should think them worth.

'Such a course, however, would be no reform, because not in advance of present opinion and practice.'—Not indeed beyond those of its active friends, since no man can honestly teach what he does not believe; but it would set every one at work in his own way, and give to truth the fairest chance of triumph. Besides, there is on this subject, as well as others, a great deal of *dormant* truth now among the people; and no small part of our work consists in rendering such truth effective for the prevention and ultimate abolition of war.

'But we should be obliged to contradict or conceal our principles.'—By no means; for we allow you to utter yours without restraint, and merely ask you not to make others responsible for what they do not themselves believe. We would restrict the freedom of none. Different classes of peace-men are united in this cause; and we simply insist, that no peace society, as such, shall endorse for one to the exclusion of the rest. All may equally plead conscience; and we would permit them all alike to argue against war, each in his own way, nor hold them accountable for any views except their own.

'Such a course would make a Babel of our cause.'—How? Almost every kindred enterprise has pursued a similar course without confusion or embarrassment. Did not Wilberforce and his coadjutors labor in this way for the abolition of the slave-trade? Was not every one allowed without complaint to urge his own arguments? Did the leaders lay down a single principle as a criterion, and insist that none but believers in that principle should co-operate with them? So with the friends of temperance. They all go for abstinence from intoxicating drinks, but leave every man to do so from whatever arguments or motives he pleases. The cause requires union only in the result; and, if its friends all

unite in total abstinence, they may reach that result by an Orthodox or a Unitarian, a Protestant or a Catholic mode of reasoning.

‘I like, however, to see a reform reduced to its simplest elementary principle.’—That may be a very pleasant and useful exercise for *you*; but is it a wise course for a reform which has to deal with all sorts of minds? You love to simplify and generalize; but most persons would be very likely to turn their back on such modes of advocating any cause. Such a procedure would also multiply the difficulties of reform. Let me suppose you arguing against the slave-trade. Not satisfied with proving it wrong, you try to bring it under the condemnation of some general principle applicable to a hundred other things; the principle, if you please, that all love of money, or all physical coercion of men, both of which are so deeply concerned in that trade, is unchristian. Your antagonist readily admits the *traffic* to be wrong, but joins issue on your general principle, and thus compels you to waste nearly all your strength upon what is not essential to your purpose. Were you endeavoring to abolish duelling, would you first establish the principle, that self-defence, or the taking of human life in any case, or all use of brute force, is unchristian, and then forbid the co-operation of any that did not embrace one or all of these principles? True, if you prove either, you condemn duelling; but if neither is true, that practice may still be utterly wrong. So in peace. I prove it just as wrong for nations to fight as it is for individuals; but one strenuous for simplification, presses me to know on what *principle* I condemn war. ‘Why, I have just adduced a dozen in the shape of so many arguments against it.’ “But on what *one* in particular do you deem it wrong? What is your stand-point?” If in reply I say, that human life is inviolable, or that the gospel discards all physical force, or forbids my injuring another for my own benefit, he starts at once a new trail of objections, not against my sole aim of abolishing war, but against my principle as applicable in his view to something else which he thinks right. He says it condemns capital punishment, and even subverts all human government; and thus he leads me away from my sole object into disputes which have little or no connection with peace. If you prove human life inviolable, or all use of brute force unchristian, you certainly condemn war; but is it wrong on no other grounds? If it is, then let all that choose, discard it on those grounds, nor insist that they shall argue against it only in your own favorite way.

‘But every reform should have some fixed, distinguishing principle.’—So it should; and such would our plan insure to the cause of peace. It is the principle, that war, being inconsistent with Christianity, and the true interests of mankind, ought to be abolished. What principle in any reform is more distinct, more intelligible, or more practical than this?

‘But we should carry out our principles.’—So we should to the accomplishment of our object, but no farther. Nothing more is done, or attempted, or even permitted in any enterprise of the kind. No principle is pushed to its utmost application. Take an example.

The broad principle, lying at the bottom of temperance, forbids excessive or injurious stimulation of our bodies ; but this principle, if carried into all its possible applications, would sweep away tobacco, and tea, and coffee, and animal food, and a multitude of other indulgences never embraced in the temperance reform. The cause of peace is not an exception, in this respect, to all others ; nor can its friends be reasonably required to carry any principle beyond their single object of abolishing war.

We plead, then, for the cordial, zealous co-operation of *all* peace-men. Associated solely for the abolition of international war, they should be pledged only to that end, and allowed to retain each his own opinions, and to labor for their common object in such ways as they respectively prefer, without insisting upon any other basis of co-operation than the belief, that war, being inconsistent with Christianity, and the true interests of mankind, ought to be abolished. Such a course would remove not a few obstructions, conciliate a much larger number of co-workers, and pave the way for a speedier and more glorious triumph.

The time has come for a much more extensive rally in behalf of this cause than has ever yet been made or attempted. It is the grand interest of the world ; and its claims we should urge upon every friend whether of God or man. Almost every movement for the good of mankind is beginning to put in practice more or less of our principles ; and scarce an enterprise of benevolence or reform, that might not be laid under contribution to our cause. Of all such influences we should avail ourselves to the utmost, and set the ark of peace afloat on this tide of universal improvement. We should spread our sails for every breeze that may waft us sooner into the port of universal and permanent peace. We should press into our service every possible auxiliary. We need and may secure all the good influences of the world. The age of brute force is fast giving place to the era of moral influence ; and even legislators and warriors, the disciples of Draco, and the sons of Mars, are beginning to learn, even while claiming the right both of punishment and of war, that there are better means than violence and blood, for controlling mankind. Such is the spirit of the age ; and, though retaining the instruments of vengeance, it will yet contrive, with little, if any use of bayonets or bullets, of halters or chains, to restrain the wrong-doer, to protect the innocent, and right the injured. The reign of love is coming ; and its triumphs over bad passions and customs will ere-long astonish the world. This spirit calls for peace ; and, should we make our platform broad enough to include all that are really desirous, from any motives, of putting an end to the time-hallowed tyranny of the sword, we might ere-long rally for its utter abolition every well-wisher to mankind. Let us do our whole duty ; and not another war shall ever sweep its besom of blood and fire over our own land, or any other portion of the civilized world.

MILITARY PREPARATIONS.

IN civilized society all benevolent men profess to deprecate war, yet it is viewed by most as a necessary evil, an event which must inevitably occur, and therefore they deem it not only the part of wisdom, but an imperative duty, to be ready to repel it by military preparations, and hence all classes join to arm their governments, and surrender their persons and fortunes to them, as instruments of war.

It is the object of this paper to show that this is a fallacy. It is not intended to take up the question of the right a Christian people have to defend themselves by military resistance, when actually invaded, without cause. Admit that every nation has such right, and that in such case it is a duty to exercise it, still, the case put is a chimerical one, and will afford no vindication of military preventions of such dangers as are ever likely to occur. The abstract right of martial resistance may be conceded, and yet protest made against military preparations, on the ground of inexpediency.

In doing this, five propositions will be advanced. 1. There is no real necessity for war, and no civilized nation has reason to expect it, which deals justly and kindly with other nations. The idea, that powerful sovereigns are ever watchful to find a community defenceless, to invade its territory, without provocation, for conquest or rapine, is one derived from barbarous ages, when nations were indeed little else than bands of robbers, and the precautions deemed necessary then are unadapted to modern civilization. Nations may make aggressive war on others from false views of national honor, or to redress some imagined wrong, or secure some alleged rights; but all disclaim the desire of so doing without any other reason than the mere purpose of conquest or injury, and it is an insulting calumny to insist that all such disclaimers are insincere. What patriot of any country will admit this criminal motive for himself or his countrymen, towards foreign nations? Ask the citizens of any land, and each will deny it, to a man. How illiberal then to impute it to all other people as well disposed as his own.

It must be admitted that most unjustifiable invasions—even of recent date—have been made by powerful nations on those who were unable to resist them; but in these cases justice has always been professed, and wrongs always alleged; and however inconsistent these professions may appear to us, they may, under the blinding influence of interest or passion, have been quite sincere with them. These invasions, too, have always been met with a show of resistance, which has provoked the pride of the aggressors. Has any authorized attack been made on any people resigning all their claims in non-resisting friendship? Not one. Ascribe such a

conduct to any government, and the charge will be met with indignant denial.

2. The evils arising from military preparations are greater in the whole than those that would be incurred by submission to any probable foreign demand they are designed to resist. Let us appreciate fully the enormous evils of such preparations.

First, in regard to the expense of them. In the United States, for instance, where they are small, compared with those of other nations, the military expenses are five-sixths of all the expenditures of government, in time of peace, and in fifteen or twenty years, amount to more than the most grasping nation would desire or be able to obtain from these States by force, if unresisted, and if disposed for such robbery. A single fact will exemplify this expense:—It has been proved by the calculations of an intelligent merchant, that the annual cost of the comparatively small navy of the United States is greater than the whole annual amount of the freights of their mercantile marine for the same years.

This instance is given merely as a small sample. The military and naval expenses of Great Britain are nine-tenths of all the expenditures of that profuse government; and other European nations are burdened in a proportionate amount. Calculations have been made which demonstrate, that if the appropriations for military purposes in civilized countries were withheld from them, and applied to benevolent objects, the Christian religion might be preached in every land, and the blessings of education extended to every family on the globe; science might be advanced, justice dispensed, slavery and pauperism nearly obliterated, and peace publications so thoroughly diffused as to render war forever impossible, and military preparations consequently unnecessary. And enough would be left to sustain a Congress and Courts of Nations, by which their interests might be regulated as justly and peaceably as now in the most enlightened province of the world.

A heavier charge of evil against military establishments is their corrupting influence. Every such establishment,—by the testimony of military men themselves,—is a school of vice. The places most fruitful of intemperance, licentiousness, profanity and infidelity, are camps, fortresses, and ships of war. Can honesty and respect for right be expected in institutions whose avowed purpose is to execute robbery for the public, and to overwhelm all rational adjudication by physical power; or even safety for life be found among those who are pledged to murder by wholesale at the bidding of their commander?

Another evil in military establishments is their despotism. The myriads of men employed in these establishments are the most abject slaves, exposed to hardships and cruelties as great as those of the African slave on the plantation; their health, comfort and morals, less regarded, and the exposure to violent death, and compulsion to crime superadded; and this military tyranny is not confined to the soldiers and sailors of standing armies and navies, but is diffused, especially by the militia system, through the whole

community. Every citizen is taught by it the necessity of arbitrary discipline for defensive energy, and is compelled to yield his money, his person and his conscience, whenever his government shall demand them, even for public crime.

Perhaps the greatest evil in military establishments is that for which they are most commended,—the encouragement of a martial spirit. It is impossible to receive the doctrines of the gospel faithfully, and admit for a moment the innocency of the martial spirit. A nation imbued with this spirit can never become truly Christian, or fully civilized; practical infidelity and proud barbarism are its essential characters. With those who concur in this view, the question of the expediency of martial preparations is at once decided; for if the interests of the spirit and of eternity are higher than those of the body and of time, it would be better, God permitting, that a nation should be trodden down, every right overthrown, all property and even life or liberty destroyed, than, with the highest prosperity, every soul in it should be immersed in a sentiment allying it to the dark passions of an infernal world.

3. The third proposition is, that a kind, forbearing policy secures rights more constantly and fully than the menacing aspect of armed preparation for defence. That this is true in private life, will probably be admitted by every observer of human society. But if human nature is the same in the mass as in detail, is not the good policy of this defenceless, confiding position as applicable to nations as to individuals? Innumerable cases are cited by the friends of peace to show that this policy, tried on a limited scale, has ever been successful; the only instance where it has been tried by a whole nation or province, is that of Pennsylvania, under the government of the Friends, which, maintained for more than seventy years without arms, was never invaded, or even insulted by its barbarous and warlike neighbors.

But the authority of the gospel bears on the policy as well as the innocency of defensive armaments. Christ has enjoined forbearance and forgiveness on his followers, without any qualification as to their numbers, condition or political connections. Is it to be believed he would have done so, if such a course would have exposed all the rights and property of society to destruction? Suppose that a true insight into human character and the voice of history did not teach that forbearance is more conquering than defiance, will we not trust the unerring judgment of the Omniscient more than the short-sighted maxims of human experience?

4. War is more frequently caused by military preparations than it is supposed to be averted by them, both by encouraging in any nation supporting them, an arrogant bearing towards foreign nations, and by provoking the pride of those nations, by their defying appearance. In a report of a careful research into the causes of wars among Christian nations, by order of the Massachusetts Peace Society, twenty-three were enumerated which arose entirely from the pride provoked, or alarm excited by the increasing armaments of their neighbors, and from no other cause. Here, then,

is proof from history of the proposition now considered; the instrument alleged to be for the prevention of war, is actually one of the causes of its production. And the report referred to, states, that of sixteen of these wars not settled by compromise, eleven terminated in favor of the powers provoked or alarmed, and the overthrow of the trusted preparations for defence.

These facts ought to surprise none who seriously reflect on the subject, for they are conformable to the known character of human governments. The spirit of chivalry, which always bent before confiding gentleness, and ever stood erect in resistance to attempted intimidation, is the universal characteristic of political rulers; and if defensive armaments do not now provoke all the assaults it is their nature and tendency to do, it is not because they inspire fear, but because, as every nation commits the same folly, a tacit understanding seems to exist that they will not take this distrustful precaution as an insult from each other.

5. Lastly, Military preparations for defence are always liable to be used for purposes of aggression. The considerations before offered have gone upon the ground that such preparations have been strictly confined to the object of defence; but has this been the case with any powerful nation? Can any government of Europe or America repel the charge of inflicting the aggressions of their "defensive" preparations on weaker communities? It is almost proverbially true that no man can be trusted with great power without an irresistible desire to abuse it. This is a solemn consideration for the Christian patriot who voluntarily contributes to the support of military defences. Let him beware that he does not thereby render himself accessory to the murderous aggression of offensive war. No form of government can check this tendency of military establishments to wrong; and no political combination can exempt the individual supporting them from the responsibility of participating in their crimes. At the bar of eternal justice every one must answer for the means and temptation he gives to the Imperial, the Royal or the Presidential robber to satiate his avarice or ambition in the blood of his fellow men.

If the preceding arguments are conclusive; if there is no ground for attributing hostile dispositions to other nations; if the evils of military preparations to meet aggressions are greater than those which would be incurred by submission to them; if kindness would be a safer defence than intimidation; if a martial attitude is often a provocation to war; and if provisions for defence are generally liable to be used for offensive war; why should these burdensome and pernicious establishment be maintained? Let Christian nations abolish them, and adopt the gospel policy of forbearing benevolence, and they will be safe. The arm of Omnipotence will protect them; the crimson stream of blood, and the darker torrent of vice will be stopped for ever.

PROGRESS OF PEACE,

OR

HOW MUCH ALREADY ACCOMPLISHED IN THIS CAUSE.

THE cause of peace seeks, as its only object, the entire abolition of war. Nearly thirty years have elapsed (1844) since the origin of this movement; and here we may well pause awhile to *review its progress, and see how much is already gained.*

It is very difficult, however, to ascertain the exact degree of success in a cause like this. It lacks the usual criteria. It tells not of so many Bibles circulated, or so many heralds of the cross sent forth; of so many churches gathered, or so many missionary stations established; of so many converts, or so many pledges. Such indices of progress belong not to this cause. Like leaven in bread, or sugar in fluids, it vanishes from our sight in the very act of accomplishing its purpose; and, if we would learn how much has been accomplished, we must trace, through a series of years, the gradual change of men's views, feelings, and habits on the subject of war. If they have clearer perceptions of its guilt or its evils; if they are less inclined to abet or tolerate appeals to the sword; if they have actually abstained from such appeals longer than they had for centuries before; if there is a growing demand from the people for other means of adjusting difficulties between nations; if the rulers of Christendom are beginning to adopt pacific expedients for the settlement of national disputes, as their permanent policy, then have we all the proofs of success which the nature of the case will admit.

Such proofs we have; and mark the change. Time was, nor long ago, when warriors received the admiration of the world; when there was scarce an advocate of peace besides the Quakers, Moravians, and a very few others; when the idea of abolishing war was scouted as the wildest of Utopian dreams; when no press, and hardly a pulpit denounced this trade of blood as inconsistent with Christianity; when war, as an arbiter of disputes between nations, was considered as equally lawful with codes and courts of law for individuals; when ministers of the gospel, otherwise excellent, preached in favor of war, both defensive and offensive, as zealously as any one now can in support of civil government, and urged their hearers, in the language of the devout and eloquent Davies, 'to cherish a war-spirit as derived from God, as a sacred, heaven-born fire.'

How altered now the tone of public sentiment. Pass through the land; traverse all Christendom; converse with every class of men; examine the various issues of the press; and at every step will you meet with views far more pacific than formerly. A change is

coming over the minds of men; and already has peace become the popular demand of the age. There is a diminished respect for men of blood, and national competition is passing from the field of battle to those departments of science, art, and industry which procure wealth, and promote refinement and happiness. Most of the standing armies of Europe are in a course of reduction, and our own States are gradually ceasing to require military drills. Every where is the art of war falling into disuse; even now is it barely tolerated as a necessary evil; and some of our legislatures are calling for measures to supersede its alleged necessity by the adoption of substitutes far better than the sword. Such substitutes popular opinion is beginning to demand; and difficulties which would, fifty or even thirty years ago, have plunged nations instantly in blood, are now adjusted often with scarce a thought of appealing to arms. Negotiation, arbitration, and other pacific measures are actually taking the place of the sword in nine cases out of ten where it was formerly used. War has ceased to be regarded as the only arbiter of national disputes; and the leading cabinets of Christendom are beginning to adopt for this purpose pacific expedients as their permanent system. Already is the international policy of Christendom materially changed; and, should this policy continue much longer, it may yet suffice to keep the peace of the civilized world for ages to come.

Observe the moral machinery set at work to produce such results. In nearly every country where any enterprises of the kind can be sustained, good men are combining their efforts for the abolition of war; and these associations, embracing some of the purest and most gifted minds in Christendom, have put in operation a variety of simple yet effective means. They employ the living voice, and are sending forth lecturers. They wield the press, and are circulating pamphlets, periodicals and tracts, far and wide. They have also published volumes; and some of these, written with singular ability, have gone to the libraries of the learned, to halls of legislation, and palaces of kings. Millions of pages on the subject of peace have, from year to year, been scattered over the best portions of Christendom, and sent occasionally into the four quarters of the globe.

Glance at the other agencies drawn into co-operation with us. We have waked the pulpit; and thousands of ministers are now preaching peace as a part of the gospel. We have enlisted the press; and multitudes of periodicals, both religious and secular, are beginning to discuss this grand question of the world. We have also laid the claims of peace before the Christian community; and not only individual churches, but ecclesiastical bodies representing almost every considerable denomination in our land, have passed resolves in its favor, and commended it to the sympathies, prayers and patronage of good men. We have likewise brought the subject before not a few of our higher seminaries; and in these it is attracting attention, calling forth discussion, and raising up youthful friends who may one day become its champions. In

some of them, prizes have been annually given for the best essay on peace; and these essays, first delivered in public by their authors, and then sent forth to the world through some periodical, must contribute not a little to that change of popular sentiment which alone is requisite for the entire abolition of war.

Before rulers, also, have we brought the claims of this cause. On the alarm of war, we have remonstrated with them against a resort to arms, and have occasionally been successful in holding them back from bloodshed. We have shown them the possibility of superseding war by better means, and urged upon them the duty of adopting such substitutes in place of the cannon and the sword. We have petitioned them especially to obviate all necessity for war, either by incorporating in their treaties a pledge to settle their disputes in the last resort by reference to umpires mutually chosen, or by calling a congress of nations to frame a specific, authoritative code of international law, and establish an international tribunal to interpret that law, and adjust all difficulties which may arise among the great brotherhood of nations.

But popular opposition would be the surest safeguard against war; and already are the people rallying to prevent the return of this terrible scourge. Even now does their voice decide in fact the question of peace or war; nor is there a despot in Christendom that would hazard an appeal to arms without first feeling the popular pulse. There is no escape; the will of the people *must* be heeded; and just as fast as they are enlightened, will rulers find it difficult, if not impossible, to play any longer this game of blood at the expense of their subjects. And the people are fast getting the light requisite for this purpose. The question is before them; and already is it discussed more or less by high and low, by old and young; in the pulpit, the senate, and the forum; in literary societies, in popular lyceums, in nearly all our seminaries of learning; in volumes and pamphlets, in quarterlies and monthlies, in weekly and daily newspapers; by the farmer, the mechanic and the merchant, the citizen and the soldier.

Mark the result of these and kindred influences. After centuries of almost incessant conflict, the general peace of Europe has been preserved ever since the origin of efforts in this cause, now nearly thirty years; a longer period of rest from war than Christendom ever knew before.

These efforts have probably saved ourselves from several wars. It is impossible to tell how many dangers have been so far obviated as to keep them entirely from our knowledge; but during the last nine years, we have been in imminent exposure to war, first with France, next with Mexico, and finally with England herself. Had public opinion been what it was fifty years before, we could hardly have escaped a war in either case; but the change of sentiment through Christendom that prevented a calamity so dreadful, has resulted under God mainly from the efforts and the influences which together constitute the cause of peace. Provocations not half as great, have frequently occasioned fierce, protracted wars; and

nothing but the altered views of the age, especially of the parties themselves, averted that deplorable catastrophe.

We have not room to review in detail all the cases just alluded to ; but let us briefly revert to the danger of a war with Mexico. Nearly the whole South and West were calling aloud for it, and Congress was on the eve of taking measures which would have rendered it inevitable ; but just at that crisis, the friends of peace petitioned our government to accept the proposal of Mexico for the settlement of their difficulties by reference to an umpire to be mutually chosen. The appeal was well-timed, and enabled the venerable JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, as he says himself, "to declare to the House and the country not only my aversion to a war with Mexico, but the painful feelings with which I have seen it recommended. It will operate," he continues, "as a check on the committee to prevent their reporting any war-measure against Mexico, which they *would infallibly have done*, had not their disposition to it been met at the threshold. The proposal of a reference to arbitration was itself so reasonable, that no voice was heard in Congress against it ; and very soon afterwards, it was conditionally accepted. This removed all immediate danger of a war ; and if the petitioners of the peace societies had never rendered to their country any other service, they would have deserved the thanks of the whole nation for this."

Reflect on the importance of these results—three wars averted from our own land, and the general peace of Christendom preserved for nearly thirty years of almost incessant war that sacrificed no less than nine millions of lives, and some thirty or forty thousand millions of dollars ! Is not here proof enough of the most triumphant success ? Had there been no drunkard, not a solitary case of intoxication, in our whole country for thirty years, would not such a fact alone prove the cause of temperance to have been gloriously successful ?

These results are undeniable ; but how many would fain account for them by quoting merely the general influences of civilization, and commerce, and Christianity, and popular education, and public opinion, and modern diplomacy, and recent experience of the evils inseparable from war ! But if these influences are the cause of the world's peace for the last thirty years, why did they prove so utterly unsuccessful down to the very time, and become so successful ever since, and *only* since the time when the friends of peace began their united efforts ? Before the battle of Waterloo, was there in Christendom no civilization, no commerce, no Christianity, no pulpit or press, no popular education, no public opinion, no arts of diplomacy, no bitter experience of the evils inflicted by this master-scurge of the world ? Yes ; all these general influences were in existence and pretty full operation ages before. Why then did they fail to insure peace ? For the same reason that the power of steam existed all over the earth thousands of years before it propelled a ship, or twirled a spindle—nobody

applied it to that purpose. For the same reason that hundreds of water-falls poured from our own hills, century after century, without turning a single water-wheel—nobody applied them to that purpose. For the same reason that all the intelligence, virtue, and piety in our land failed for generations to check the progress of intemperance—nobody applied them to that specific purpose. Such an application was indispensable. It was no special increase of intelligence, or patriotism, or piety, or any other good influences, that accomplished the temperance reform, but the concentration of them all upon that specific object. Here is the whole secret; and without this, our intelligence, and patriotism, and virtue, and piety, and philanthropy might have continued till doomsday without rolling back the deluge of liquid fire that was sweeping over our land. Just so in the cause of peace. The civilization, and commerce, and Christianity, and public opinion, and all the other general influences so flippantly quoted by some as having secured for Christendom her last thirty years of peace, failed for centuries to prevent bloodshed, until the friends of peace, like those of temperance in their cause, seized those general influences, and concentrated them on their single purpose of abolishing war. Such influences are quite essential; but it is only their right application that can secure the result sought. They are the elements or instruments of every good cause. So in missions and temperance; but would any man, for this reason, attempt to account for all that has been accomplished in those causes by quoting such general influences without an allusion to the special efforts made by the associated friends of temperance and missions? Yet we might as well do this, as think to account for the peace of Christendom for the last thirty years without giving to the cause of peace, under God, the chief credit of a result so immensely important to the world.

But some minds it is extremely difficult to cure of this strange skepticism. 'We cannot,' say they, 'deny the glorious results of which you speak; but they came from influences not dependent on your movement. It is the gospel that has produced them.'—True; but it is only the gospel as applied *since* the commencement of our efforts; for that very gospel failed for ages to produce such results. Why? Solely because it was not then applied as it is now beginning to be. But why not extend this reasoning to all other enterprises? The gospel is the origin, the main-spring of the missionary, Bible, and temperance movements; but would you say there is no need of such enterprises, because the gospel, as applied by them, has confessedly effected every one of the results commonly ascribed to their agency? Because it is the medicine that cures, is there no need of its being applied?

'But commerce and travel have done much for peace.'—Very true; but they have done far more for missions and other benevolent enterprises. Shall we then say, that the latter do not deserve the credit of their own acknowledged achievements? Our tracts, our Bibles, our missionaries are sent round the globe in the vessels of our merchants; is the credit of the result all due to com-

merce? Would you reserve none to tract, Bible or missionary societies?

‘But the pulpit has done more for peace than your peace societies.’—Be it so; but because it has done a hundred fold more for missions, is the missionary society of no use? Did not the pioneers of that cause first wake the pulpit to its duty in behalf of a perishing world? Do not its labors now constitute an integral part of the missionary enterprise? Just so of peace. It has prompted ministers of the gospel to do nearly all they have ever done on the subject, and their labors in this cause, as in that of missions, have become part and parcel of the movement; but what should we think of the Christian who would urge this fact as a reason why nothing more should be done for the missionary cause? ‘Ministers are at work in its behalf; let us therefore abandon it.’ Strange logic; yet the very same that even good men sometimes use in order to neutralize the claims of peace.

‘But the press, by the multitude of its brief, pithy articles, is doing more than the peace society to prevent war.’—Grant, if you please, this position also; yet it was the peace society that first enlisted the press in this work, and has furnished nearly every thing hitherto published on the subject in our newspapers and other periodicals. Services of this sort may all be traced, directly or indirectly, to the cause of peace as the main-spring.

‘Rulers, too, are coming to your aid.’—True again; but they did not generally alter their course until the friends of peace pressed its claims upon them, or diffused among the people such views as effectually demanded a pacific instead of a warlike policy. The change in their measures has resulted mainly from the influences set at work by the associated friends of peace.

‘But the world has grown too wise to repeat its old game of war.’—So have vast multitudes become too wise to taste the drunkard’s drink; but where did they learn this wisdom? In the school of temperance. If nations are now too wise to play the suicidal game of war, whence came this wisdom? Was it not from the cause of peace? If not, how came all Christendom to put this wisdom in practice just at the time, and only since the time, when our enterprise began?

‘But the wars of Napoleon taught a lesson too terrible to be forgotten soon, if ever.’—Terrible indeed they were, but little more so than some previous wars which nevertheless did not long restrain Europe from the sword. The superior efficacy of the last lesson has resulted less from its own nature than from the special efforts made by the friends of peace to impress it on the public mind; and without such efforts, that lesson would long ago have lost its power to hold even Christendom back from blood. Why did not the ‘Thirty Years War,’ which early in the seventeenth century made the very heart of Europe a wilderness, teach its nations their present policy, and even prevent the rise of such a monster as Napoleon?

‘But nations now understand their own interests much better

than formerly, and perceive far more clearly the advantages of peace, and the evils of war.'—It may be so; but this they always knew well enough for every practical purpose; and if their knowledge is now greater or more influential than formerly, it is mainly because the friends of peace have so often and so earnestly inculcated this truth upon them.

'After all, however, there is little principle in this new policy of peace; in pursuing it, nations have an eye solely to their own interests.'—Be it so, if you please; but if they actually discard war, and make peace their permanent policy, we shall not quarrel with them about their motives. All we seek is the peace of the world; and, if men will for *any* reason cease from war, we gain our whole object.

'This they *are* doing; and since the leading influences of the age are so fast setting in favor of peace, there is no need of any more efforts in this cause.'—We rejoice in the fact here stated; but nearly all the influences of the world *were* on the side of war until the friends of peace united to turn the current. Look through Christendom; and you will find not only its thirty years of peace, but nearly all its changes of opinion in favor of our object, as fairly attributable to the cause of peace, as the progress of temperance is to that cause, or the spread of the gospel to missionary efforts. True, God has lent his aid to the work; but this disproves neither its success nor its necessity. Can any enterprise succeed without his smiles? Does his blessing supersede means? Because he works, is there no need of man's agency? In every enterprise which God designs to render successful, he raises up a variety of auxiliary influences; but these, so far from superseding the cause itself, only form his part of the movement, and insure its ultimate triumph by the pledge of his approbation and blessing.

Let us not imagine, then, that our work is already done. Done! it is only begun, and will require ages to finish it. We have not yet beaten swords into plough-shares, but merely kept them in their scabbards. We have not killed the monster; we have only caged and chained him. The war-gangrene still cankers the heart of Christendom, and poisons the very fountains of its morality and religion. The whole war-system still remains; and the magazine needs only a spark to kindle such an explosion as would convulse the civilized world. The war-spirit, so far from being extinct, merely sleeps; and the demon waits only a sufficient provocation to unkennel his blood-hounds, and send them howling in rage as fierce, and havoc as terrible as ever, over the fairest fields of Christendom itself. We have as yet no perfect security; nor can we ever have until nations shall give up the war-principle of adjusting their differences by the sword, and establish in its place a permanent system of rational, legal, peaceful adjudication.

Thanks to the God of peace for the cheering success thus far vouchsafed; but this should only stimulate to still greater exertions. No other enterprise has done more, if so much, in proportion to the means used. Contrast these means with the results already reached

During the first twenty-five years from the origin of this cause, its receipts through Christendom did not probably average more than four thousand dollars a year; while the war-system was annually costing Christendom, in one way and another, more than one thousand millions! Less for peace in twenty-five years than for the war-system, even in peace, a single hour!! Yet this mere pittance, spent in the use of moral means, in a right application of the gospel to the case, has under God done more than all the myriads wasted on her war-system, to preserve the peace of Christendom the last thirty years.

What encouragement, then, to efforts in this cause! Let the requisite means be used; and ultimate, if not speedy success is certain. Let the gospel, wherever preached, be rightly applied to war; let the press, in the ubiquity and power of its influence, be fully enlisted in behalf of this enterprise; let editors not only lend their columns to its advocacy, but indite articles of their own in its behalf; let the pulpit open its moral battery, and pour upon the public mind volley after volley of God's truth on this subject; let ministers of every name take the cause under their patronage, and labor for it as they do for temperance or missions; let Christians as a body come up to this work in earnest and take hold of it as their own; let the friends of this object organize themselves into societies or committees to co-operate with us by raising funds, procuring lectures, and circulating our publications; let churches remember this cause as they do others in their prayers, and contribute regularly and liberally to its funds; let the friends of peace spontaneously unite in petitioning government to provide, in arbitration or a congress of nations, ample substitutes for the sword; let all that deprecate a calamity so fearful, combine at once to resist any and every war that may hereafter be threatened;—let all this be done, and we may see war ere-long vanishing, like dew before the rising sun, from every land blest with the light of the gospel, and eventually all nations beating their swords into plough-shares, their spears into pruning-hooks, and learning war no more.

Such a result *must* come, for God has promised it; yet never can it come without the use of such means as he has appointed for the purpose. *The gospel must be applied aright to the case.* Here is our work; and fain would we press all good men into it. Ministers must preach; Christians must pray; the eloquent must plead; the poor must give their mite, and the rich their hundreds, if not their thousands. The cause requires a system of operations incomparably more expensive than that of Prison Discipline; and yet upon this did John Howard spend from his own purse an average of nearly ten thousand dollars a year for more than fifteen years in succession. Oh for some Howard or Thornton to rise, and give his thousands and tens of thousands to this blessed work of a world's entire, perpetual pacification!

WASTE OF PROPERTY BY WAR.

THE value of property can be estimated only by the purposes it may subserve. It supports life, procures comforts, and furnishes means of improvement, happiness and salvation. These uses measure its value; and in this view it has been made, by writers on political economy, an index to the prosperity of a nation, and a criterion of its capacity for enjoyment and usefulness.

War is the grand impoverisher of the world. In estimating its havoc of property, we must inquire not only how much it costs, and how much it destroys, but how far it prevents the acquisition of wealth; and a full answer to these three questions would exhibit an amount of waste beyond the power of any imagination adequately to conceive. Such an answer we shall not now attempt, but merely glance, first, at *the prevention of wealth by war*, next *its incidental havoc*, and finally *its direct expenses*.

I. Consider, then, how *war prevents the accumulation of property*. Its mere uncertainties must operate as a very serious hindrance; for, while every thing is afloat, and no forecast can anticipate what changes may take place any month, men will not embark in those undertakings by which alone wealth is rapidly acquired. They shrink from the risk, and wisely wait to see what is coming; and thus the main-springs of a nation's prosperity,—its capital, its enterprise, and its best facilities for making money,—remain comparatively idle and useless. This cause alone, an invariable attendant upon war, is sufficient to paralyze the energies of business in all its departments.

Still worse, however, are the sudden changes of war. These precede its commencement, accompany its progress, and follow its close, baffling the utmost precaution, keeping business unsettled, and actually wasting, as well as preventing, a large amount of property. They discourage enterprise, defeat the best plans, and produce a vast multitude of failures. They may, here and there, make a fortune; but, where they make one, they ruin or mar a hundred. The mere dread of such changes must paralyze,

more or less, every department of business, and cripple nearly all efforts for the acquisition of wealth.

Hence ensue a general derangement and stagnation of business. Nearly all its departments are either thrown into confusion, or brought entirely to a stand; and thus the main energies of a people, even if not absorbed in war, must either rust in idleness, or be frittered away in baffled schemes, and fruitless exertions.

Mark the inevitable result in the disuse or unprofitable employment of capital, industry and skill in commerce and manufactures, in agriculture, the various arts, and all departments of labor and enterprise. These are the great fountains of wealth; but in war they are either dried up, or forced into new and unproductive channels. Capital, as in the case of Holland during the late wars of Europe, (1793-1815,) is locked up, or sent out of the country, because there are at home so few opportunities of profitable or safe investment. Enterprise is checked, because there is so little reward or demand for its products. There is no foreign market for the fruits of agriculture; and land ceases to be tilled with care and success. There is no outlet for manufactures; and the shop and the factory are closed, or kept at work with little vigor and less profit. Intercourse between nations is almost suspended; and commerce stands still, vessels rot at the wharves, and sea-ports, once alive with the hum of business, are cut off from the principal sources of their wealth, and sink into speedy, perhaps irrecoverable decay. All the main-springs of national prosperity are broken, or crippled, or kept in operation at immense disadvantage. An incalculable amount of capital in money, and ships, and stores, and factories, and workshops, and machinery, and tools, and raw materials, and buildings, and inventions, and canals, and railways, and industry, and skill, and talent, is withdrawn from use, and, for want of profitable employment, goes more or less to waste. How much is thus lost, it would be vain even to conjecture; but we should be safe in supposing that in these ways war might, besides all it spends, and all it destroys, reduce for a time the value of a nation's entire property from thirty to fifty per cent.!

But the most direct influence of war on national prosperity, comes from the sudden withdrawal of men in the vigor of life. In such men are found the mines or laboratories of a nation's wealth; but what multitudes of these

does the war-system require for its support! The standing warriors of Europe are (1844) about three millions even in a time of peace, and exceeds four millions and a half in war, with large additions to meet occasional emergencies. Not a few of these millions may have been the main-springs of business; and their removal can scarcely fail to derange and cripple every one of its departments. All of them must possess an unusual share of strength for labor, since no others would be equal to the hardships of war; and the sudden abstraction of such men by thousands from every part of a country, and from every kind of employment, must paralyze the entire industry of a nation. Agriculture, trades, manufactures, all kinds of business must receive a severe and lasting shock.

Still worse is the influence of war on the habits indispensable to the thrift of a people. It mars the character necessary for the acquisition of property. It debases their minds, corrupts their morals, and undermines almost every species of excellence among them. It renders them idle, dishonest and profligate. It fills the land with persons who prey upon society like moths or gangrene. It destroys the habits needed to enrich a people, and introduces others fatally calculated to impoverish any country. It represses almost every thing good, and gives fresh and fearful activity to whatever is bad. It is a hot-bed of evils. Idleness and vagrancy, fraud, theft and robbery, the lowest vices, and the blackest crimes, are both the nurses and the offspring of war.

Such considerations as these we might pursue to almost any extent; but enough has been said to show, that all the enormous expenses of war would not equal the loss of property occasioned by the combined and permanent influence of such causes alone as we have here specified. Take an illustration. When our population was some fifteen or sixteen millions, an eminent statesman of our own estimated the annual production of the United States at \$1,400,000,000, or nearly ninety dollars to each inhabitant; and, if we suppose war to prevent only one fifth of all this, the loss would be no less than \$280,000,000 a year! Reckoning our present population (1844) at twenty millions, the annual sacrifice would be about \$350,000,000. But, supposing the amount of annual production to average only fifty dollars to each inhabitant, then Christendom, with a population of 250,000,000, would lose \$2,500,000,000 a year; and the whole globe, with 1,000,000,000 people, would sacrifice

the enormous sum of ten thousand millions!! Such a result seems incredible; and yet the calculation for our own country is probably below the truth, and may serve as a clue to the boundless waste of property by war even in ways which are generally overlooked.

II. Glance next at *the immediate, incidental havoc of property by war*. Such havoc must, from the nature of the case, be immense. Follow an army, ancient or modern, savage or civilized; trace the course of the French under Napoleon in Russia or Portugal, setting fire in one case to every house for one hundred and fifty miles; look at even British troops in Spain or India; see them trampling down harvests, and burning villages, destroying towns, ravaging entire provinces, and pillaging city after city; and can you conceive the amount of property thus wasted? Bring the case home, and say, if Boston contains property to the amount of more than one hundred millions, and New York two or three times as much, how many millions either city would lose from capture, or a close and protracted siege.

We can ascertain more nearly, yet very imperfectly, *what is destroyed on the ocean*. The sum total of our own exports and imports may have ranged, for the last ten years, from two hundred to two hundred and forty or fifty millions of dollars a year; nearly as large an amount may perhaps have been interchanged along our immense coast; and no small part of both would be liable in war to be seized by our enemies. The imports into one of our cities amounted in a single quarter of 1836, to thirty-six millions; and a war, suddenly occurring, might have found afloat on the ocean an equal amount destined to the same port, and scores of millions belonging to the whole nation. The nature of the case forbids accuracy of calculation, yet shows that commerce is liable to losses beyond the power of computation or even conjecture. Since the close of our revolutionary struggle, we have been engaged in foreign war less than three years; but it would probably require some hundreds of millions to cover all the losses we have sustained from depredations on our commerce.

Another source of loss to a nation's wealth, is found in the *waste of life by war*. It takes men at the very age when their labor would be most productive, and shortens their life more than twenty years in war, and some ten or fifteen in peace! The statistics of mortality among men devoted to this work of blood, are truly startling. Soldiers, though

in the bloom and vigor of life, live on an average only about three years in a time of war, and die even in peace twice as fast as galley slaves, and more rapidly than men ordinarily do at the age of fifty and sixty!

What a loss of property must such a waste of life occasion? Let us suppose it costs an average of \$500 to raise a soldier, and reckon his labor for the ten years of his life shortened in peace, and twenty years in war, at \$150 a year. If the standing armies of Europe are three millions in a time of peace, she sustains, at this rate, a loss of \$1,500,000,000 for their training, \$450,000,000 a year for labor, and \$4,500,000,000 for the shortening of their life ten years; an average in peace of \$840,000,000 a year from this source alone!! Reduce these estimates one half, and you still have, even in peace, the enormous sacrifice of \$420,000,000 a year. In a time of war, the armies of Europe, when full, are supposed to be some four millions and a half; but, putting them in round numbers at four millions, the loss would be for their training \$2,000,000,000, for their labor \$600,000,000 a year, and for cutting short their life twenty years, \$12,000,000,000; an average loss in war, if we suppose a soldier's life then to be only three years, of \$5,266,000,000 a year!! Such a result, however incredible, comes fairly from the premises; and, should you reduce these estimates even eighty per cent., you would still make out a loss of more than \$1,000,000,000, every year of actual war from this source alone! If we extend our calculation to the five millions of persons in the army of Xerxes, to the millions of Ninus, and Semiramis, and Jenghiz-khan, to all the armies from Nimrod to the present time, we should find, from the mere waste of life, an aggregate exceeding our utmost conceptions. We have not taken into account the superior value of officers; and still the result proves the loss of property in this way alone to be much greater than all the direct expenses of war.

III. Look, then, at *the actual cost of war*. Even in peace, it is enormous. The amount of money wasted on fortifications and ships, on arms and ammunition, on monuments and other military demonstrations, it is impossible to calculate with precision or certainty. The expense of the wall round Paris was estimated (1840) at 250,000,000 francs, or nearly \$50,000,000; a single triumphal arch in that city, only one among the hundreds scattered through Christendom, cost 10,000,000 francs; and we know not how

many millions more were expended in the pageantry of removing Napoleon's remains from St. Helena to their present resting-place. The palace of Versailles, mainly the fruit of war, is acknowledged to have cost 1,000,000,000 francs, or \$200,000,000, a sum sufficient to build the whole city of New York, or four such cities as Boston. Go to Greenwich or Chelsea, and there see what immense sums are spent on the diseased, crippled and worn-out servants of war. Survey the grand arsenal of England at Woolwich, and imagine how many millions have been wasted on its twenty-seven thousand cannon, and its hundreds of thousands of small arms. Millions of dollars have been expended on some single forts in our own country; and still the highest authority assured us in 1835, that thirty millions more would hardly suffice to put our entire coast and frontiers in even a *tolerable* state of defence.

But the original cost of these materials of war is not the only expense they occasion; immense sums are required every year to keep them in repair. Here lies the chief care of the war-system in peace; and, should you go through Europe, or even our own country, you would find a vast number of shops, and foundries, and ship-yards constantly at work for this purpose. This single item of expense cannot, for all Christendom, be less than \$100,000,000 a year!

Still more expensive, however, is the maintenance of an army either in war or in peace. Thiers, the distinguished historian of France, and once a leading member of her cabinet, reckons the expense of supporting a soldier to be in Austria about \$130, in France \$146, in Prussia nearly \$200, in England still greater; and it would be a very low estimate to suppose, that every soldier in Christendom costs an average of \$150 a year. It is impossible to tell the exact number of standing warriors in Christendom; but they cannot be less, and may be more, than 3,000,000 in peace. Aside from naval forces, the army of Spain has been 120,000, that of England 100,000, with the addition of 200,000 in war, and an indefinite number for emergencies in her eastern possessions; that of France from 350,000 to 400,000, and in 1840 even 900,000; that of Austria 750,000 in war, probably not less than 400,000 in peace; that of Russia 850,000 in peace, and reckoned by some as high as 1,000,000. If we put the peace establishment of Christendom as low as 3,000,000, and suppose them all to require for their annual support an average of only \$150

each, the result would be \$450,000,000 a year for their sustenance; and reckoning one officer to ten soldiers, and awarding to each of the latter an English shilling a day, or \$87 a year for wages, and to the former an average salary of \$500 a year, or less than six shillings a day, we should have, for the pay of the whole, no less than \$385,000,000 a year, or a grand total, for both sustenance and pay, of \$835,000,000!! Reckoning the annual cost of their sustenance only \$100 each; and, with the paltry compensation of one shilling a day for officers as well as privates, we reach the enormous sum of \$561,000,000 a year!

We cannot well conceive how much the leading nations of Europe waste upon their war-system even in peace. The annual charge of Great Britain for her war-debt alone has been some twenty-eight or thirty millions sterling a year, not less than \$140,000,000; exceeding, by more than one-third, all the taxable property in the state of Ohio in 1836. The war-department of France in 1819, a year of peace, cost twenty times as much as her whole civil list. In 1827 England paid in peace \$220,000,000 for war-purposes, and for all her civil offices only one-fortieth part of that sum. In 1825, another year of peace, her entire expenses amounted to \$256,000,000, more than half the wealth of the whole state of New York as estimated in 1835, while her civil list for the same year was only \$4,698,000; a proportion of one to fifty-six!

Few suspect how much our own country spends upon the war-system even in peace. If we suppose our annual income for the last fifteen years to have averaged only \$24,000,000, we shall find, that not less than \$18,000,000 have been lavished upon our army and navy; three dollars for war to one for the peaceful operations of government! Still more expensive in fact is our militia system. If one person in ten among us is liable to military duty, the whole number would now be nearly 2,000,000. If we suppose that four trainings every year are necessary to keep the system in full vigor; that the yearly expenses for equipment are only three dollars for each man, and incidental expenses barely fifty cents a day; that every training absorbs one day and a half, each worth \$1.50, less than the fine usually imposed for not training; that the number of spectators is equal to that of the soldiers, allowing to each one dollar a day for time, and fifty cents for expenses; that the officers together incur half as much expense as all the

privates; we should make out a total of \$45,000,000 a year for the above items alone! Add the cost of splendid regimentals, and fine clothes, and standards, and music, and cavalry, and artillery, and arsenals, and magazines, and the incidental destruction of property, and all the injury arising from the suspension and derangement of business, and vices contracted on such occasions; and we shall not wonder, that one of our ablest and most candid writers (Hon. William Jay,) should have reckoned "the yearly aggregate expense of our militia," even when their whole number was only 1,500,000, "not much, if any short of fifty millions!" At this rate, the present number of our militia would cost us more than \$66,000,000 a year; but, if we deduct even one half of this sum, and then add our yearly expenditure of eighteen millions for the army and navy, we should make the expense of our own war-system more than fifty millions a year in a time of profound peace!

We boast of our pacific policy and habits; yet war has ever been the burden of our national expenses. In 1817, our war expenses were about nine times as large as those for all other purposes. To give some details, we expended, in 1832, for civil offices, \$1,800,758; for intercourse with foreign nations, \$325,181; for miscellaneous objects, \$2,451,203; for the army, \$5,446,035; for the naval service, \$3,956,320; for revolutionary pensions, a war charge, \$1,057,121; for various other pensions, \$127,301; for the Indian department, \$1,352,420; for the national debt, the fruit of our last war, \$17,840,309; in all, more than thirty millions and a half in one form or another for war, seventeen times as much as for the whole civil list, and about ten times as much as for all the other purposes of our government! From 1791 to 1832, a period of forty-one years, the aggregate of our expenditures, with some two years and a half of actual war, was \$842,250,891; and of this sum at least eight-ninths were for war-purposes, and merely \$37,158,047, or about one twenty-third part of the whole, for the civil list; one dollar for the support of government, to twenty-three dollars for war! During our revolutionary struggle, we borrowed of France \$7,962,959, expended from our own resources \$135,193,703, and issued of paper money \$359,547,027; in all, \$502,703,689, besides an indefinite amount of contributions from individuals and states. From 1816 to 1834, eighteen years, our national expenses amounted to \$463,915,756; and of this sum,

nearly four hundred millions went in one way and another for war, and only sixty-four millions for all other objects! Here then we have, even in a time of peace, twenty-two millions a year for war, and about three millions and a half, less than one-sixth of the whole, for the peaceful operations of a government that plumes itself on its pacific policy! If we take into account all the expenses and all the losses of war to this country, it will be found to have wasted for us, in sixty years, some two or three thousand millions of dollars!!

But look at the direct expenses of war. A single first-rate ship of the line is supposed to cost us, in active service, full half a million of dollars a year; and the number of war-ships in Christendom, though few of the first class, has been estimated at more than two thousand. Our last war, though cheap in comparison with most wars, required simply for its prosecution more than fifty millions a year. England expended in our revolutionary war nearly \$700,000,000, the wars consequent on the French Revolution, cost her more than \$5,000,000,000; and the wars of all Christendom, even of Europe alone, from 1793 to 1815, a period of only twenty-two years, wasted barely for their support, some \$15,000,000,000;—a sum so far beyond all ordinary calculation or conception, that a person, beginning at the birth of our Savior, and counting thirty a minute for twelve hours every day, would not finish the whole even at the close of the present century!

Take from an English writer a glimpse of England's expenditures for some of her great wars. From 1688 to 1815, a period of 127 years, she spent sixty-five in war, two more than in peace. The war of 1688 continued nine years, and increased her expenditures \$180,000,000. Then came the war of the Spanish succession, and absorbed in eleven years more than \$300,000,000. Next was the Spanish war of 1739, which cost in nine years \$270,000,000. Then came the seven years' war of 1756, in the course of which England spent \$560,000,000. The next was the American war of 1775, which lasted eight years, and cost \$680,000,000. The French Revolutionary war of nine years from 1793, occasioned an expenditure of \$2,320,000,000. During the war against Bonaparte from 1803 to 1815, England raised by taxes \$3,855,000,000, and by loans \$1,940,000,000; in all, \$5,795,000,000, or an average of \$1,323,082 every day, and more than a million of it for war-purposes alone! In the war of 1688, she borrowed \$100,000,000; in the war of

the Spanish succession, \$162,500,000; in the Spanish war, \$145,000,000; in the Seven Years' war, \$300,000,000; in the American war, \$520,000,000; in the French Revolutionary war, \$1,005,000,000. During seven wars, lasting in all sixty-five years, she borrowed \$4,170,000,000, and raised by taxes \$5,949,000,000; making a total expenditure of \$10,115,000,000!* It has been estimated, that England spent about ten thousand millions merely in wars undertaken first to humble the Bourbons, and then to restore them to the throne which Napoleon had usurped.

Glance at the financial history of such a warlike nation as England, and mark the unbounded prodigality of war. Her average revenue during the reign of the Norman kings, was £300,000; under the Plantagenets, or Saxon line, £133,017; under the house of Lancaster, only £80,026; during that of York, £100,000; under that of Tudor, £510,000. During the entire reign of George I., there came into the treasury of Great Britain only £79,832,160, or a very little more than in the single year of 1815; during that of his successor, £217,217,301, of which he spent £157,000,000 in three wars; and during that of George III., there was expended no less than £1,386,268,446, more than \$6,000,000,000, three times as much as all the coin on the globe at the time of its greatest abundance in 1809. From 1797 to 1817, twenty years, England borrowed \$2,160,000,000, and raised by taxes \$6,192,866,066; in all, \$8,352,866,066, or an average for the twenty years of \$1,143,444 every day, and more than a million of this for war!

War has loaded all Europe with debts. It is impossible to ascertain their precise amount; but in 1829, that of Prussia was said to be \$133,000,000; that of Russia, \$158,000,000; that of Spain, \$315,000,000; that of Austria, \$351,000,000; that of Netherlands, \$668,000,000; that of France, \$874,000,000; while that of England in 1815 was \$4,395,000,000. We do not know how nearly the above sums exhibit the *present* war-debts of these countries; but the sum total now resting on Europe alone, cannot be much, if any, less than *ten thousand millions of dollars*, or five times as much as all the coin in the world!

What a maelstrom to engulf the riches of the world! All the *public* property of England was estimated in 1833

* We have here multiplied pounds by five to turn them into dollars; a little more than their real value.

at £138,715,571, less than one-sixth part of her war-debt ; and her entire resources, private as well as public, were reckoned the same year at £5,547,484,517, only a little more than six times as much as her debt in 1815. Its interest alone, if left to accumulate, would in the lapse of a few ages, consume her whole wealth. Her war-expenses even in peace would in less than seventy years exhaust all her property at home, and consume in one century all her resources over the globe ! If we consider all the ways, direct and indirect, in which the war-system destroys property, it will be found even in peace to waste for Europe alone nearly two thousand millions every year, and we should be quite moderate in putting the sum total at fifteen hundred millions !

How much, then, must war have wasted in five thousand years over the whole earth ! Look back to the time when it was the all-absorbing business of nations, every other pursuit its handmaid, and intervals of peace only resting-places to recruit for this work of blood ; imagine one-eighth, in some cases one-fifth and even one-fourth part of the population to be soldiers, all trained to war as the leading object of their life ; think of Bacchus and Sesostris with millions of warriors at their heels ; of Ninus and Semiramis with two millions of soldiers, and more than ten thousand armed chariots ; of Cyrus and Cambyses, of Alexander and Cæsar, with their ferocious successors ; of Turks and Tartars, Saracens and Crusaders ; of Tamerlane, and Jenghiz-khan, and Napoleon ; conceive these countless millions of robbers, marauders and incendiaries, not merely consuming for their own support an amount altogether incalculable, but burning villages and cities, laying waste empires, and ravaging the whole earth age after age with fire and sword ; and it would seem a low estimate to suppose, that the entire course of war has wasted fifty times as much as all the property now on the globe !!

But for this curse of curses, what a world might ours have been ! Give it back all the property that war has cost, and prevented, and destroyed from the first ; and the bare interest would suffice ere-long to make the whole earth a second Eden ; to build a palace for every one of her nobles, and provide luxuries for all her now famished and suffering poor ; to spread over the entire surface of our globe a complete net-work of canals and rail-ways ; to beautify every one of her cities, beyond all ancient or mod-

ern example, with works of art and genius; to support all her governments, and give a church to every village, a school to every neighborhood, and a Bible to every family.

Take an estimate or two. With the eighteen millions a year from our own treasury for war, or the fifty millions more from the pockets of the people for our militia system, how much good might be done in a multitude of ways. Eighteen millions!—this alone is more than twice the original cost of the Great Western Canal from Albany to Buffalo, which has added hundreds of millions to the value of our western country; three or four times as much as our whole population pay yearly for the support of the gospel at home, and nearly a hundred times as much as the average amount of annual contributions from all the Christians in our land, the last thirty years, for evangelizing the world! What then might have been accomplished for the good of mankind by the hundreds and even thousands of millions wasted by ourselves upon this custom during and since our revolutionary war!

Glance at all Christendom. The bare interest at five per cent. on her entire war-debt would be \$500,000,000 a year; and with this sum we might every year make a railway nearly round the globe, or pay the necessary expenses of all its governments without war, or support a minister of the gospel for every five hundred of its inhabitants! Take the fifteen hundred millions annually wasted in time of peace; and, in fifty years, it would suffice to make, at \$30,000 a mile, no less than 2,500,000 miles of rail-road; enough to encircle the globe more than a hundred times!!

Would to God that the lessons taught by fifty centuries of blood, might be duly impressed at length upon a warring world! Take them, ye heralds of the cross, and proclaim them aloud to the multitudes that hang upon your lips. Let the press send them forth on the wings of steam all over the earth. Ponder them well, ye who hold the helm of state. Come hither, ye millions of oppressed and starving poor, come, and learn the chief cause of your woes. Ye are all the victims of war. His brand is on your brow; his manacles on your limbs; the blight of his withering curse upon all your pursuits and interests. It is the master-tyrant of our world; and every one that loves God or his country, his species or himself, should unite to sweep from the earth a despotism so bloody and baleful.

APPEAL TO CITIES :

OR

THE SPECIAL CLAIMS OF PEACE UPON THEM.

THE cause of peace aims solely at the abolition of WAR, and has nothing to do with any thing else—with capital punishment, the suppression of mobs, the treatment of robbers and pirates, or any other matters of civil, internal government. We are concerned *only* with the intercourse of *nations*, and seek merely to abolish the custom of settling their disputes by the sword.

An object this of vast importance; and for its accomplishment we would fain unite all the friends of God and man in the use of appropriate means. These means are all included essentially in such an application of the gospel as shall Christianize public opinion on the subject, bring war under the ban of the civilized world, and thus lead its nations to discard forever their savage method of settling their disputes. We would train up a new and entire generation of peace-makers; and for this purpose we would enlist the pulpit and the press, the church and the school, the fire-side and the workshop, the parent and the teacher, old and young, male and female, the mass of every community professing a religion which promises, as one of its results, the permanent reign of peace over the whole earth.

We neither expect nor desire any violent or sudden change. We labor, by the diffusion of light and love, for such a change of public sentiment as shall effectually demand the peaceful adjustment of all difficulties between nations. We propose neither to sacrifice nor endanger their interest, but simply to introduce better means for the protection of their rights, the redress of their wrongs, and the settlement of their disputes. We would gradually supersede war by such substitutes as negotiation, arbitration and mediation, or some permanent system, like a congress of nations, which shall combine all these principles, and perform for states essentially the same services that our codes and courts of law now do for individuals. We would have rulers, like their subjects, adjust their difficulties without bloodshed. They *could*, if they *would*; they *will* whenever

public opinion shall demand it aright; that opinion, properly enlightened, *would* thus demand it; and hence we seek to form such an opinion by spreading light on this subject all over the civilized world.

Already is this work most auspiciously begun. A few philanthropists in both hemispheres united in this cause soon after the downfall of Napoleon; and with an average expenditure for all Christendom of only four or five thousand dollars a year for the first twenty-five years, have they made an impression on the civilized world, and materially modified its international policy. Public opinion on this subject is widely different from what it was fifty or even thirty years ago; and difficulties which would then have occasioned fierce, protracted wars, are now adjusted often with scarce a thought of appealing to arms. Peace is fast becoming the settled policy of Christendom; and, should this policy continue much longer, it may become almost impossible to involve its nations again in blood, and quite easy to introduce some permanent mode of adjusting their disputes without the sword. The general peace of Christendom since 1815, has resulted very much from the efforts and influences which together constitute the cause of peace; and we might mention instances in which they have, in the judgment of such men as the venerable John Quincy Adams, been the means of saving our own country from war.

Our encouragement is most ample; and, since the time has fully come for a more vigorous and hopeful prosecution of this enterprise, we would appeal to our friends for the aid which is just as necessary in this cause as in any other. We must enlighten the people; we must bring the subject before rulers; we must employ agents, and send forth lecturers; we must issue a variety of publications, and scatter tracts, periodicals and volumes through the land.

All this will require money as well as personal efforts; and for both we appeal to the friends of peace especially in our cities. Every argument applicable to others, will apply with equal force to yourselves. Does war suspend or derange business, cripple every department of industry, and dry up all the great sources of wealth? Does it waste property by millions, butcher men by thousands, and sweep in fire and blood over whole empires? Are its laurels steeped in the tears of countless widows and orphans? Is it a mass of abominations, a source of mischief and misery to nearly all concerned? Does it trample on the Sabbath,

and withhold or neutralize the means of grace, and thwart almost every effort for the salvation of men in Christian or pagan lands? Is it a sink of pollution, a hot-bed of the most loathsome vices and the foulest crimes? All these arguments against war will apply to you with peculiar force, since the largest share of its evils fall invariably on cities.

Look at the facts in the case. All must suffer from war, but the city far more than the country. Review its history, and say where have fallen the hottest and heaviest thunderbolts of its wrath? Ask of Tyre and Jerusalem, of Carthage, Rome and Moscow. What mean the war-ships anchored in your harbors, or the forts and batteries guarding the entrance to your wharves? The chief treasures of the land are deposited in your vaults, and the main-springs of its business lie in your ships, and stores, and work-shops. Where does war seek its plunder? In the city. Where does it revel in unbridled debauchery? Where do you find its famine and pestilence, its carnage and conflagration? In cities. They are the hinges of war, the first objects of its assaults, and the chief victims of its vengeance.

So it must be. Our cities, the store-houses of the world, and the main-springs of its enterprise and prosperity, must ever be exposed to the brunt of war, and draw down upon themselves the first and fiercest thunderbolts of the storm. An immense amount of property, owned mostly in our cities, is constantly afloat on the ocean, and would be liable, on the approach of war, to instant capture. Our whale-ships, our merchant-men in the East Indies, all our most richly laden vessels, some of them with cargoes worth each hundreds of thousands, would be too far from home to escape the tempest by a speedy return, and would thus fall an easy prey to the public and private cruisers that would at once be scouring the whole ocean. In our last war of little more than two years' duration, (1812-4,) nearly three thousand English merchant vessels were said to have been captured by the Americans, probably not less than five thousand on both sides; a loss perhaps of fifty millions a year, and nearly all from our cities.

Nor is this the worst of your case; for a blight would soon come upon nearly all your interests. Your stocks would fall; your banks would fail; your vessels would rot at your wharves; your stores and workshops would be closed; the grass would ere-long grow in streets now worn with the ceaseless tread of business; nearly every species

of property would immediately sink in value from twenty to fifty per cent. ; many of your merchants would become bankrupts, and most of your mechanics must either starve for want of employment, or flee into the country for bread. With so much at stake, will not the city come to the aid of a cause which aims to avert such evils ?

Look at the comparative ability of cities. They are the main depositories of wealth. The city of Boston, with less than a seventh part of the population, was estimated (1840) to contain a third of all the property in Massachusetts, or three times as much, in proportion to her numbers, as the country. Truly then the city is by far the most able to give. The *surplus* wealth of the world is chiefly in its cities ; and to these should we therefore go for the means of sustaining every good cause, but especially one in which they have so deep an interest.

We *must* gain these hinges of the world. In them will be found the master-spirits of the age—our ablest lawyers, physicians and preachers ; not a few of our most gifted and highly cultivated minds ; our authors, and editors, and statesmen, who give law to public opinion ; the chief offices of government, with the multitude of their dependencies, and the ever-teeming press with the vast amount of its weekly and daily issues all over the land. In the single city of New York, nearly a million of publications are supposed (1845) to issue from the press every week ! What then must be the combined influence of all the great cities through Christendom ? It must of course decide every question of peace or war. They pitch the tune, and all the rest follow. Let London and Paris, Rome and Vienna, Boston and New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and New Orleans, go for peace, or for war ; and not all the remaining millions in their respective countries, could turn the scale.

Already has the country taken hold of this cause in earnest ; and now we come to our cities, and ask them to share in this great and good work. The cause is peculiarly your own ; and will you not give it your countenance, your advocacy, your money ? None of these do we ask you to withdraw from any other good cause ; but does not this cause now deserve a much larger share of your aid than it has ever yet received ? Are not its claims upon you fair, unquestionable and urgent ? Shall it plead in vain ?

WAR INCONSISTENT WITH CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. HOWARD MALCOM, D. D.,
PRESIDENT OF GEORGETOWN COLLEGE, KY.

THE war spirit is so wrought into the texture of governments, and the habits of national thinking, and even into our very festivals and pomps, that its occasional recurrence is deemed a matter of unavoidable necessity. Even the friends of man's highest welfare seem to regard a general pacification of the world as a mere Utopian scheme, and choose to lend their energies and prayers to objects which seem of more probable attainment. This apathy and incredulity are to be overcome.

It is not intended here to enter upon the question, on which good men may differ in opinion, whether defensive war may in *any* case be justified, nor upon a regular discussion of the general subject; but merely to offer a few thoughts to show how utterly at variance the *spirit* of war is with truth and righteousness.

1. *It contradicts the genius and intention of Christianity.*

Christianity requires us to seek to amend the condition of man. But war cannot do this. The world is no better for all the wars of five thousand years. Christianity, if it prevailed, would make the earth a paradise. War, where it prevails, makes it a slaughter-house, a den of thieves, a brothel, a hell. Christianity cancels the laws of retaliation. War is based upon that very principle. Christianity is the remedy for all human woes. War produces every wo known to man.

The *causes* of war, as well as war itself, are contrary to the gospel. It originates in the worst passions and the worst aims. We may always trace it to the thirst of revenge, the acquisition of territory, the monopoly of commerce, the quarrels of kings, the intrigues of ministers, the coercion of religious opinion, the acquisition of disputed crowns, or some other source equally culpable. Never has any war, devised by man, been founded on holy tempers and Christian principles.

All the features,—all the concomitants,—all the results of war, are the opposite of the features, the concomitants,

the results of Christianity. The two systems conflict in every point, irreconcilably and eternally.

2. *War sets at nought the example of Jesus.*

One of Christ's laws is, "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly." His conduct was always pacific. He became invisible when the Nazarites sought to cast him down from their precipice. When a troop came to arrest him, he struck them down, but not dead. His constant declaration was, that he 'came not to destroy men's lives, but to save.'

True, he once instructed his disciples to buy swords, telling them that they were going forth into a world of enemies. But the whole passage shows he meant to speak by parable. They answer, "Here are two swords." He replies instantly, "*It is enough.*" How could two swords have been enough for twelve apostles, if he had spoken literally? Nay, when Peter used one of these, it was too much; Christ bade him, "Put up thy sword," and healed the wound. He meant to show the apostles their danger, not their remedy; for they were going as "sheep among wolves." His metaphor was indeed misunderstood, as it was when he said, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," and they thought he meant to reprove them for having no bread.

Once he drove men from the temple; but it was with "a scourge of small cords," and a gentle doom it was, compared to their deserts. He expressly said his servants would *not* fight, because his kingdom was not of this world. We find in his example no instances of true severity. His whole life was benevolence personified. He was the PRINCE OF PEACE.

Do we forget that Christ is our example? Whatever is right for us to do, would, in general, have been right for him. Imagine the Redeemer robed in the trappings of a man of blood, leading on columns to slaughter, laying a country waste, setting fire to cities, storming fortresses, and consigning tens of thousands to wounds and anguish, death and damnation, just to define some point of policy, to decide some kingly quarrel, to enlarge some boundary, or avenge some insult. Could "meekness and lowliness" be learned from him thus engaged?

There is no rank or position in an army compatible with the character of Christ. It is most certain that we gather no army lessons from him who "came to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and to comfort all that mourn." It is most certain that no man,

who makes fighting his *profession*, can find authority in the example of our Lord.

It is not necessary to enlarge on this point. It will be conceded. No warrior thinks of making Christ his pattern. How then can a follower of Christ overlook the inconsistency between the profession of religion, and the profession of arms?

3. *War is not only inconsistent with the general structure and nature of Christianity, and the example of Jesus; but it violates all the express precepts of the New Testament.*

Even the Old Testament does not sanction war as a custom. In each case of lawful war, it was entered on by *express command*. If such authority were now given, we might worthily take up arms. But without it, how can we violate both the genius and precepts of our religion, and set at nought the example of a Divine guide? It should be remembered, that in no case, even under the Old Testament, was war appointed to decide doubtful questions, or to settle quarrels, but to inflict national punishment. They were intended, as are pestilence and famine, to chastise nations guilty of provoking God. Such is never the pretext of modern war; and if it were, it would require Divine authority, which, as has just been said, would induce even members of the Peace Society to fight.

As to the New Testament, a multitude of precepts might be quoted. "Ye have heard, an eye for an eye; but I say unto you, RESIST NOT EVIL.—Follow peace with all men.—Love one another.—Do justice, love mercy.—Love your enemies.—Follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace.—Return good for evil.—Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one toward another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you.—If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight.—Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

It is unnecessary to adduce more of these passages. All know how much they abound in the New Testament. There they stand! No interpretation can nullify their force, or pervert their application. In *any* sense the words will bear, they forbid war. If language have any force, they equally forbid *retaliation*. Yet this is always advanced as the very best pretext for war, and is more frequently the avowed reason than any other!

The preceding quotations relate to the single point of fighting. But contending nations and armies violate *every* precept of the gospel. Rehearse all the catalogue of graces, and mark how we are enjoined to be meek, lowly, peaceable, easy to be entreated, gentle, thinking no evil, merciful, slow to anger, given to quietness, knowledge, patience, temperance, prayer. War sets them all at nought!

Of the sermon on the mount, five benedictions are upon the poor in spirit, the meek, the merciful, and the peacemakers. Two others are upon the persecuted and reviled. These include all but two of the entire list, and the others regard those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, and the pure in heart. The professed warrior, therefore, shuts himself out from *all* these benedictions! The discourse then declares that not only killing, but anger, is murder. It expressly revokes the law of retaliation, and, exploding the traditionary rule of loving our neighbor, and hating our enemy, requires us to love our enemies, and do good to them which despitefully use us. Afterwards, in presenting a form of prayer, it not only teaches us to say, "forgive us our trespasses, *as* we forgive those that trespass against us," but, "if ye forgive *not* men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you." What a peace sermon is here! What modern peace society goes farther than this?

The *irresponsible* feelings of a regular soldier are necessarily wrong. He makes war a trade, and is ready to fight any nation, or any part of his own nation, as he is sent. He must have no mind of his own. He is to wheel, march, load, fire, advance or flee, just as he is bidden, and because he is bidden. In the language of Thomas Jefferson, "the breaking of men to military discipline, is breaking their spirits to passive obedience." The nearer a soldier comes to a mere machine, the better soldier he makes. Is this right for a *Christian*? Is it compatible with his duty to "examine all things, and hold fast that which is good?"

The *contempt of life*, which is necessary to a brave soldier, is sin. Life is our probation,—our period of preliminary service to the great God. No man should despise it. He who masters the fear of death, must do it either by religious influence, or by rejecting the fear of God, and all concern for the future state of his soul. That there are religious soldiers, is true; but they are far too few to give character to an army. They are mere exceptions to the general military character. The contempt of life, which

distinguishes the veteran, is itself a great sin, and is induced by the preceding great sin of casting off the fear of God, and concern for the soul.

What gospel precept is there, which he who makes war a profession, is not at times compelled to violate? What Christian grace is there, which would not depreciate him for his trade of death?

Some graces, it is confessed, are convenient in camp; as when a soldier acts as a servant or a laborer. If he have charge of a horse, or a wardrobe, it is desired that he possess honesty, meekness, and faithfulness. But these qualities spoil him for the field. He must then cast away meekness, and fight. He must cast away honesty, and forage. He must cast away forgiveness, and revenge his country. He must not return good for evil, but blow for blow, wound for wound. Thus, when we take the common soldier individually, we find him *compelled to violate every precept of his religion.*

The whole structure of an army is in violation of New Testament precepts. What absolute despotism! What division of rank by nice gradations! "Condescending to men of low estate" would spoil discipline. "Esteeming others better than ourselves" would degrade the officers. Instead of humility, must be gay trappings. Instead of Christ's law of love, must be man's rule of honor. Instead of examining all things, the soldier must be like a trained blood-hound, ready to be let loose against any foe. Instead of returning good for evil, the army is organized expressly to return injuries with interest.

Survey an army prepared for battle. See the cannons, musquets, mortars, swords, drums, trumpets and flags. Do these men look like Christians? Do they talk like followers of the meek and lowly Son of God? Are they prepared to act like the friends of the human race, and like followers of God, as dear children seeking to bring all men to the knowledge of him? Are their feelings toward the opposite host like those which are produced by "fervent love" out of "a pure heart?"

Observe an army in the hour of battle. See attacks and retreats, battalions annihilated, commanders falling, shouts of onset, groans of death, horses trampling the fallen, limbs flying in the air, suffocating smoke, thundering artillery, thousands smarting in the agony of death, and none to administer a cup of water. Do the precepts of Christianity

authorize such a scene? Would such an exhibition ever grow out of its legitimate effects?

Inspect the field when all is over. The harvest trampled and destroyed, houses smoking in ruin, the mangled and slain strewed among dead horses, and broken gun-carriages! Prowlers stripping booty even from the warm bodies of the dying! Jackals lurking around, and birds of prey wheeling above! Here and there a wretched widow, or an anxious wife, seeking her loved one among the dead and dying! Does all this look as if Christians had there been serving their Master, the God of mercy?

Let us turn our eyes to the ocean. A huge ship, bristling with implements of death, glides quietly along. Presently "*a sail!*" is echoed from sentinel to sentinel. All on board catch the sound, and gaze at the faint outline. At length, she is discerned to be a ship of war, and all strive to discern her flag. On that hangs the important issue! For no feud, no jealousy, no enmity exists between the crews. At last the signal is discerned to be that of a foe. Immediately what a scene! Decks cleared and sanded, ports opened, tompions out, guns arranged, matches lighted, and every preparation made for a work of death. While waiting the moment to engage, every word is indication of pride, or revenge, or daring, or wrath, or ambition.

The fight begins! Death flies with every shot. Blood and carnage cover the decks. The rigging is cut to pieces, and the hull is bored with hot shot. Officers are picked off by sharpshooters, and scores of common men perish at their posts. At length, one party strikes, and the strife is stayed. Perhaps, ere all the wounded can be removed, the noble and costly ship sinks into the deep. The victorious, herself almost a wreck, commits her slain to the deep, and bears on towards her country the agonized, the crippled and the dying of both ships. What a scene to gratify malignant demons! What distracting tidings does she bear to the bereaved at home! What pain and misery does she carry within her! In all this, there was no personal malice, no private offence given; nothing was known of one another, except from the respective flags. Could enormity be more diabolical and cold blooded?

But no where does war wear such horrors as in a siege. The inhabitants are straitly shut up. Business, pleasure, education and intercourse are checked; and sorrow, poverty, terror and distress are spread abroad. The bombardment

begins. Shells explode in the streets, or penetrate the roofs. Citizens are killed in the streets, and soldiers on the ramparts. Women and children retreat to cellars, and live in all discomfort. Day by day the gloom thickens. All news is of houses burnt, persons killed, prices raised, and scarcity increased. Gladly, perhaps, would the citizens surrender ; but the governor is inflexible. At length, famine is threatened. The laborer, out of employment, cannot purchase at such prices, and his family, hitherto accustomed to daily comforts, fall victims to rigorous poverty. Still the siege continues. The middling classes next sink to beggary. Every thing is sold to buy a little food. Anon, breaches are made in the walls. All must work, amid galling fire, to repair them. Mines are sprung, blowing houses and the occupants into the air. No relief comes. Dead animals, offal, skins, the very bodies of the slain, are eaten. Hundreds perish in desperate sorties. All are miserable. The widow, the bereft mother, the disappointed bride, and the tender orphan, mourn continually. Pestilence succeeds to famine. Thousands, who have escaped violence, die of disease. At length, the city is taken by storm ; pillage, and perhaps an awful conflagration, succeed ; a brutal soldiery raven among the virtuous ; and the indescribable scene ends in permanent poverty, lamentation, and dishonor. Is this Christianity ?

We will close by a confirmatory picture from the history of the peninsular wars of Napoleon. It is part of a description of the second siege of Zaragossa :

“The French fought their way into the entrance of this ill-fated city by mining and exploding one house after another, while the inhabitants were confined to that quarter of the city still in possession of the Spaniards, who were crowded, men, women and children, into the cellars, to avoid the cannon balls and bombs. Pestilence broke out as a matter of course ; and when once begun, it was impossible to check its progress, or confine it to one quarter of the city. It was not long before more than thirty hospitals were established. As soon as one was destroyed by the bombardment, the patients were removed to some other building, which was in a state to afford them temporary shelter, and thus the infection was carried into every part of Zaragossa. The average of daily deaths from this cause was, at this time, not less than three hundred and fifty. Men stretched upon straw, in helpless misery, lay breathing their last, and with their dying breath spreading the mortal taint of their own disease, without medicines, food or attendance ; for the ministers of charity themselves be-

came the victims of the disease. The slightest wound produced gangrene and death in bodies so prepared for dissolution by distress of mind, agitation, and want of proper aliment and of sleep; for there was no respite, either by day or night, for this devoted city. By day, it was involved in a red sulphuric atmosphere of smoke and dust, which hid the face of heaven; by night the fire of cannon and mortars, and the flames of burning houses, kept it in a state of horrible illumination. The cemeteries could no longer afford room for the dead. Large pits were dug to receive them in the streets, and in the courts of the public buildings, till hands were wanted for the labor; they were laid before the churches, heaped upon one another, and covered with sheets; and not unfrequently these piles of mortality were struck by a shell, and the shattered bodies scattered in all directions. When the French entered the city, *six thousand bodies* were lying in the streets and trenches, or piled up in heaps before the churches.

How wonderful that Christians, followers of the Prince of Peace, should concur in the mad idolatry of strife! How inconsistent! Behold a man rising from the Lord's supper, and proceeding to array himself in fantastic robes and plumes, girding on him the instruments of human butchery, and drilling himself in the tactics of death! See him murdering fellow Christians, and unprepared sinners, and even praying to his Redeemer for aid in the endeavor! See priest and people thronging the house of God to celebrate bloody victories, and give thanks for having sent thousands to their last account, with all their sins upon their head!

Reader! is not this stupendous inconsistency? Is it not time you reflected on this subject? Are you in favor of the great schemes of benevolence? Then come, unite in attacking this prolific parent of abominations. Let your voice, wherever you are, be lifted up to spread the principle of "peace on earth." Blessed principle! You *cannot* err in trying to spread its influence. You *cannot* err in lending your aid to banish from the earth a monster of pride, corruption, destructiveness, misery and murder. Take your stand as the advocate of peace. Retire from military trainings, and discard the horrid thought of being hired to rob, ravage and destroy. Give no countenance to a system which could not continue a moment, were the spirit and precepts of Christianity to prevail on earth. Let all around you understand that you are as conscientiously *peaceful*, as you are honest or pure.

WAR UNLAWFUL

UNDER THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

BY JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY.

OF all the practices which lay waste the welfare of men, there is none which operates to so great an extent, or with so prodigious an efficacy, as *war*. Not only is it productive of an incalculable amount of bodily and mental suffering, but it is also a moral evil of the very deepest dye. "From whence come wars and fightings among you?" asked the apostle James. "Come they not hence, even of your lusts which war in your members?" War, then, has its origin in corrupt passions; and, arising out of such an evil root, this tree of bitterness seldom fails to produce, in vast abundance, the fruits of malice, wrath, cruelty, fraud, rapine, lasciviousness, confusion and murder.

Although few persons will dispute the accuracy of this picture, or deny the general position, that war is at variance with the principles of Christianity, it is still a singular fact, that the Friends* are almost the only class of Christians who regard it as their duty entirely to abstain from that practice. The generality of professed Christians are accustomed to make distinctions between one kind of war and another. They will condemn one which is oppressive and unjust; advancing in this respect no farther than the moralists of every age; while, on the other hand, they hesitate as little in expressing their approbation of wars which are defensive, or undertaken in a just cause.

The main argument from Scripture for the rectitude of warfare in what is termed a just cause, is *the divinely sanctioned example of the Israelites*. That they were engaged in many wars; that those wars were often very destructive, yet carried forward under the direct sanction and clear command of the Almighty; are points which no reader of the Old Testament can deny. But we must not forget,

* We hardly need inform our readers, that the author is a Quaker, one of the most eminent among his brethren, and writes here in vindication of their views concerning war. We abridge his essay, but omit none of his views or arguments.—AM. ED.

that the wars of the Israelites differed from all other wars in certain very important particulars. That very divine sanction which is pleaded, did in fact distinguish their wars from all those in which any other nation is known to have been ever engaged. They were undertaken in pursuance of God's express command, and directed to the accomplishment of his revealed designs. These designs had a two-fold object—the temporal preservation and prosperity of his peculiar people, and the punishment and destruction of idolatrous nations. The Israelites were sometimes engaged in war without any direction from God; but such of their military operations as were sanctioned of the Lord, assumed the character of a work of obedience and faith. They went forth to battle in compliance with his command, and in reliance upon his aid. These characteristics of their warfare were attended with two very marked consequences; first, that their conflicts, so far from being attended by that destruction of moral and pious feeling which is so generally the effect of war, were often accompanied by high religious excellence in those who thus fought the battles of the Lord, as in the case of Joshua, the Judges, and David; and secondly, that these contests were followed by uniform success. The Lord was carrying on his own designs by the Israelites; and, under such circumstances, their success afforded an evidence of his approbation. Now, it cannot be predicated even of the justest wars among other nations, that they are undertaken by the direct command of Jehovah; or that they are a work of obedience and faith; or that they are often accompanied with high religious excellence in those who undertake them; or that they are followed by uniform success. Even if the system of Israelitish morals, then, was still in force without alteration, we could not justly conclude from such an example, that warfare, as generally practised, is in any case consistent with the will of God.

The defenders of modern warfare plead, also, the authority of John the Baptist. Various classes of persons resorted to him for instruction; and among others, "the soldiers demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your wages." Since the precept, *do violence to no man*, probably related to their deportment among friends and allies, it may be allowed that he did not on this occasion forbid the practice of fighting;

but, it must still be observed, that his expressions afford no direct encouragement to that practice. His doctrine is neutral. The question whether war is in itself lawful or unlawful, was one which he obviously did not entertain. On the supposition that the soldiers would continue to be soldiers, he confined himself to recommending a gentle, orderly, and submissive demeanor.

But John the Baptist, though the forerunner of Christ, did not himself belong to the Christian dispensation. His moral system was that of the law; and, admitting that system to continue unchanged, we still may fairly deny that the example of the Hebrews, or the expressions of John, afford any valid authority for warfare as generally practised. Our objection to every species of war, however, rests principally *on that more perfect revelation which distinguishes the dispensation of the gospel*. We contend earnestly, that *all warfare is wholly at variance with the CHRISTIAN religion*.

In support of this position, I may adduce the testimony of the prophets; for, in their predictions respecting the gospel dispensation, they frequently allude both to its superior spirituality and its purer morality. Under this dispensation, says Isaiah, "*they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.*" ii. 2—4. The prophet Micah repeats the same prediction, and adds "they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid." iv. 1—4.

The times here foretold, are confessedly those of the gospel, and are elsewhere described in similar language. In Isa. ix. 6, the Messiah is expressly denominated the "Prince of Peace." In Isa. xi., the reign of Christ is painted in glowing colors, as accompanied by the universal harmony of God's creation. Lastly, in Zech. ix. 9, 10, we read, as the result of his reign, "*I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off; and he shall speak peace unto the heathen; and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth.*"

In these passages, a total cessation from war is described as one of the most conspicuous characteristics of Christianity. Such a consequence is represented by Isaiah as arising from the conversion of heathen nations; and who-

ever should be members of God's true church, she was no longer to participate in the warfare of the world. The chariot was to be cut off from Ephraim, and the war-horse from Jerusalem. For the full accomplishment of these prophecies, we must, indeed, look forward to a period yet to come; but the inspired writers describe this complete, uninterrupted peaceableness, as a distinguishing feature of the Christian dispensation, as the result of obedience to its law; and we may therefore infer that, if its true nature were fully understood, and its laws exactly obeyed, a conversion to our holy religion would be uniformly accompanied with entire abstinence from war, and peace thus become exactly co-extensive with Christianity itself.

In accordance with the prophecies I have quoted, Christianity promulgates certain moral rules which would, if faithfully obeyed, lead to the results predicted. I allude not exclusively to those divine laws which condemn aggressive warfare; for these laws are far from being powerful enough to produce the effect in question. They were, indeed, commonly admitted in the world long before the Christian dispensation; but never have they been found sufficient to convert swords into plough-shares, and spears into pruning-hooks. In point of fact, the distinction drawn between just and unjust warfare, is in most cases entirely nugatory; for there are few wars which are not defended, and not many perhaps which the persons waging them do not *believe* to be justified, by some plea of self-preservation or honorable retribution. Some stronger and more comprehensive principles, then, were obviously needed in order to the accomplishment of this great end; and these principles are unfolded in the pure, exalted code of morality revealed in the gospel. They are *the non-resistance of injuries, the return of good for evil, and the love of our enemies.*

The Lord Jesus himself promulgated these principles as distinguishing his own dispensation from that of the law. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, *That ye resist not evil*; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, *Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven;*

for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. *Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.*" So also Peter commands the believers not to render "evil for evil, nor railing for railing; but contrariwise, blessing." Paul holds up the very same standard: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves; but rather *give place unto wrath*; for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for, in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil; *but overcome evil with good.*"

In this fundamental law of the gospel, *our Lord has laid his axe to the root*, by establishing certain principles which, honestly observed, must put an end to every evil practice. Of this nature precisely are the principles we are now considering; and, if followed up with true consistency, they cannot fail to abolish every species of warfare. The great law of Christ is the *law of love*; and, since no kind of war can ever consist with this love, it is indisputable that, where the latter prevails as it ought, the former must entirely cease.

I grant that the above precepts of our Lord are addressed to *individuals*; and hence the clear duty of individual Christians to obey them on every occasion. If attacked, insulted, injured, persecuted, they ought to suffer wrong, to revenge no injury, to return good for evil, and to love their enemies. So also, if exposed to the calamities of war, their duty remains unaltered. If the sword of the invader be lifted up against them, the precept is still, *Resist not evil*. If the insults and injuries of the carnal warrior be heaped upon them, they are still forbidden to avenge themselves, and still commanded to pray for their persecutors. If surrounded by a host of enemies the most violent and malicious, Christian love must still be unbroken, still universal. The law of Christ then requires *individuals* to abstain from all warfare. So the early Christians did. When Julian was bestowing upon his troops a largess with a view to some approaching battle, his bounty was refused by Martin, a soldier previously converted to Christianity. "Hitherto," said he, "I have fought for thee; permit me now to fight for my God. I am the soldier of Christ; for *me*, the combat is unlawful."

The soldier retains his private responsibility, and can

never dispossess himself of his individual obligation to obey God. But the unlawfulness of war in any form, is equally evident when regarded as the affair of nations. Doubtless there may be found in the Scriptures a variety of injunctions applicable to men only as individuals; but it is one of the excellent characteristics of the Bible, that its *principles* are of universal application to mankind, whether acting singly as individuals, or collectively as nations. If not thus applicable, national crimes might be committed without entailing any national guilt, and without any real infraction of the revealed will of God.

Now, among these eternal, unchangeable principles of the Bible, is that of *universal love*. The law of God, addressed alike to all men, plainly says, *Resist not evil; revenge not injuries; LOVE YOUR ENEMIES*. Individuals, and nations consisting of individuals, are all unquestionably bound to obey this law; and, whether it is the act of an individual, or a nation, *the transgression of the law is sin*. Nations transgress the Christian law of love, and commit sin, when they declare or carry on war, precisely as does the private duellist, when he sends or accepts a challenge, and deliberately endeavors to destroy his neighbor. The man who takes any part in national warfare, takes a part also in the national sin. He aids and abets his nation in breaking the law of Christ. So far then is the authority of his legislature, or his monarch, from justifying his engagement in warfare, that he cannot obey either, *without adding to his private transgression, the further criminality of actively promoting the transgression of the state*.

It is evident, then, that total abstinence from warfare would be the necessary result of strict adherence to the law of Christ. But one of the precepts already cited, bears a specific, peculiar allusion to the subject of war: "*Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, Love your enemies.*" Here is a direct, avowed contrast between the law and the gospel. In calling the attention of his hearers to the sayings "by them of old time," Christ quoted from the law of Moses itself; and it was with that law, as understood by the Jews, that he compared his own holier system. Now the precepts of ancient times to which he refers,—the precepts respecting love and hatred,—probably formed a part of those divine edicts which were delivered to the Israelites by Moses. That which related to the love of

their neighbor, is recognized at once: "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the *children of thy people*, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Lev. xix. 18. The love here enjoined, was to the *children of the people of Israel*. The neighbor to be loved was a fellow-countryman, or, if a stranger, a proselyte; and the precept in fact commanded no more than that the Israelites should *love one another*. So also the injunction of old, that the Israelites should hate their enemies, was exclusively *national*. They were not permitted to hate their *private* enemies in the same favored community, but were enjoined to do them good: "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again." But they were to hate their *national* enemies, and make no covenant with them: "Thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them." On another occasion, a similar injunction was delivered respecting the Amalekites: "Thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven."

Such was the hatred enjoined upon ancient Israel, and thus was it to be applied. Now, it is to these edicts, that the law of Christ is placed in opposition: "But *I* say unto you, *Love your enemies*." True, this law is applicable to private life; but it was principally intended to discountenance *national* enmities, and prevent the practice of war. The Israelites were commanded to combat and destroy the nations who were enemies alike to themselves and to God. Christians are introduced to a purer, more lovely system; their law commands them to be the friends of all mankind. If sent forth among idolatrous nations, it is as the ministers of their restoration, not as the instruments of their punishment; and, as they may not contend with the sword against God's enemies, much less may they wield it for *any* purpose of their own. Armed with submission, forbearance and long-suffering, they must secede from the warfare of a wrathful and corrupt world, and, whatever the aggravations to which they are exposed, must evince themselves to be the meek, harmless, benevolent followers of the PRINCE OF PEACE.

I know of nothing in the New Testament which has any appearance of contravening these precepts, but a single passage in the gospel of Luke. After our Lord's paschal supper, and immediately before he was betrayed, he said to his disciples, "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one." These words, superficially con-

sidered, may be deemed to inculcate the notion, that his followers were to defend themselves and their religion with the sword; but the context, and the circumstances which followed, evidently decide otherwise. The disciples, apparently understanding their Lord literally, answered, "Here are two swords;" and Jesus replied, "It is enough." In declaring that two swords were *enough* under such circumstances, he offered them an intelligible hint, that he had been misunderstood; but the opportunity was at hand on which they were to be completely undeceived. The enemies of Jesus approached, armed; whereupon the disciples said, "Lord, shall we smite with the sword?" and Peter, without waiting for a reply, smote the servant of the High Priest, and cut off his ear. Then were they clearly instructed, that it was their duty not to fight, but to suffer wrong. "Suffer ye thus far," said he to Peter; and immediately afterwards he confirmed his doctrine by action—he touched the wounded man, and healed him. Then he cried out to Peter, "Put up thy sword into the sheath; the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? All they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword." When carried before Pilate, he plainly declared, that his kingdom was such as neither to require nor allow the defence of carnal weapons. "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews."

When our Lord, therefore, exhorted his disciples to sell their garments, and buy swords, his precept was evidently not to be understood literally. Such, indeed, is the explicit judgment of most commentators; and we may therefore conclude either with Erasmus, that the sword of which our Lord here spake, was the sword of the Spirit, the word of God, or with critics in general, that the words of Jesus imported only a general warning to the disciples, that their situation was about to be greatly changed; that, deprived of his presence, they would be exposed to every species of difficulty, become the objects of hatred and persecution, and thus be driven to a variety of expedients in providing for their own maintenance and security.

The absolute inconsistency of war with the gospel, was the prevalent belief of the early Christians. Justin Martyr, A. D. 140, quoting the prophecy of Isaiah already cited, says, "That these things have come to pass, you may be readily convinced; for we who were once slayers of one another, do not now fight against our enemies." Irenæus, Bishop

of Lyons, 167, discusses the same prophecy, and proves its relation to our Savior by the fact, that the followers of Jesus had disused the weapons of war, and no longer knew how to fight. Tertullian, 200, indeed, alludes to Christians who were engaged in military pursuits, but, on another occasion, informs us, that many soldiers quitted those pursuits in consequence of their conversion to Christianity; and repeatedly expresses his own opinion, that any participation in war is unlawful for believers in Jesus, not only because of the idolatrous practices in the Roman armies, but because Christ has forbidden the use of the sword, and the revenge of injuries. Origen, 230, in his work against Celsus, says, "We no longer take up the sword against any nation, nor do we learn any more to make war. We have become, for the sake of Jesus, *the children of peace*. By our prayers, we fight for our king abundantly, but take no part in his wars, even though he urge us."

Traces of the same doctrine and practice are very clearly marked in the subsequent history. Under the reign of Dioclesian, 300, a large number of Christians refused to serve in the army, and, in consequence, many of them suffered martyrdom. Now, although the conduct of these Christians might arise partly from their religious objections to the idolatrous rites at that time mixed up with the military system, it is probable that the unlawfulness of war itself was also a principle on which they acted. Thus Lactantius, who wrote during the reign of this very emperor, expressly asserts, that "to engage in war, cannot be lawful for the righteous man, whose warfare is that of righteousness itself." In the twelfth canon of the Council of Nice held under the reign of Constantine, 325, a long period of excommunication is attached as a penalty to the conduct of those persons who, having once renounced the military calling, were persuaded by the force of bribes to return to it "like dogs to their own vomit." Such a law would scarcely have been promulgated under the reign of the converted Constantine, had not an opinion been entertained in the council, that *war itself* is inconsistent with the highest standard of Christian morality. We have already noticed the declaration of Martin, 360, that it was unlawful for him to fight because he was a Christian; and even so late as the middle of the fifth century, Pope Leo declared it "contrary to the rules of the church, that persons after the action of penance, should revert to the warfare of the world."

I must, however, advert to another principle, viz., that

human life is sacred, and that death is followed by infinite consequences. The Israelites were enjoined to inflict death; and the destruction of life, when thus expressly authorized by the Creator, must unquestionably have been right; but the sanction thus given to killing, was accompanied with a comparatively small degree of illumination respecting the true nature of life and death, respecting immortality and future retribution. Bishop Warburton has endeavored to prove that the Israelites had no knowledge on these subjects; and it is sufficiently evident that the *full* revelation of these important truths was reserved for the gospel. Those who read the declarations of Jesus, can no longer doubt, that man is born for eternity; that when his body dies, his soul ascends into Paradise, or is cast into hell; and that after the day of resurrection and final judgment, we shall all reap the full eternal reward of our obedience or our rebellion. Christians thus instructed, must acknowledge, that the *future welfare* of an individual man is of greater importance than the present merely temporal prosperity of a whole nation; nor can they, if consistent with themselves, refuse to confess that, unless sanctioned by the express authority of Christ, they take upon themselves a most unwarrantable responsibility when they cut short the days of their neighbor, and transmit him to the awful realities of eternity. Since then no such express authority can be found in the New Testament; since, on the contrary, it is clearly declared, that the kingdom of Christ is not of this world, and that his followers "war not after the flesh," I cannot but conclude, that for one man to kill another under any circumstances, is utterly unlawful under the Christian dispensation.*

Such, then, are the grounds on which we consider it our duty to abstain entirely from war. On a review of the whole argument, the reader will recollect, that the wars of the Israelites bore so peculiar a character as to afford no real sanction to those of other nations, even if the Jewish dispensation were still continued; and also that the precept of John the Baptist to soldiers appears to be merely

* This doctrine of *the strict inviolability of human life* is adopted by only a part of the believers in *the contrariety of all war to the gospel*, and is not made the basis of operations in the cause of peace. Even William Penn, while strong enough against *all war*, still incorporated, as the author himself states in a note, the penalty of death in the laws of his colony, though the Quakers *now* are pretty generally opposed to the taking of human life in *any* case.—AM. ED.

neutral on the subject, but that our opinion of the unlawfulness of all war rests principally on *the moral law as revealed in the gospel*; that abstinence from warfare was predicted as one of its principal characteristics; that it fully unfolds the principles which alone are sufficiently powerful to produce this effect, namely, those of suffering wrong, returning good for evil, and loving our enemies; that, since these principles were so clearly promulgated by Jesus and his Apostles, the *individual* who engages in any kind of warfare, plainly infringes the divine law; that nations, when carrying on war, do also infringe that law; that the Christian who fights for his prince or his country, not only commits sin in his own person, but aids and abets the national transgression; that the injunction of Christ to his followers respecting the love of their enemies, was specifically directed against *national wars*; that, when our Lord exhorted his disciples to sell their garments, and buy swords, his expressions were evidently to be understood figuratively; that our sentiments on this subject, so far from being new and extraordinary, form a striking and prevalent feature in the early Christians; and lastly, that the practice of warfare is directly at variance with the full light enjoyed under the gospel respecting life, death and eternity.

Notwithstanding the clearness and importance of these principles, it is continually pleaded that wars are often expedient, and sometimes absolutely necessary. To such a plea it might be sufficient to answer, that nothing is so expedient, nothing so desirable, nothing so *necessary*, either for individuals or for nations, as conformity with the revealed will of God. Let Christians, then, take a survey of Europe during the last eighteen centuries, and impartially examine how many of its wars have been really expedient or *necessary*. Far the greater part of them have in fact been, even in a political point of view, much more hurtful than useful to all the parties. Where, for instance, has England found an equivalent for the almost infinite waste of blood and treasure in her many wars? Must not impartial history decide, that *almost the whole* of her wars have in fact been waged against imaginary dangers, might have been avoided, and have turned out to be extensively injurious to herself? If Christians would abstain from all wars which have no better foundation than a false worldly honor, from all which are not absolutely inevitable, from all which are in reality injurious to their country, they would take a very important step towards that entirely

peaceable conduct which we uphold and defend. Even after such a step, however, war might *seem* on certain occasions to be *actually necessary* for mere defence and self-preservation; and, if we admit the lax morality so generally prevalent, we must confess that war, in such cases, *is right, and cannot be avoided*; but for those who "follow the Lamb *whithersoever* he goeth," war is *never* right. It is *always* their duty to obey his high and holy law, to suffer wrong, to return good for evil, to love their enemies. If, in consequence of their obedience to this law, they apprehend themselves surrounded with many dangers, let them still place undivided reliance upon the power and benevolence of their God and Savior. It may be his good pleasure to deliver them from the peril, or let them fall a sacrifice; but, whatever the result, so long as they obey his law, so long are they safe in his hands.

Godliness, however, has the promise of this life, as well as of that which is to come; and we may therefore entertain a reasonable confidence, that our temporal happiness and safety, as well as our growth in grace, will in general be promoted by obedience to our heavenly Father. These observations are peculiarly applicable to those particulars in the divine law which preclude all warfare. No weapons of self-defence will be found so efficacious as Christian meekness, kindness and forbearance, the suffering of injuries, the absence of revenge, the return of good for evil, and the ever-operating love of God and man. Those who regulate their life according to these principles, have little reason to fear violence. Such has often been the lot of Christian individuals, and such might also be the experience of Christian nations. When we consider the still degraded condition of mankind, we can hardly look at present for the trial of this experiment; but were there a people who would boldly conform their national conduct to the rules of Christ, lay aside the weapons of carnal warfare, and proclaim the principles of universal peace, suffer wrong with condescension, abstain from all retaliation, return good for evil, and diligently promote *the welfare of all men*; I am fully persuaded, that *such* a people would not only dwell in absolute safety, but would be blessed with eminent prosperity, enriched with unrestricted commerce, loaded with reciprocal benefits, and endowed, for every good, and wise, and worthy purpose, with irresistible influence over surrounding nations.

CHALMERS ON PEACE.*

THERE are a great many passages in Scripture which warrant the expectation that a time is coming, when an end shall be put to war—when its abominations and its cruelties shall be banished from the face of the earth; and many and delightful are the images which the Bible employs, as guided by the light of prophecy, it carries us forward to those millennial days, when the reign of peace shall be established, and the wide charity of the gospel, which is confined by no limits, and owns no distinctions, shall embrace the whole human race within the ample grasp of one harmonious and universal family.

Let me first attempt to do away a delusion which exists on the subject of prophecy. Its fulfilments are all certain, say many; and we have therefore nothing to do, but to wait for them in passive and indolent expectation. Let us therefore sit down quietly in the attitude of spectators—let us leave the Divinity to do his own work in his own way, and mark, by the progress of a history over which we have no control, the evolution of his designs, and the march of his wise and beneficent administration.

Now, it is very true, that the Divinity will do his own work in his own way; but if he choose to tell us that that way is not without the instrumentality of men, but by their instrumentality, might not this sitting down into the mere attitude of spectators, turn out to be a most perverse and disobedient conclusion? It is true, that his purpose will obtain its fulfilment, whether we shall offer or not to help it forward by our co-operation; but if the object is to be brought about, and he has also determined on the way which leads to it, and that that way shall be by the putting forth of human exertion, then, let us keep back our co-operation as we may, God will raise up the hearts of others to that which we abstain from.

Now, this is the very way in which prophecies have actually been fulfilled; and the same holds true of the prophecy of universal peace. The abolition of war will be the

* From a Sermon by Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D. D.

effect, not of any sudden or resistless visitation from heaven on the character of men—not of any mystical influence working with all the omnipotence of a charm on the passive hearts of those who are the subjects of it—not of any blind or overruling fatality which will come upon the earth at some distant period of its history, and about which, we of the present day have nothing to do, but to look silently on, without concern, and without co-operation. The prophecy of a peace as universal as the spread of the human race, and as enduring as the moon in the firmament, will meet its accomplishment; but it will be brought about by the activity of men. It will be done by the philanthropy of thinking and intelligent Christians. The conversion of the Jews—the spread of gospel light among the regions of idolatry—these are distinct subjects of prophecy, on which the faithful of the land are now acting, and to the fulfilment of which they are giving their zeal and their energy. I conceive the prophecy which relates to the final abolition of war, will be taken up in the same manner, and the subject will be brought to the test of Christian principle, and many will unite to spread a growing sense of its follies and its enormities over the countries of the world, and the public will be enlightened by the mild dissemination of gospel sentiment through the land, and the prophecy contained in this book, will pass into effect and accomplishment by no other influence than the influence of its ordinary lessons on the hearts and consciences of individuals, and the measure will first be carried in one country by the control of general opinion, and the sacred fire of good-will to the children of men will spread itself through all climes, and through all latitudes—and thus by scriptural truth conveyed with power from one people to another, and taking its ample round among all the tribes and families of the earth, shall we arrive at the magnificent result of peace throughout all its provinces, and security in all its dwelling places.

The mere existence of this prophecy of peace, is a sentence of condemnation upon war, and stamps a criminality on its very forehead. So soon as Christianity shall gain a full ascendancy in the world, from that moment war is to disappear. We have heard that there is something noble in the art of war; that there is something generous in the ardor of that fine chivalric spirit which kindles in the hour of alarm, and rushes with delight among the thickest scenes of danger and enterprise;—that man is never more proudly arrayed, than when, elevated by a contempt for death, he

puts on his intrepid front, and looks serene, while the arrows of destruction are flying on every side of him;—that expunge war, and you expunge some of the brightest names in the catalogue of human virtue, and demolish that theatre on which have been displayed some of the sublimest energies of the human character. It is thus that war has been invested with a most pernicious splendor, and men have offered to justify it as a blessing and an ornament to society, and attempts have been made to throw a kind of imposing morality around it; and one might almost be reconciled to the whole train of its calamities and its horrors, did he not believe his Bible, and learn from its information, that in the days of perfect righteousness, there will be no war;—that so soon as the character of man has had the last finish of Christian principle thrown over it, from that moment all the instruments of war will be thrown aside, and all its lessons will be forgotten.

But apart altogether from this testimony to the evil of war, let us just take a direct look of it, and see whether we can find its character engraved on the aspect it bears to the eye of an attentive observer. The stoutest heart would recoil, were he who owns it, to behold the destruction of a single individual by some deed of violence. Were the man who at this moment stands before you in the full play and energy of health, to be in another moment laid by some deadly aim a lifeless corpse at your feet, there is not one of you who would not prove how strong are the relentings of nature at a spectacle so hideous as death. There are some of you who would be haunted for whole days by the image of horror you had witnessed—who would feel the weight of a most oppressive sensation upon your heart, which nothing but time could wear away—who would be so pursued by it as to be unfit for business or for enjoyment—who would think of it through the day, and it would spread a gloomy disquietude over your waking moments—who would dream of it at night, and it would turn that bed which you courted as a retreat from the torments of an ever-meddling memory, into a scene of restlessness.

O! my brother, if there be something appalling in the suddenness of death, think not that when gradual in its advances, you will alleviate the horrors of this sickening contemplation, by viewing it in a milder form. O! tell me, if there be any relentings of pity in your bosom, how could you endure it, to behold the agonies of the dying man, as goaded by pain, he grasps the cold ground in con-

vulsive energy, or faint with the loss of blood, his pulse ebbs low, and the gathering paleness spreads itself over his countenance; or wrapping himself round in despair, he can only mark by a few feeble quiverings, that life still lurks and lingers in his lacerated body; or lifting up a faded eye, he casts on you a look of imploring helplessness, for that succor which no sympathy can yield him.—It may be painful to dwell on such a representation; but this is the way in which the cause of humanity is served. The eye of the sentimentalist turns away from its sufferings, and he passes by on the other side, lest he hear that pleading voice which is armed with a tone of remonstrance so vigorous as to disturb him. He cannot bear thus to pause, in imagination, on the distressing picture of one individual; but multiply it ten thousand times; say, how much of all this distress has been heaped together upon a single field; give us the arithmetic of this accumulated wretchedness, and lay it before us with all the accuracy of an official computation—and, strange to tell, not one sigh is lifted up among the crowd of eager listeners, as they stand on tiptoe, and catch every syllable of utterance which is read to them out of the registers of death. O! say, what mystic spell is that, which so blinds us to the sufferings of our brethren; which deafens our ear to the voice of bleeding humanity, when it is aggravated by the shriek of dying thousands; which makes the very magnitude of the slaughter, throw a softening disguise over its cruelties, and its horrors; which causes us to eye with indifference, the field that is crowded with the most revolting abominations, and arrests that sigh, which each individual would singly have drawn from us, by the report of the many who have fallen, and breathed their last in agony along with them.

I am not saying that the burden of all this criminality rests upon the head of the immediate combatants. It lies somewhere; but who can deny that a soldier may be a Christian, and that from the bloody field on which his body is laid, his soul *may* wing its ascending way to the shores of a peaceful eternity? But when I think that the Christians, even of the great world, form but a very little flock, and that an army is not a propitious soil for the growth of Christian principle—when I think on the character of one such army, that had been led on for years by a ruffian ambition, and been inured to scenes of barbarity, and had gathered a most ferocious hardihood of soul from the many enterprises of violence to which an unprincipled command-

er had carried them—when I follow them to the field of battle, and further think, that on both sides of an exasperated contest, the gentleness of Christianity can have no place in almost any bosom, but that nearly every heart is lighted up with fury, and breathes a vindictive purpose against a brother of the species, I cannot but reckon it among the most fearful of the calamities of war, that while the work of death is thickening along its ranks, so many disembodied spirits should pass into the presence of Him who sitteth upon the throne, in such a posture, and with such a preparation.

I have no time to set before you a vivid picture of the other miseries which war carries in its train—how it desolates every country through which it rolls, and spreads violation and alarm among its villages—how, at its approach, every home pours forth its trembling fugitives—how all the rights of property, and all the provisions of justice must give way before its devouring exactions—how, when Sabbath comes, no Sabbath charm comes along with it, and for the sound of the church bell which wont to spread its music over some fine landscape of nature, and summon rustic worshippers to the house of prayer, nothing is heard but the deathful volleys of the battle, and the maddening outcry of infuriated men—how, as the fruit of victory, an unprincipled licentiousness which no discipline can restrain, is suffered to walk at large among the people, and all that is pure, and reverend, and holy in the virtue of families, is cruelly trampled on, and held in the bitterest derision.

But let me hasten to some of the obstacles which stand in the way of the extinction of war. The first great obstacle, then, is the way in which the heart of man is carried off from its barbarities and its horrors, by the splendor of its deceitful accompaniments. There is a feeling of the sublime in contemplating the shock of armies, just as there is in contemplating the devouring energy of a tempest; and this so elevates and engrosses the whole man, that his eye is blind to the tears of bereaved parents, and his ear is deaf to the piteous moan of the dying, and the shriek of their desolated families. There is a gracefulness in the picture of a youthful warrior burning for distinction on the field, and lured by this generous aspiration to the deepest of the animated throng, where, in the fell work of death, the opposing sons of valor struggle for a remembrance and a name; and this side of the picture is so much the exclusive object of our regard, as to disguise from our view the

mangled carcasses of the fallen, and the writhing agonies of the hundreds and the hundreds more who have been laid on the cold ground, where they are left to languish and to die. There no eye pities them. No sister is there to weep over them. There no gentle hand is present to ease the dying posture, or bind up the wounds which, in the maddening fury of the combat, have been given and received by the children of one common father. There death spreads its pale ensigns over every countenance; and when night comes on, and darkness around them, how many a despairing wretch must take up with the bloody field as the untended bed of his last sufferings, without one friend to bear the message of tenderness to his distant home, without one companion to close his eyes.

I avow it. On every side of me I see causes at work which go to spread a most delusive coloring over war, and to remove its shocking barbarities to the back ground of our contemplations altogether. I see it in the history which tells me of the superb appearance of the troops, and the brilliancy of their successive charges. I see it in the poetry which lends the magic of its numbers to the narrative of blood, and transports its many admirers, as by its images, and its figures, and its nodding plumes of chivalry, it throws its treacherous embellishments over a scene of legalized slaughter. I see it in the music which represents the progress of the battle; and where, after being inspired by the trumpet-notes of preparation, the whole beauty and tenderness of a drawing-room are seen to bend over the sentimental entertainment; nor do I hear the utterance of a single sigh to interrupt the death-tones of the thickening contest, and the moans of the wounded men as they fade away upon the ear, and sink into lifeless silence. All, all goes to prove what strange and half-sighted creatures we are. Were it not so, war could never have been seen in any other aspect than that of unmingled hatefulness; and I can look to nothing but to the progress of Christian sentiment upon earth to arrest the strong current of its popular and prevailing partiality for war. Then only will an imperious sense of duty lay the check of severe principle on all the subordinate tastes and faculties of our nature. Then will glory be reduced to its right estimate, and the wakeful benevolence of the gospel chasing away every spell, will be turned by the treachery of no delusion whatever from its simple but sublime enterprises for the good of the species. Then the reign of truth and quietness will be ushered into

the world, and war, cruel, atrocious, unrelenting war will be stript of its many and its bewildering fascinations.

But another obstacle to the extinction of war, is a sentiment which seems to be universally gone into, that the rules and promises of the gospel which apply to a single individual, do not apply to a nation of individuals. Just think of the mighty effect it would have on the politics of the world, were this sentiment to be practically deposed from its wonted authority over the counsels and the doings of nations, in their transactions with each other. If forbearance be the virtue of an individual, forbearance is also the virtue of a nation. If it be incumbent on men in honor to prefer each other, it is incumbent on the very largest societies of men, through the constituted organ of their government, to do the same. If it be the glory of a man to defer his anger, and to pass over a transgression, that nation mistakes its glory which is so feelingly alive to the slightest insult, and musters up its threats and its armaments upon the faintest shadow of a provocation. If it be the magnanimity of an injured man to abstain from vengeance, and it by so doing, he heaps coals of fire upon the head of his enemy, then that is the magnanimous nation, which, recoiling from violence and from blood, will do no more than send its Christian embassy, and prefer its mild and impressive remonstrance; and that is the disgraced nation which will refuse the impressiveness of the moral appeal that has been made to it.

It is, then, only by the extension of Christian principle among the people of the earth, that the atrocities of war will at length be swept away from it; and each of us in hastening the commencement of that blissful period in his own sphere, is doing all that in him lies to bring his own heart, and the hearts of others, under the supreme influence of this principle. It is public opinion, which in the long run governs the world; and while I look with confidence to a gradual revolution in the state of public opinion from the omnipotence of gospel truth working its silent but effectual way through the families of mankind, yet I will not deny that much may be done to accelerate the advent of perpetual and universal peace, by a distinct body of men embarking their every talent, and their every acquirement in the prosecution of this as a distinct object. This was the way in which, a few years ago, the British public were gained over to the cause of Africa. This is the way in which some of the other prophecies of the Bible are at this

moment hastening to their accomplishment ; and it is this way, I apprehend, that the prophecy of peace may be indebted for its speedier fulfilment to the agency of men selecting this as the assigned field on which their philanthropy shall expatiate. Were each individual member of such a scheme to prosecute his own walk, and come forward with his own peculiar contribution, the fruit of the united labors of all would be one of the finest collections of Christian eloquence, and of enlightened morals, and of sound political philosophy, that ever was presented to the world. I could not fasten on another cause more fitted to call forth such a variety of talent, and to rally around it so many of the generous and accomplished sons of humanity, and to give each of them a devotedness and a power far beyond whatever could be sent into the hearts of enthusiasts by the mere impulse of literary ambition.

Let one take up the question of war in its principle, and make the full weight of his moral severity rest upon it, and upon all its abominations. Let another take up the question of war in its consequences, and bring his every power of graphical description to the task of presenting an awakened public with an impressive detail of its cruelties and its horrors. Let another neutralize the poetry of war, and dismantle it of all those bewitching splendors, which the hand of misguided genius has thrown over it. Let another teach the world a truer, and more magnanimous path to national glory, than any country of the world has yet walked in. Let another tell with irresistible argument, how the Christian ethics of a nation is at one with the Christian ethics of its humblest individual. Let another pour the light of modern speculation into the mysteries of trade, and prove that not a single war has been undertaken for any of its objects, where the millions and the millions more which were lavished on the cause, have not all been cheated away from us by the phantom of an imaginary interest. This may look to many like the Utopianism of a romantic anticipation ; but I shall never despair of the cause of truth addressed to a Christian public, when the clear light of principle can be brought to every one of its positions, and when its practical and conclusive establishment forms one of the most distinct of Heaven's prophecies—"that men shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks ; and that nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

THE CHIEF EVIL OF WAR.

BY W. E. CHANNING, D. D.

LET us, then, consider the chief evil of war. What is it? What induces us to place war at the head of human calamities? In replying to these questions, I shall not direct you to the physical sufferings of war, however terrible. Death in its worst forms; the overthrow of proud cities; the devastation of fruitful fields; the impoverishing of nations; famine; pestilence; these form the train of victorious war. But these are not the distinguishing evils of war. Other causes are wasting human life and joy. Cities are overthrown by earthquakes as well as by armies, and more frequently swept by accidental conflagrations than by the flames of war. Hostile bands ravage the fields; but how much oftener do whirlwinds, storms, hurricanes rush over land and sea, prostrating harvests, and destroying the labors of years on a scale so vast as to reduce human devastations to a narrow extent. The truth is, that man is surrounded with mighty powers of nature which he cannot comprehend or withstand; and, amidst their beneficent operations, all of them inflict much suffering. What distinguishes war is, not that man is slain, but that he is slain, spoiled, crushed by the cruelty, the injustice, the treachery, the murderous hand of man. The evil is *moral* evil. War is the concentration of all human crimes. Here is its distinguishing, accursed brand. Under its standard gather violence, malignity, rage, fraud, perfidy, rapacity and lust. If it only slew man, it would do little. It turns man into a beast of prey. Here is the evil of war, that man, made to be the brother, becomes the deadly foe of his kind; that man, whose duty it is to mitigate suffering, makes the infliction of suffering his study and end; that man, whose office it is to avert and heal the wounds which come from nature's powers, makes researches into nature's laws, and arms himself with her most awful forces, that he may become the destroyer of his race. Nor is this all. There is also found in war a cold-hearted indifference to human miseries and wrongs, perhaps more shocking than the bad passions it calls forth. To my mind, this contempt of human nature is singularly offensive. To hate, expresses something like respect. But

in war, man treats his brother as nothing worth; sweeps away human multitudes as insects; tramples them down as grass; mocks at their rights; and does not deign a thought to their woes.

These remarks show us the great evil of war. It is moral evil. The field of battle is a theatre, got up at immense cost, for the exhibition of crime on a grand scale. There the hell within the human breast blazes out fiercely and without disguise. A more fearful hell in any region of the universe cannot well be conceived. There the fiends hold their revels, and spread their fury.

Suppose two multitudes of men, each composed of thousands, meeting from different countries, but meeting not to destroy but to consult and labor for the good of the race; and suppose them, in the midst of their deliberations, to be smitten suddenly by some mysterious visitation of God, and their labors to be terminated by immediate death. We should be awe-struck by this strange, sudden, wide-spread ruin. But reflection would teach us, that this simultaneous extinction of life in so many of our race, was but an anticipation or peculiar fulfilment of the sentence passed on all mankind; and a tender reverence would spring up, as we should think of so many generous men coming together from so many different regions, in the spirit of human brotherhood, to be wrapt in one pall, to sleep in one grave. We should erect a monument on the solemn spot; but chiefly to commemorate the holy purpose which had gathered them from their scattered abodes; and we should write on it, "To the memory of a glorious company, suddenly taken from God's ministry on earth, to enter again, a blessed brotherhood, on a higher ministry in heaven." Here you have death sweeping away hosts in a moment; but how different from death in a field of battle, where man meets man as a foe, where the countenance flashes rage, and the arm is nerved for slaughter, where brother hews down brother, and where thousands are sent unprepared, in the moment of crime, to give their account. When nature's laws, fulfilling the mysterious will of God, inflict death on the good, we bow, we adore, we give thanks. How different is death from the murderous hand of man!

Allow me to make another supposition, which may bring out still more strongly the truth on which I now insist, that the great evil of war is inward, moral; that its physical woes, terrible as they may be, are light by the side of this.

Suppose then, that in travelling through a solitary region, you should catch the glimpse of a distant dwelling. You approach it eagerly in the hope of hearing a welcome after your weary journey. As you draw nigh, an ominous stillness damps your hope; and on entering, you see the inmates of the house, a numerous family, stretched out motionless, and without life. A wasting pestilence has, in one day, made their dwelling a common tomb. At first you are thrilled with horror by the sight; but as you survey the silent forms, you see on all their countenances, amidst traces of suffering, an expression of benignity. You see some of the dead lying side by side, with hands mutually entwined, showing that the last action of life was a grasp of affection; whilst some lie locked in one another's arms. The mother's cold lips are still pressed to the cheek of the child, and the child's arms still wind round the neck of the mother. In the forms of others you see no ambiguous proof, that the spirit took its flight in the act of prayer. As you look on these signs of love and faith, stronger than the last agony, what a new feeling steals over you! Your horror subsides. Your eyes are suffused with tears, not of anguish, but of sympathy, affection, tender reverence. You feel the spot to be consecrated. Death becomes lovely like the sleep of infancy. You say, Blessed family, death hath not divided you!

With soothed and respectful sorrow, you leave this resting place of the good, and another dwelling, dimly described in the horizon, invites your steps. As you approach it, the same stillness is an augury of a like desolation, and you enter it, expecting to see another family laid low by the same mysterious disease. But you open the door, and the spectacle freezes your blood, and chains your steps to the threshold. On every face you see the distortion of rage. Every man's hand grasps a deadly weapon; every breast is gored with wounds. Here lies one, rived asunder by a sword. There, two are locked together, but in the death-grapple of hatred, not the embrace of love. Here lies woman trampled on and polluted, and there the child, weltering in his own blood. You recoil with horror, as soon as the sickness of the heart will suffer you to move. The deadly steam of the apartment oppresses, overpowers you, as if it were the suffocating air of hell. You are terror-struck, as if through the opening earth you had sunk into the abode of fiends; and when the time for reflection comes, and you recall the blessed habitation you had just before left,

what a conviction rushes on you, that nothing deserves the name of wo, but that which crime inflicts. You feel, that there is a sweetness, loveliness, sacredness in suffering and death, when pervaded by holy affections; and that infinite wretchedness and despair gather over these, when springing from unholy passion, when bearing the brand of crime.

I do not mean to deny, that the physical sufferings of war are great, and should incite us to labor for its abolition. But sufferings, separate from crime, coming not through man's wickedness, but from the laws of nature, are not un-mixed evils. They have a ministry of love. God has ordained them, that they should bind men to one another, that they should touch and soften the human heart, that they should call forth mutual aid, solace, gratitude, and self-forgetting love. Sorrow is the chief cement of souls. Death, coming in the order of nature, gathers round the sufferer sympathizing, anxious friends, who watch day and night, with suffused eyes and heart-breathed prayer, to avert or mitigate the last agonies. It calls up tender recollections, inspires solemn thought, rebukes human pride, obscures the world's glories, and speaks of immortality. From the still death-bed, what softening, subduing, chastening, exalting influences proceed. But death in war, death from the hand of man, sears the heart and conscience, kills human sympathies, and scatters the thought of judgment to come. Man dying in battle, unsolaced, unpitied, and a victim to hatred, rapacity, and insatiable ambition, leaves behind him wrongs to be revenged. His blood does not speak peace or speak of heaven; but sends forth a maddening cry, and exasperates survivors to new struggles.

Thus war adds to suffering the unutterable weight of crime, and defeats the holy and blessed ministry which all suffering is intended to fulfil. When I look back on the ages of conflict through which the race has passed, what most moves me is not the awful amount of suffering which war has inflicted. This may be borne. The terrible thought is, that this has been the work of crime; that men, whose great law is love, have been one another's butchers; that God's children have stained his beautiful earth, made beautiful for their home, with one another's blood; that the shriek, which comes to us from all regions and ages, has been extorted by human cruelty; that man has been a demon, and has turned earth into hell.

LOSS OF LIFE BY WAR.

LIFE IS man's chief earthly boon. It is essential to all his other blessings; and without it he can neither do, nor enjoy, nor be any thing. It is the means of all his acquisitions; it is the medium of all his enjoyments; it is the pivot of his destiny for two worlds, the seed-time of his whole immortal being, the period of his preparation for a blissful or a miserable immortality!

Such is life, the destruction of which is the grand aim of war. For what else are its engines constructed, its science and its skill taught, its arts and stratagems practised, all its daring and desperate deeds undertaken? For what purpose its swords and bayonets, its muskets and cannon, its bombs and rockets, and other instruments of death? Are they not made and used almost solely for the butchery of mankind? Is it not for this as her grand object, that Christendom still maintains her two thousand war-ships, still keeps her millions of human blood-hounds ready for their prey, and loads her toiling, struggling, starving myriads with debts and taxes? Have not the chief energies of our race for nearly six thousand years, been absorbed, all over the earth, in the work of mutual butchery?

Surely, then, the result *must* be a fearful sacrifice of life. The sum total we cannot ascertain; but let us consider first how *war obstructs the increase of mankind*, and next how *it actually destroys them*; its work of prevention, and its work of destruction, both of which conspire to swell the incalculable amount of its havoc.

We cannot dwell on the thousand ways in which war prevents the legitimate and salutary growth of our species. The general poverty which it creates, must tend to hold back the mass of the community from marriage. Virtue is the chief nurse of population; but this custom is a hot-bed of vice and crime. It reeks with licentiousness; and every one knows that such habits in a community are fatal to the increase of its numbers, and often suffice alone to insure, as in the South-Sea Islands, a steady and rapid diminution. Its laws, its stern exigencies, forbid in most cases the marriage of its agents; and the great body of

them become reckless libertines, whose intrigues debauch more or less every community they visit. There is no record of their countless victims; but the general result in war-countries is seen in the fact, that in Paris, as in many other parts of Europe, every third child is a bastard. Nor does even this tell the whole truth; for means are almost universally employed by such persons there, with the certainty of success in most cases, to prevent conception, or procure abortion. In some European countries, no man is permitted to marry until he has served in the army a long term of years; and during this time, the common soldiers indulge in the loosest debaucheries, and the officers live on a species of tolerated concubinage which creates whole families of illegitimate children. At the close of their service, some marry, others do not; and the result is such a general relaxation of morals and domestic ties as must greatly diminish the number of lawful marriages, and the growth of a legitimate and virtuous population. Camps and fleets are even in peace most prolific nurseries of licentiousness; every war-ship, when in port, is a floating brothel, insomuch that *six hundred* prostitutes are said to have perished in the sinking of the Royal George at Spit-head, in 1782; and every recruiting rendezvous, every resting-place of soldiers for a single night, is a centre or source of pollution; nor can you well conceive the full influence in these respects of three millions of men, in the vigor of health, and the fire of youthful passion, withdrawn from marriage, and left to sate their fierce and lawless lusts on female purity.

The general result you may see in war-countries compared with those which have pursued a pacific policy. Such has been our own policy; and in fifty years we have quadrupled our population. Such has been the policy of China; and, with a territory equal to little more than one third of Europe, she has nearly half the people on the globe. While our own population was doubling every quarter of a century, that of Europe, according to Adam Smith, was increasing at a rate so slow as hardly to reach the same result in five hundred years; but since the downfall of Napoleon, the inhabitants of Prussia have been doubling in twenty-six years, those of Great Britain in forty-two, those of Russia in sixty-six, and those of France in one hundred and five. During these thirty years of general peace, (1845,) the population of Europe, with the exception of Spain and Portugal rent with civil wars, has probably

increased more than in any two centuries before for a thousand years. The sum total of prevention from war, we cannot of course estimate or even conjecture; but, had this custom never existed, their might hitherto have been full twice as many human beings on the globe, with four times the amount of happiness. Nor can this supposition be neutralized by saying, that the earth would thus have been overstocked; for experiment and calculation have proved it capable of supporting in comfort more than fifty times its present population!

But look especially at the *direct havoc of mankind by war*. It introduces a variety of customs destructive to life. We are not, as friends of peace, concerned with the question of capital punishment; but, if war did not first lead to such penalties, it certainly has increased their number to a fearful extent, and written the code of even some Christian States in blood. In England itself there were, in the time of Blackstone, no less than one hundred and sixty crimes punishable with death; and in the reign of Henry VIII., there perished by the hands of the executioner 72,000 persons, or an average of one every hour of day-light for a space of seventeen years! War, likewise, originated duelling, judicial combats, and other practices which have swept off immense multitudes. We little suspect how many have fallen in duels alone, and can hardly believe what a French writer not long since stated, in a paper read before the French Academy, and published under their sanction, that in certain departments of France, five, six, and even ten per cent. of all the deaths in the army are occasioned by this spawn of the war-system!

But the *immediate* destruction of life by war, is vast and appalling. So it must be, since death is its grand aim; and if you contemplate the thousands and millions of its agents, bold, blood-thirsty and reckless, trained with all possible skill to the trade of human butchery, armed for this purpose with instruments the most terribly effective, plying every art, and stretching every nerve to destroy mankind, and stimulated to desperation by the promise to success of the highest earthly rewards, can you adequately conceive the havoc likely to ensue?

Far greater, however, is the *incidental* loss of life. Well does Dr. Johnson say, "War has means of destruction more formidable than the cannon and the sword. Of the thousands and ten thousands that perish, a very small part ever feel the stroke of the enemy. The rest languish in tents

and ships, amid damps and putrefaction, pale, torpid and spiritless; gasping and groaning unpitied among men rendered obstinate by long continuance of hopeless misery; and are at last whelmed in pits, or heaved into the ocean, without notice or remembrance. By incommodious encampments and unwholesome stations, whole fleets are silently dispeopled, and armies sluggishly melted away."

If you doubt the truth of these sweeping remarks, go to a camp, and there see human life rotting in masses into the grave. The filth, intemperance and licentiousness of soldiers carry them off in vast multitudes, and generate diseases the most malignant and fatal. When seized with sickness, there is little or no care taken of them; no mother, wife or sister near to tend their couch; no pillow of down to ease their aching head; no escape from pinching cold, or scorching heat; no shelter from howling blasts, or drenching rains. Hence death treads sure and quick upon the heels of disease that might, in nine cases out of ten, have been cured at home, or entirely prevented. You can hardly conceive how fast an army will melt away under the influence of such causes alone, and no record kept, no notice taken of its victims. In transferring troops from one country to another, especially to sultry regions, statesmen coolly calculate on losing, from this cause alone, every third man. In certain climates, and under certain circumstances in every-climate, it requires only a few brief years or even months to annihilate whole crews or regiments without shedding a drop of blood.

It is often impossible to calculate or trace even the known loss of life. "I was sixteen years old," said a venerable Christian with the frost of eighty winters on his head, "when our Revolutionary war began; and, on my brother's fitting out a privateer, I embarked along with him. There were *ninety* on board besides officers. In a fortnight we were captured, and carried to a prison in Lisbon, whence we were forced on board a British man of war, and sailed for the Indies. There I spent seven or eight years, and did not reach this country till after the treaty of 1783. What became of my companions, I know not; but of the whole crew, not more than four or five were ever heard of again, and those were all, or nearly all, officers. The common sailors, I believe, all perished."

Let us quote a single instance of the fatal effect of climate. "The climate," says Lord Collingwood, "was

deadly, and no constitution could resist its effects. At San Juan," near the Isthmus of Darien, "I joined the ship, and succeeded Lord Nelson who was promoted to a larger ship; but he had received the infection of the climate before he went from the port, and had a fever from which he did not recover until he quitted his ship, and went to England. My constitution resisted many attacks, and I survived most of my ship's company, having buried in four months one hundred and eighty of the two hundred that composed it;" *a loss of ninety per cent. from the climate alone!* "Nor was mine a singular case; for *every ship that was long there, suffered in the same degree.* The transport's men *all* died; and some of the ships, having none left to take care of them, sunk in the harbor. Transport ships, however, were not wanted; for the troops they had brought, were no more; they had fallen not by the hand of an enemy, but from the contagion of the climate."

The common usage, discipline and hardships of soldiers prey upon them like murrain. It would seem impossible for them to survive some of their punishments that are not *designed* to take life; and multitudes die either by the process, or from its immediate effects. The ill-treatment they receive, frequently drives them to suicide; and their scanty clothing, their unwholesome food, their unhealthy encampments, their want of shelter and bedding, their repose on the damp, cold, frozen earth, their exposures on duty day and night in all seasons, all weathers, and every clime, cannot fail to hurry countless multitudes to the grave. Scarce a peasant in Ireland, or a serf in Poland, or a slave in any country on the globe, is subjected continually to such fatal privations, hardships and exposures as fall to the *common* lot of soldiers.

Glance at their food, often provided by avaricious, unprincipled contractors with less care than a farmer ordinarily takes in feeding his swine! It has been sometimes so intolerably bad as to be refused even by wretches dying with hunger; and an eminent physician once testified under oath before the British Parliament, that in the military hospitals of Aracan, "monstrous reptiles, engendered in the mass of *filth*, which the soldiers had been *obliged* to take for food, were often seen crawling from the mouths of the sick!"

Let us select a specimen or two of the treatment of prisoners. "Our numbers," says one of the sufferers, a

Frenchman in Spain, "thinned rapidly on the way. Fatigue and insufficient provision rendered many incapable of rising to renew their march after a night's halt; and the dawn exhibited to us the stiffened limbs of such as death had released from further earthly trouble. The survivors were gaunt and emaciated; and frequently would a poor fellow drop to the ground in the extremity of weariness and despair. No effort was made to assist these sufferers; but they were either left behind to perish, or bayoneted on the spot." The French, in their retreat from Moscow, had in one instance three thousand Russian prisoners. "During the march," says Labaume, "having no provisions to give them, they were herded together like beasts, and not allowed on any pretext to quit the limits assigned them. Without fire, perishing with cold, they lay on the bare ice; to appease their ravenous hunger, they seized with avidity the horse-flesh which was distributed to them, and, for want of time and means to dress it, ate it entirely raw; and I have been assured that, when this supply failed, many of them ate their comrades who had sunk under their miseries!"

Take an example of hardships not uncommon in war. "Every day," says a young Scotch soldier in the Peninsular War, "we were either on guard, or on fatigue. We were not a night in bed out of two during all the time we remained there. Besides, the weather was dreadful; we had always either snow or hail, the latter often as large as nuts; and we were forced to put our knapsacks on our heads to protect us from its violence. The frost was most severe, accompanied by high winds. Often for whole days and nights we could not get a tent to stand; many of us were frost-bitten, and others were found dead at their posts. On our march, the rain poured in torrents; and melted snow was half knee-deep in many places, and stained by the blood that flowed from our bruised and wounded feet. There was nothing to sustain our famished bodies, or shelter them from the rain or snow. We were either drenched with rain, or crackling with ice. Fuel we could find none. The sick and the wounded whom we had been still enabled with our own hands to drag along with us in wagons, were now left to perish in the snow. The road was one line of bloody foot-marks from the sore feet of the men; and on its sides lay the dead and the dying."

Just glance at the havoc occasioned by forced and ex-

hausting marches. The French soldiers, on their retreat from Moscow, would, on halting at night, throng into the houses, throw themselves down on the first dirty straw they could find, and there perish, in large numbers, with hunger and fatigue. From such sufferings, and from the infection of the air in the warmer season by putrefied carcases of men and horses that strewed the road, there sprang two dreadful diseases, the dysentery and typhus fever, before which they melted away like dew before the sun. At times they were so overwhelmed with whirlwinds of snow, that they could not distinguish the road from the ditches, and often found their grave in the latter. The roads, league after league, were chequered with dead bodies covered with snow, and forming undulations or hillocks like those in a grave-yard. Many of the survivors scarce retained the human form. Some had lost their hearing, others their speech; and many, by excessive cold and hunger, were reduced to a state of such stupid phrenzy, that they roasted the dead bodies of their companions, and even gnawed their own hands and arms. "No grenade or grape," says an eye-witness, "could have so disfigured those victims of the cold. One of them had lost the upper joints of all his ten fingers; and he showed us the stumps. Another wanted both ears and nose. More horrible still was the look of a third whose eyes had been frozen; the eye-lids hung down rotting, the globes of the eyes were burst, and protruded from their sockets. It was awfully hideous; but a spectacle yet more dreadful was to present itself. Out of the straw in the car that brought them, I now beheld a figure creep painfully, which one could scarcely believe to be a human being, so wild and distorted were the features. The lips were rotted away, the teeth stood exposed; he pulled the cloth from before his mouth, and grinned on us like a death's-head!"

How many perish from such causes, we cannot conjecture; but in the Russian campaign of 1812, so fatal was the effect of hunger and fatigue, exposure and disease, that of 22,000 Bavarians, though they had been in no action, only 11,000 lived to reach the Duna, and the very flower of the French and the allied armies perished. A division of the Russian forces, amounting to 120,000 at the commencement of the pursuit, could not near Warsaw muster 35,000; and a re-enforcement of 10,000, that had marched from Wilna, arrived with only 1500, of whom one

half were the next day in the hospitals. Not a few companies were utterly annihilated without a single stroke from the enemy!

Such is the waste of life in war from other causes than the sword; and even in peace the mortality among soldiers is about twice as great as among citizens. A memoir, read before the French Academy by a distinguished writer, states that in seven years of peace, (1820-6) the mortality in the French army averaged 2.254 in the hundred, while in France it is only 1.22; nor does it ordinarily reach even two per cent. before the age of fifty or sixty. Of 2360 galley slaves, thirty-nine died from 1824-27; only 1.652 in the hundred, or little more than two-thirds of the mortality among soldiers. Though generally young and robust, they live in a time of war an average of about three years; and even in peace their life is probably cut short not less than fifteen years.

But no record is kept of peaceful inhabitants who perish in every country where war rages. In Madrid and other cities of Spain, the French, in the days of Napoleon, forced their way into the houses of citizens, bayoneted all within that chanced to have arms, and stationed parties of cavalry at the different outlets of the town to cut off those who should try to escape. In Portugal they burnt villages and towns, butchered prisoners, and massacred without distinction all classes of society; and, in their retreat from that ill-fated country, they literally strewed the roads with the dead bodies of nobles and peasants, of women, and children, and priests, all put to death like so many dogs.

Of such havoc it is impossible to form any estimate or conjecture; but we know that war has sometimes entirely depopulated immense districts. In modern as well as ancient times, large tracts have been left so utterly desolate, that a traveller might pass from village to village, even from city to city, without finding a solitary inhabitant! The war of 1756, waged in the heart of Europe, left in one instance no less than twenty contiguous villages without a single man or beast! In one ancient campaign, 50,000 laborers died of hunger; Hannibal alone, in sixteen years, plundered no less than four hundred towns; the barbarous invaders of the Roman Empire sometimes swept *all* the inhabitants from province after province; and some of the most notorious conquerors have, like Jenghiz-khan, waged wars of utter extermination, and butchered thousands and

millions of unarmed men, women and children in cold blood.

Let us quote the testimony of an eminent reviewer to the general havoc of life in war: "The levies of soldiers in France, during her late wars, exceeded four millions, and not less than three millions of these, on the lowest calculation, perished in the field, the hospital, or the bivouac. If to these we add, as we unquestionably must, at least an equal number out of the ranks of their antagonists, it is clear that not less than six millions of human beings, in the course of twenty years, perished by war in the very heart of civilized Europe, at the commencement of the nineteenth century. But even these stupendous numbers give us no adequate conception of the destruction of human life directly consequent on the wars of the revolution and the empire. We must add the thousands who perished from want, outrage and exposure, and the hundreds of thousands who were subsequently swept away by the ravages of that pestilence which took its rise amid the retreat from Russia, and the crowded garrisons of the campaign of 1813, and for several years afterwards desolated in succession every country of Europe."

We can scarcely glance at the multitudes that perish in sieges and hospitals. In the latter alone nearly as many die as on the field of battle; nor will such a statement seem exaggerated to any one who will minutely investigate this loathsome and horrid subject. Look at the havoc of sieges. In that of Londonderry, 1689, there perished more than 12,000 soldiers, besides a vast number of the inhabitants. During the siege of Paris, in the sixteenth century, the famine was so severe that mothers ate their own children, and 30,000 persons died of hunger alone. In the siege of Magdeburg, 1631, more than 5000 of the slain were thrown into the Elbe, to clear the streets; and a much greater number had been consumed in the flames; the victims of famine, disease and hardship could not be reckoned; but the sum total of the lost was estimated at 30,000. Such was the havoc of life at the storming of Belgrade, 1717, that "the Jews were compelled to throw into the Danube the bodies of 12,000 slain, merely to spare the trouble and expense of burying them." In the siege of Malplaquet in the north-east of France, 1709, there fell on both sides no less than 34,000 soldiers alone. The storming of Ismail by Suwarrow, 1790, cost 40,000 men.

In the siege of Hamburgh, 1813, there perished 15,000 of the garrison, besides all the victims among the inhabitants, and the besieging army. In the siege of Mexico, more than 100,000 were slain in battle, and upwards of 50,000 more died from the infection of putrefying carcasses. The siege of Vienna sacrificed 70,000 lives, and that of Ostend 120,000. At the siege of Acre, by the Crusaders, 300,000 fell; ancient Carthage, containing 700,000 inhabitants, was so utterly destroyed, that not a single edifice was left standing; during the siege of Jerusalem, 1,100,000 persons perished, and during that of Troy, according to Burton, not less than 946,000 Trojans, and 870,000 Greeks; in all, 1,816,000 for a worthless courtesan!

Mark the havoc of single battles. At Durham, 1346, there fell 15,000; at Halidonhill and Agincourt, 20,000 each; at Bautzen and Lepanto, 25,000 each; at Austerlitz, Jena and Lutzen, 30,000 each; at Eylau, 60,000; at Waterloo and Quatre Bras, one engagement, 70,000; at Borodino, 80,000; at Fontenoy, 100,000; at Yarmouth, 150,000; at Chalons, no less than 300,000 of Attila's army alone! The Moors in Spain, about the year 800, lost in one battle 70,000; in another, four centuries later, 180,000, besides 50,000 prisoners, and in a third, even 200,000. Still greater was the carnage in ancient times. At Cannæ, 70,000 fell. The Romans alone, in an engagement with the Cimbri and Teutones, lost 80,000. The Carthagenians attacked Hymera in Sicily with an army of 300,000 men, and a fleet of 2000 ships, and 3000 transports; but not a ship nor a transport escaped destruction, and of the troops, only a few in a small boat reached Carthage with the melancholy tidings. Marius slew, in one battle, 140,000 Gauls, and in another, 290,000. In the battle of Issus, between Alexander and Darius, 110,000 were slain, and in that of Arbela, 300,000. Julius Cæsar once annihilated an army of 363,000 Helvetians; in a battle with the Usipetes, he slew 400,000; and on another occasion, he massacred more than 430,000 Germans, who "had crossed the Rhine, with their herds, and flocks, and little ones, in quest of new settlements."

It is difficult to conceive the havoc of ancient warfare. During a single war of the northern barbarians in Africa, no less than five millions, according to Procopius, perished by the sword, famine and pestilence; and in the war of twenty years waged by Justinian against the barbarous

hordes that poured into Italy, the Goths alone are supposed to have lost more than fifteen millions !

Look at two cases more. The army of Xerxes, according to Rollin, was composed of 1,700,000 foot, 80,000 horse, and 20,000 men for conducting the carriages and camels. On passing the Hellespont, he received a re-enforcement of 300,000, making the whole 2,100,000. His fleet consisted of 1207 vessels, each carrying 230 men ; in all, 277,610 men. This number was augmented from the European nations with 1200 vessels carrying 240,000 men ; and on board the small galleys, transports, and other craft, to the number of 3000, were 240,000 more men. Including the multitude of usual attendants on an army in the East, Dr. Dick supposes "the whole number of souls that followed Xerxes into Greece, must have amounted to 5,283,320 ;" and, if the attendants were only one-third as great as common at the present day in Eastern countries, the sum total must have reached nearly six millions ! What became of this vast multitude ? In one year it was reduced to 300,000 fighting men ; and of these only 3000 escaped destruction. More than five millions lost in a single year !

During the thirteenth century arose Jenghiz-khan, and ravaged the heart of Asia. His armies sometimes exceeded a million, and his wars were those of utter extermination. He seemed the war-demon incarnate. His spirit feasted on death. On the plains of Nessa, he shot 90,000 persons in cold blood. At the storming of Kharasm, he massacred 200,000, and sold 100,000 for slaves. In the district of Herat, he butchered 1,600,000, and in two cities with their dependencies, 1,760,000. During the last twenty-seven years of his long reign, he is said to have massacred an average of more than half a million every year ; and in the first fourteen years, he is supposed by Chinese historians to have destroyed not less than eighteen millions ; a sum total of 32,000,000 human beings sacrificed in forty-one years by a single hand on the Moloch shrine of war !

Do you ask, now, for an epitome of the havoc war has made of human life ? In the Russian campaign, there perished in less than six months nearly half a million of the French alone, and perhaps as many more of their enemies. During only twelve years of the recent wars of Europe, no less than 5,800,000 Christian lives are supposed

to have been lost. Even the French admit, that the wars of Napoleon alone must have sacrificed six millions; and, if we reckon all the victims, both among the soldiers and the people, of the wars consequent on the French Revolution, the sum total cannot be less than nine or ten millions. The Spaniards are said to have destroyed in forty-two years more than twelve millions of American Indians. The wars in the time of Sesostris cost 15,000,000 lives; those of Semiramis, Cyrus and Alexander, 10,000,000 each; those of Alexander's successors, 20,000,000. Grecian wars sacrificed 15,000,000; Jewish wars, 25,000,000; the wars of the twelve Cæsars, 30,000,000 in all; the wars of the Romans before Julius Cæsar, 60,000,000; the wars of the Roman Empire, of the Saracens and the Turks, 60,000,000 each; the wars of the Reformation, 30,000,000; those of the Middle Ages, and the nine Crusades in two centuries, 40,000,000 each; those of the Tartars, 80,000,000; those of Africa, 100,000,000!

Such estimates may well seem incredible; but we have taken them all from sources entitled to credit. On such a subject, perfect accuracy is impossible; you might as well think of counting the spires of grass on the whole globe, or the drops of rain that fell in Noah's flood; but, if the foregoing statements make any approximation to the truth, the entire havoc of human life by war must defy our utmost powers of conception. "If we take into consideration," says the learned Dr. Dick, "the number not only of those who have fallen in battle, but of those who have perished through the natural consequences of war, it will not perhaps be overrating the destruction of human life, if we affirm, that *one-tenth* of the human race has been destroyed by the ravages of war; and, according to this estimate, more than *fourteen thousand millions* of human beings have been slaughtered in war since the beginning of the world." Edmund Burke went still further, and reckoned the sum total of its ravages from the first at no less than **THIRTY-FIVE THOUSAND MILLIONS!**

WITNESSES FOR PEACE.

“AMERICA,” says the Rev. Mr. JEFFRIES, a distinguished English Episcopal Missionary, and one of the Chaplains of the East India Company, “America has the honor of inventing two of the most valuable institutions that ever blessed mankind,—the Peace Society, and the Temperance Society; and, if every American viewed them as I do, *he would join them immediately.*” The cause of peace is common to all Christians; and from men of eminence in different denominations, we will quote a few specimens of their views on this subject.

WYCLIFFE, the Reformer, deserves to stand at the head of them all. “What honor falls to a knight that kills many men? The hangman killeth many more, and with a better title. Better were it for men to be butchers of beasts than butchers of their brethren! As, according to common law, no man will make battle, except he have leave from the prince of the people; so no man should take vengeance, unless God move him, and warn him as his instrument, saying *how* he will have vengeance.

METHODISTS.—Let us hear the father of Methodism, JOHN WESLEY. “You may pour out your soul, and bemoan the loss of true, genuine love in the earth. Lost indeed! you may well say, but not in the ancient sense. *See how these CHRISTIANS love one another!* These *Christian* kingdoms that are tearing out each other’s bowels, desolating one another with fire and sword! These *Christian* armies that are sending each other by thousands, by tens of thousands, quick to hell! These *Christian* nations that are all on fire with intestine broils, party against party, faction against faction! Yea, what is most dreadful of all, these Christian churches, (tell it not in Gath; but, alas! how can we hide it from Jews, Turks or Pagans?) that bear the name of Christ, the Prince of Peace, yet wage continual war with each other! O God! how long will thy promise fail?

EPISCOPALIANS.—*Soame Jenyns*. If Christian nations were nations of *Christians*, all war would be impossible and unknown among them.

Thomas Scott. War in every case must be deemed the triumph or the harvest of the first great murderer, the devil.

Bishop Watson. Christianity looks upon all the human race as children of the same father; and in ordering us to do good, to love as brethren, to forgive injuries, and to study peace, it quite annihilates the disposition for martial glory, and utterly debases the pomp of war.

Dr. Jortin. The consequences of war are too well known. They are the desolation of populous and flourishing regions, the

loss of trade, the increase of taxes and debts, poverty both public and private, the destruction of thousands, and the ruin of almost as many families, besides the sicknesses, the famines, the iniquities and cruelties which always accompany a state of hostility.—The wars continually waged by Christian nations, are most notorious offences against the sixth commandment, against the law of nature, against the laws of God given by Moses, against the Christian religion. In all wars, one side is in fault, sometimes both; and in this case war is no better than robbery and murder, the guilt of which lies, I do not say, upon the soldiers, but upon those in whose hands is lodged the power of declaring war.

BAPTISTS.—*Ward*, the veteran and venerable missionary, says, “the glory of our Christian profession lies in our business on earth resembling the work which the Father gave to Christ to do; but how unfavorable to this is the profession of arms! Rather, how totally incompatible with it! Christianity says, *love your enemies*; the maxims of statesmen say, *kill them off*. Christ says, *resist not evil*; the statesman says, *fight, and leave the reasons to me*.—What a shocking sight to tie a handkerchief over a man’s eyes, and tell him to shoot in the crowd at persons whom he never saw, a company of fathers, sons, brothers; but, more than this, a company of men who have to live forever in happiness or misery, and every bullet perhaps sends a man to hell. Either our religion is a fable, or there are unanswerable arguments, (urged, it is true, till they are stale enough,) against war, and the profession of arms. *Thou shalt do no murder*. ‘One murder makes a villain; millions, a hero.’ Where? At the bar of God? I trow not. Satan was a murderer from the beginning, a kind of hero reigning in hell.

Judson, the Apostle of Burmah, says, “I hail the establishment of peace societies as one of the most auspicious signs of the present eventful era, and regard them as combining with Bible and missionary societies to form that three-fold cord which will ultimately bind all the families of man in universal peace and love.—Since war has been universally advocated and applauded, it appears to me that it is not optional with any to remain neutral or silent on this great question; since, thus remaining, they must be considered as belonging of course to the war party. Notwithstanding, therefore, I am a missionary, I have for some time determined to make whatever efforts were necessary to comply with the dictates of conscience, and wash my hands of the blood that is shed in war. I regret that I have so long delayed to enter my protest against this practice by some overt act; a measure which appears, in the present state of things, *the indispensable duty of every Christian*.

PRESEBYTERIANS.—*Dr. Macleod*. War is a school of vice, a nursery of debauchery. By it cities are sacked, and countries laid waste. The dearest ties of kindred are unloosed; fathers made childless, children fatherless, and wives converted into widows. What more cruel, and less congenial with the spirit of the gospel?

Dr. Beman. The character of war is not less incompatible with the genius of the gospel, and an advanced stage of intellectual refinement, than that of despotism or slavery. It is a relict

of barbarism which would long since have disappeared from human society, had the laws of nations kept pace with the positive statutes which govern the political and social compact. With two guardian angels,—Christianity on my right hand, and Science on my left,—methinks I am conducted to an eminence from which I survey the surrounding and subjected world. The freshness of Eden covers the scene, and the smile of heaven gilds the prospect. The trumpet of carnage is blown no more; nor does the crimson flag ever again unfurl itself to the breeze. The demon of vengeance, ever hungry for human flesh, is chained, and commissioned no more to imprint his bloody footsteps upon the earth; nor do the sighing zephyrs ever again waft the death-groans of murdered victims. The ensanguined field is no more covered with the mangled bodies of the slain; nor do the broad streams of blood ever again pursue their dark, and deep, and melancholy course amidst the shouts of victory, and the agonies of despair. The wife is no more hastened into widowhood, nor her babes consigned to orphanage. The bow of victory is broken, the spear of death is cut asunder, and the chariot of conquest is burned in the fire. This is a consummation devoutly to be sought; an enterprise which may well command our most vigorous efforts while we live, and the successful termination of which will deserve to be perpetuated by a monument as high as heaven.

CONGREGATIONALISTS.—*Dr. Dwight.* War has prevailed in every age, and through every country; and in all it has waded through human blood, trampled on human corpses, and laid waste the fields and dwellings, the happiness and the hopes of mankind. It has been employed to empty earth, and people hell, to make angels weep, and fiends triumph over the deplorable guilt and debasement of the human character. We slaughter thousands and millions in war, and then plant laurels amid the bones, and nourish them with the blood of those whom we have destroyed. Yet, to men of such characters, statues are erected, nay, temples have been built, and altars have smoked with victims. To them the page of the historian, and the harp of the poet are consecrated. To their praise the sculptor bids the marble breathe, and the painter teaches the canvass to glow. They live in palaces, and are entombed in mausoleums.

Dr. Appleton. If the sufferings of the soldier are great in the camp, they are terrible in the field. I can hardly imagine a scene more dreadful than that which is subsequent to the hour of battle. Suppose yourself in a hospital crowded with the wounded and the dying. Here one limb has been shattered, and another severed from the body. Here some part of the body itself has been pierced through, or still retains the weapon which inflicted the wound. In that corner you behold a wretch with his head lacerated, his jaws fractured, or an eye dislocated. In another you see those whom want of reason renders unconscious of their state, or those who are frantic, and perhaps blaspheming under the intolerable severity of their anguish. Here is one impatient for the knife and the tourniquet, from a conviction that his present

pains cannot be augmented. There is one shrieking under operations more painful than the malady they are designed to assuage.

Look now at the condition of the common inhabitants in a country where contending armies are stationed. The regular pursuits of life must be interrupted or abandoned. Honor, property and life itself are at the mercy of those whom no earthly power is able to control, and who perhaps will acknowledge no law but their own wants and passions. Children and females, the aged and the feeble, find themselves surrounded by every terror, and exposed to every indignity. Ferocious troops are quartered in houses which had been the abodes of wealth, taste and domestic enjoyment. The owners, if not arrested, are constrained to witness these ravages without complaint, and compelled to become the slaves of those by whom they are impoverished. Churches and public edifices are converted into barracks; rich gardens are plundered and laid waste; and harvests are consumed in a day to give forage to a devouring cavalry. All enclosures are made common; flocks and herds are slaughtered and consumed; wardrobes are despoiled, and store-houses exhausted. Do not Christian nations, then, worship an idol more savage and hideous than the Moloch of the Hindoos?

Dr. Payson. War is surrounded by a deceitful lustre. The monster, unveiled in all his deformity, is seen steeped from head to foot in human gore, gorging his insatiable maw with the yet quivering limbs of mangled victims, and feasting his ears with the wailings of disconsolate widows and helpless orphans; while the flash of cannon, the glare of bombs, and the red blaze of cities wrapt in conflagration, furnish the only light which illuminates his horrid banquet. Such is the idol whom the votaries of war adore; such the Moloch on whose altars men have exultingly sacrificed, not hecatombs of beasts, but millions of their fellow creatures; on whose blood-thirsty worshippers beauty has lavished her smiles, and genius its eulogies; whose horrid triumphs, fit only to be celebrated in the infernal world, painters and sculptors, poets and historians, have combined to surround with a blaze of immortal glory.

But let the monster's hideous form be exposed in its true colors; and it will be an honor to Christianity, a powerful argument in her favor, to be known as his most decided and successful foe. To accomplish this work, to place before men in naked deformity the idol they have so long ignorantly worshipped in disguise, and thus turn against him the powerful current of public opinion, is the great object of the associated friends of peace. Nor is it easy to conceive how *any one* who believes the Scriptures, and professes to be a disciple of the Prince of Peace, or a friend to the human race, *can justify himself in withholding his aid from a cause so evidently the cause of God.* Who would not wish to share this honor? After the glorious victory shall have been won, after wars shall have been made to cease under the whole heaven, who will not then wish to have been among the few that first unfurled the consecrated banner of peace?

VIEWS OF WAR.*

BY ROBERT HALL.

REAL war is a very different thing from that painted image of it which you see on parade, or at a review. It is the most awful scourge that Providence employs for the chastisement of man. It is the garment of vengeance with which the Deity arrays himself, when he comes forth to punish the inhabitants of the earth. It is *the day of the Lord, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger*. Let us consider it in two views—as a source of misery, and as a source of crimes.

It is impossible for a humane mind to contemplate the rapid extinction of innumerable lives without concern. To perish in a moment, to be hurried instantaneously, without preparation and without warning, into the presence of the Supreme Judge, has something in it inexpressibly awful and affecting. In war death reigns without a rival, and without control. War is the work, the element, or rather the sport and triumph of death, who glories, not only in the extent of his conquest, but in the richness of his spoil. In the other methods of attack, in the other forms which death assumes, the feeble and the aged, who at the best can live but a short time, are usually the victims; here it is the vigorous and the strong. It is remarked by an ancient historian, that in peace children bury their parents, in war parents bury their children; nor is the difference small. Children lament their parents, sincerely indeed, but with that moderate and tranquil sorrow which it is natural for those to feel who are conscious of retaining many tender ties, many animating prospects. Parents mourn for their children with the bitterness of despair; the aged parent, the widowed mother, loses, when she is deprived of her children, every thing but the capacity of suffering; her heart, withered and desolate, admits no other object, cherishes no other hope. *It is Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted, because they are not.*

But, to confine our attention to the number of the slain would give us a very inadequate idea of the ravages of the sword. The lot of those who perish instantaneously may be considered, apart from religious prospects, as comparatively happy, since they are exempt from those lingering diseases and slow torments to which others are liable. We cannot see an individual expire, though a stranger or an enemy, without being sensibly moved, and prompted by compassion to lend him every assistance in our power. Every trace of resentment vanishes in a moment; every other emotion gives way to pity and terror. In these last extremities we remem-

* From Mr. Hall's Sermon entitled *Reflections on War*.

ber nothing but the respect and tenderness due to our common nature. What a scene then must a field of battle present, where thousands are left without assistance and without pity, with their wounds exposed to the piercing air, while the blood, freezing as it flows, binds them to the earth, amid the trampling of horses, and the insults of an enraged foe! If they are spared by the humanity of the enemy, and carried from the field, it is but a prolongation of torment. Conveyed in uneasy vehicles, often to a remote distance, through roads almost impassable, they are lodged in ill-prepared receptacles for the wounded and the sick, where the variety of distress baffles all the efforts of humanity and skill, and renders it impossible to give to each the attention he demands. Far from their native home, no tender assiduities of friendship, no well-known voice, no wife, or mother, or sister is near to soothe their sorrows, relieve their thirst, or close their eyes in death. Unhappy man! and must you be swept into the grave unnoticed and unnumbered, and no friendly tear be shed for your sufferings, or mingled with your dust!

We must remember, however, that as a very small proportion of a military life is spent in actual combat, so it is a very small part of its miseries which must be ascribed to this source. More are consumed by the rust of inactivity than by the edge of the sword. Confined to a scanty or unwholesome diet, exposed in sickly climates, harassed with tiresome marches and perpetual alarms, their life is a continual scene of hardships and dangers. They grow familiar with hunger, cold and watchfulness. Crowded into hospitals and prisons, contagion spreads among their ranks, till the ravages of disease exceed those of the enemy.

We have hitherto adverted to the sufferings only of those who are engaged in the profession of arms, without taking into our account the situation of the countries which are the scene of hostilities. How dreadful to hold every thing at the mercy of an enemy, and to receive life itself as a boon dependent on the sword. How boundless the fears which such a situation must inspire, where the issues of life and death are determined by no known laws, principles or customs, and no conjecture can be formed of our destiny, except as far as it is dimly deciphered in characters of blood, in the dictates of revenge, and the caprices of power. Conceive but for a moment the consternation which the approach of an invading army would impress on the peaceful villages in this neighborhood. When you have placed yourselves for an instant in that situation, you will learn to sympathize with those unhappy countries which have sustained the ravages of arms. But how is it possible to give you an idea of these horrors? Here you behold rich harvests, the bounty of heaven and the reward of industry, consumed in a moment, or trampled under foot, while famine and pestilence follow the steps of desolation. There the cottages of peasants given up to the flames; mothers expiring through fear, not for themselves but their infants; the inhabitants flying with their helpless babes, in all directions, miserable fugitives on their

native soil! In another part you witness opulent cities taken by storm; the streets, where no sounds were heard but those of peaceful industry, filled on a sudden with slaughter and blood, resounding with the cries of the pursuing and the pursued; the palaces of nobles demolished, the houses of the rich pillaged, the chastity of virgins and of matrons violated, and every age, sex and rank mingled in promiscuous massacre and ruin.

In contemplating the influence of war on public morals, it would be unpardonable not to remark the effects it never fails to produce in those parts of the world which are its immediate seat. The injury which the morals of a people sustain from an invading army is prodigious. The agitation and suspense universally prevalent are incompatible with every thing which requires calm thought, or serious reflection. In such a situation is it any wonder the duties of piety fall into neglect, the sanctuary of God is forsaken, and the gates of Zion mourn and are desolate? Familiarized to the sight of rapine and slaughter, the people must acquire a hard and unfeeling character. The precarious tenure by which every thing is held during the absence of laws must impair confidence; the sudden revolutions of fortune must be infinitely favorable to fraud and injustice. He who reflects on these consequences will not think it too much to affirm, that the injury the virtue of a people sustains from invasion, is greater than that which affects their property or their lives. He will perceive that by such a calamity the seeds of order, virtue and piety, which it is the first care of education to implant and mature, are swept away as by a hurricane.

If statesmen, if Christian statesmen at least, had a proper feeling on this subject, and would open their hearts to the reflections which such scenes must inspire, instead of rushing eagerly to arms, would they not hesitate long, would they not try every expedient, every lenient art consistent with national honor, before they ventured on this desperate remedy, or rather, before they plunged into this gulf of horror?

The contests of nations are both the offspring and the parent of injustice. The word of God ascribes the existence of war to the disorderly passions of men. *Whence come wars and fightings among you? saith the apostle James; come they not from your lusts that war in your members?* It is certain two nations cannot engage in hostilities but one party must be guilty of injustice; and if the magnitude of crimes is to be estimated by a regard to their consequences, it is difficult to conceive an action of equal guilt with the wanton violation of peace. It sinks every other crime into insignificance. If the existence of war always *implies* injustice in one at least of the parties concerned, it is also the fruitful parent of crimes. *It reverses, with respect to its objects, all the rules of morality.* It is nothing less than a *temporary repeal of the principles of virtue.* It is a system out of which almost all the virtues are excluded, and in which nearly all the vices are incorporated. Whatever renders human nature amiable or respectable,

whatever engages love or confidence, is sacrificed at its shrine. In instructing us to consider a portion of our fellow-creatures as the proper objects of enmity, it removes, as far as they are concerned, the basis of all society, of all civilization and virtue; for the basis of these is the good-will due to every individual of the species, as being a part of ourselves. From this principle all the rules of social virtue emanate. Justice and humanity, in their utmost extent, are nothing more than the practical application of this great law. The sword, and that alone, cuts asunder the bond of consanguinity which unites man to man. As it immediately aims at the extinction of life, it is next to impossible, upon the principle that every thing may be lawfully done to him whom we have a right to kill, to set limits to military license; for when men pass from the dominion of reason to that of force, whatever restraints are attempted to be laid on the passions, will be feeble and fluctuating. Though we must applaud, therefore, the attempts of the humane Grotius to blend maxims of humanity with military operations, it is to be feared they will never coalesce, since the former imply the subsistence of those ties which the latter suppose to be dissolved. Hence the morality of peaceful times is directly opposite to the maxims of war. The fundamental rule of the first is to do good; of the latter, to inflict injuries. The former commands us to succor the oppressed; the latter, to overwhelm the defenceless. The former teaches men to love their enemies; the latter, to make themselves terrible even to strangers. The rules of morality will not suffer us to promote the dearest interest by falsehood; the maxims of war applaud it when employed in the destruction of others. That a familiarity with such maxims must tend to harden the heart, as well as to pervert the moral sentiments, is too obvious to need illustration. The natural consequence of their prevalence is an unfeeling and unprincipled ambition, with an idolatry of talents, and a contempt of virtue; whence the esteem of mankind is turned from the humble, the beneficent, and the good, to men who are qualified by a genius fertile in expedients, a courage that is never appalled, and a heart that never pities, to become the destroyers of the earth. While the philanthropist is devising means to mitigate the evils and augment the happiness of the world, a fellow-worker together with God in exploring and giving effect to the benevolent tendencies of nature, the warrior is revolving, in the gloomy recesses of his capacious mind, plans of future devastation and ruin. Prisons crowded with captives, cities emptied of their inhabitants, fields desolate and waste, are among his proudest trophies. The fabric of his fame is cemented with tears and blood; and if his name is wafted to the ends of the earth, it is in the shrill cry of suffering humanity; in the curses and imprecations of those whom his sword has reduced to despair.

EARLY CHRISTIANS ON WAR.

BY THOMAS CLARKSON, THE PHILANTHROPIST.*

THE Bible, rather than any human authority, should be our guide; but, since the early Christians learned its meaning from the Apostles themselves, or their immediate successors, we naturally wish to ascertain how they regarded the custom of war, and shall endeavor to prove, that *so long as the lamp of Christianity burnt pure and bright, Christians held it unlawful to bear arms, and actually abstained from the use of them at the hazard of their lives; nor was it till Christianity became corrupted, that its followers became soldiers.*

I. The opinions of the first Christian writers after the Apostles relative to war, were alike for nearly three hundred years, if not longer. JUSTIN MARTYR, one of the earliest in the second century, *considers war as unlawful, and makes the devil its author.* TATIAN, the disciple of Justin, *speaks in the same terms on the subject;* and CLEMENS, of Alexandria, a contemporary of the latter, is equally *decisive against the lawfulness of war.*

TERTULLIAN, the next in order of time, *strongly condemns the practice of bearing arms.* In his *Worship of Idols*, he says, "though the soldiers came to John, and received a certain form to be observed, and though the centurion believed, yet Jesus Christ, by disarming Peter, disarmed every soldier afterward; for custom never sanctions an unlawful act." In his *Soldier's Garland*, he says, "can a soldier's life be lawful, when Christ has pronounced, that he who lives by the sword, shall perish by the sword? Can one who professes the peaceable doctrines of the Gospel, be a soldier, when it is his duty not so much as to go to law? And shall he who is not to revenge his own wrongs, be instrumental in bringing others into chains, imprisonment, torment, death?"—"In all this conspiracy of evils against us," he asks, in his *Apology*, "what one evil have you observed to have been returned by Christians? We could in a night's time have made ourselves ample satisfaction, had we not thought it unlawful to repay one injury with another; but God forbid, that any of this divine sect should seek revenge. If we would not revenge ourselves in the dark, but chose to engage you in the open day, do you think we could want forces? We are but of yesterday, and by to-day we overspread your empire. Your cities, your islands, your *forts*, towns, assemblies, and very *camps*, wards, companies, palaces, senate, forum, all swarm with Christians. What war can we now be unprepared

* This tract, though abridged, retains all the original facts and arguments, with a few additions.—AM ED.

for, did not our religion require us to be killed rather than to kill? The fact of Christians being in forts and camps, is no proof that they were there as soldiers; and the supposition is forbidden by the general tenor of Tertullian's language against war as unlawful for Christians. If they *were* soldiers, it only proves, what is true, that some Christians, even before the death of Tertullian, entered the army, or more probably, remained in it after their conversion.

CYPRIAN, in his *Epistle to DONATUS*, speaks thus, "When thou reflectest upon thy condition, thy thoughts will rise in transports of gratitude and praise to God for having made thy escape from the pollutions of the world. The things thou wilt principally observe will be the highways beset with robbers, the seas with pirates; encampments, marches, and all the terrible forms of war and bloodshed. When a single war is committed, it shall be deemed perhaps a crime; but that crime shall commence a virtue, when committed under the shelter of public authority; so that punishment is not rated by the measure of guilt; but the more enormous the size of the wickedness is, so much the greater is the chance of impunity."

LACTANTIUS, who lived some time after CYPRIAN, says, "it can never be lawful for a righteous man to go to war." To these might be added ARCHELAUS, AMBROSE, CHRYSOSTOM, JEROME, and CYRIL, all of whom were of opinion, that it is unlawful for Christians to engage in war.

II. With respect to *the PRACTICE of the early Christians*, there is no well authenticated instance upon record of their entering into the army for nearly the two first centuries, but they declined the military profession as one in which it was not lawful for them to engage.

1. The first species of evidence on this point may be found in the following facts, reaching from the year 170 to 195. Cassius had rebelled against the Emperor Verus, and was slain soon after. Clodius Albinus in one part of the world, and Pescennius Niger in another, had rebelled against the Emperor Severus, and both were slain. Now, suspicion fell, as it always did in those times, if any thing went wrong, upon the Christians; but TERTULLIAN tells us that this suspicion was totally groundless. "You defamed us," says he, "by charging us with having been guilty of treason to our emperors; for not a Christian could be found in any of the rebel armies, whether commanded by Cassius, Albinus, or Niger." These are important facts; for the armies in question were very extensive. Cassius was master of all Syria with its four Legions; Niger, of the Asiatic and Egyptian Legions, and Albinus, of those of Britain; which Legions together contained between a third and a half of the standing Legions of Rome; and the circumstance, that no Christian was to be found in them, is the more remarkable, because, according to the same TERTULLIAN, Christianity had then spread over almost the whole of the known world.

2. A second species of evidence may be collected from expres-

sions and declarations in certain authors of those times. JUSTIN MARTYR and TATIAN *make distinctions between soldiers and Christians*; and CLEMENS, of Alexandria, gives the Christians, who were contemporary with him, the appellation of *the Peaceable*, thus distinguishing them from others of the world; and he says expressly, *the Peaceable never use sword or bow*, meaning by these the instruments of war.

3. A third species of evidence may be found in the belief, which the writers of these times had, that the prophecy of Isajah, that men should turn their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, was then in the act of completion. IRENÆUS, about the year 180, affirms that this famous prophecy had been completed in his time; "for the Christians," says he, "have changed their swords and lances into instruments of peace, and they know not how to fight." JUSTIN MARTYR, contemporary with IRENÆUS, asserts the same thing. "That the prophecy," says he, "is fulfilled, you have good reason to believe; for *we who in times past killed one another, do not now fight with our enemies.*" And here it is observable, that the Greek word *fight* means to *fight as in war*; and the Greek word *enemy* means an enemy of the State. TERTULLIAN, who lived after both, speaks in these remarkable words, "Deny that these (meaning the turning of swords into plough-shares) are the things prophesied of, *when you see what you see*, or that they are the things fulfilled, *when you read what you read*; but if you deny neither of these positions, then you must confess that the prophecy has been accomplished, *as far as the practice of every individual is concerned, to whom it is applicable.*" We might go from TERTULLIAN even as far as THEODORET, if it were necessary, to show that the prophecy in question was considered as then in the act of completion.

4. The fourth and last species of evidence may be found in the charges of CELSUS, and the reply of ORIGEN. CELSUS, at the end of the second century, attacked the Christian Religion, and made it one of his charges, that *Christians refused to bear arms for the Emperor*, even in cases of necessity, and when their services would have been accepted. He told them further, that if the rest of the Empire were of their opinion, it would soon be overrun by the barbarians. Now, CELSUS dared not have brought this charge, if the fact had not been publicly known; but let us see whether it was denied by those who thought his work demanded a reply. ORIGEN, in the third century, answered him; but, in his answer, *he admits the facts as stated by Celsus, that the Christians would not bear arms, and justifies them on the ground, that war is unlawful for Christians.*

As the early Christians would not enter the armies, so, when they became converted there, they relinquished their profession. We find from TERTULLIAN, that many in his time, *immediately on their conversion to Christianity, quitted the military service.* We are told, also, by ARCHELAUS, 278, that many Roman soldiers who had embraced Christianity after having witnessed the piety and

generosity of Marcellus, *immediately forsook the profession of arms.* We are told, also, by EUSEBIUS, that about the same time *numbers laid aside a military life, and became private persons rather than abjure their religion.*"

Even Gibbon bears his sneering testimony to the pacific scruples of the early Christians. "The defence of our persons and property, they knew not how to reconcile with the patient doctrine which enjoined an unlimited forgiveness of past injuries; nor could their humane ignorance be convinced, that it was lawful, on *any* occasion, to shed the blood of our fellow-creatures by the sword either of justice or of war, though their criminal or hostile attempts should threaten the peace or safety of the whole community. The Christians felt and confessed, that such institutions might be necessary for the present system of the world, and they cheerfully submitted to the authority of their pagan governors; but, while they inculcated the maxims of passive obedience,"—*submission*, a very different thing,—"they refused to take any active part in the civil administration or military defence of the empire."

Here then are facts to show, that for nearly the first two centuries, no Christians would either take upon themselves, or continue the profession of soldiers. But it may be said, that the military oath, taken in the Roman armies, and repeated annually, was full of idolatry; that the Roman standards were all considered as gods, and had divine honors paid them by the soldiery; and that images of the Emperors were to be worshipped in the same manner. Now, these impious customs were interwoven with the military service; nor was any soldier exempted from them. It will be urged, then, that no Christian could submit to such services. Indeed, when a person was suspected of being a Christian in those times, he was instantly taken to the altar to sacrifice, it being notorious that, if he *were* a Christian, he would not sacrifice, though the loss of his life was the certain consequence of his refusal.

An objector may say, that these idolatrous tests and customs operated *as the great cause*, why Christians refused to enter the army, or why they left it when converted. True; these tests did operate as *one cause*. So TERTULLIAN states, and makes this one of his arguments against the lawfulness of serving in the army. He says, "the military oath and the baptismal vow are inconsistent with each other, the one being the sign of Christ, the other of the Devil;" and he calls the military standard "the Rival, or Enemy of Christ." All history confirms the fact. Take the following instance. Marinus, according to EUSEBIUS, was a man of family and fortune, and an officer in a legion which in 260 was stationed at Cæsarea, Palestine. One of the centurion's rods happened to become vacant in this legion, and Marinus was appointed to it; but just at this moment another, next in rank, accused him before the tribunal of being a Christian, stating, "that the laws did not allow a Christian who refused to sacrifice to the Emperors,

to hold any dignity in the army." Achæus, the judge, asked Marinus if it was true that he had become a Christian? He acknowledged it; and three hours were allowed him to consider whether he would sacrifice or die. When the time expired, he chose the latter. The history of those times is full of such instances; and so desirous were the early Christians of keeping clear of idolatry in every shape, that they avoided every custom which appeared in the least degree connected with it. Thus when a largess was given in honor of the Emperors, L. Septimus Severus and his son, a solitary soldier, as we learn from TERTULLIAN, carried the garland given him on that occasion, in his hand, while the rest wore it on their heads. The Church then held it unlawful to wear the garland, because it belonged to the dress of the heathen priests, when sacrificing to their gods. On being interrogated by his commander why he refused wearing it, he replied, that he had become a Christian. He was immediately punished before the army, and sent into prison. But, while such idolatrous services hindered Christians from entering, and compelled them to leave the army, nothing is more true, than that the belief of its being unlawful for Christians to fight, occasioned an equal abhorrence of military life.

There were *three notions* upon which this belief was grounded. 1. That it was their duty *to love their enemies*. The world was then full of divisions and bitterness. The Jews looked upon the Gentiles as dogs and outcasts, so as not even to tell them their road when asked, or give them a draught of water; and the Gentiles, in turn, considered the Jews as the enemies of all nations, and haters of mankind. Nations, too, were set against each other on account of former and existing wars. JUSTIN MARTYR says, "we who once hated each other, and delighted in mutual quarrels and slaughter, and, according to custom, refused to sit at the same fire with those who were not of our own tribe and party, now since the appearance of Christ in the world, live familiarly with them, pray for our enemies, and endeavor to persuade them who hate us unjustly, to order their lives according to the excellent precepts of Christ." Such was the practice of the early Christians, as founded on this tenet. TERTULLIAN says, "it was their peculiar character to love their enemies;" and ATHENAGORAS, JULIAN and LACTANTIUS, make "this their character to have been a proof of the divinity of their religion." It was impossible for them, while embracing this heavenly tenet, even had the idolatrous services been dispensed with, to appear in the shape of warriors.

2. That it became them as Christians, to abstain from all manner of violence, and become distinguishable as the followers of peace. "The great King of Heaven," says ISIDORE of PELUSIUM, "came down from above to deliver rules for an heavenly conduct, which he has placed in a certain *mode of contending quite contrary to that in the Olympic Games*. There, he that fights, and gets the better, receives the Crown; here, he that is struck, and bears it meekly, has the honor and applause. There, he that returns blow

for blow; here, he that turns the other cheek, is celebrated in the theatre of Angels; for the victory is measured not by revenge, but by a wise and generous patience. This is the new law of Crowns, the new way of contending for the mastery." We find, accordingly, from ATHENAGORAS and other early writers, that the Christians of their time abstained, when they were struck, from striking again, and carried their principles so far as even to refuse going to law with those who injured them. It was impossible for them, while interpreting the Scriptures in this manner, "to have used the sword or the bow in war."

3. *That the slaughter of men in war was neither more nor less than direct murder.* They had such an abhorrence of murder, and of being thought to be implicated at all in so atrocious a crime, that they refused to be present where the life of a fellow-creature was taken away, whatever was the occasion. ATHENAGORAS, TATIAN, THEOPHILUS ANTIOCHENUS, and MINUTIUS FELIX, all agree in asserting this.

On these three grounds, independently of idolatrous practices in the army, the belief of the unlawfulness of war appears to have been universal among Christians of those times. Every Christian writer of the second century, who notices the subject, makes it unlawful for Christians to bear arms; and, as this belief seems to have been universal, so it operated as an impediment to a military life, quite as much as the idolatry connected with it, of which the following instances may suffice for illustration:

Let us first take a case on *this principle alone.* Maximilian having been brought before the tribunal to be enrolled as a soldier, Dion, the Proconsul, asked him his name. Maximilian, turning to him, replied, "why wouldst thou know my name? *I am a Christian, and cannot fight.*" Then Dion ordered him to be enrolled, and bade the officer mark him; but Maximilian refused to be marked, still asserting that he was a Christian; upon which Dion instantly replied, "bear arms, or thou shalt die." To this Maximilian answered, "I cannot fight, if I die; I am not a soldier of this world, but a soldier of God." Dion then said, "who has persuaded thee to behave thus?" Maximilian answered, "my own mind, and he who called me." Dion then spoke to his father, and bade *him* persuade his son; but his father observed, that his son knew his own mind, and what it was best for him to do. After this had passed, Dion addressed Maximilian again in these words, "take thy arms, and receive the mark." "I can receive," says Maximilian, "no such mark. I have already the mark of Christ;" upon which Dion said, "I will send thee quickly to thy Christ." "Thou mayst do so," says Maximilian; "but the glory will be mine." Dion then bade the officer mark him; but Maximilian still persisted in refusing, and spoke thus, "I cannot receive the mark of this world; and, if thou shouldst give me the mark, I will destroy it. It will avail nothing. I am a Christian; and it is not lawful for me to wear such a mark about my neck, when I have received the saving mark of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the

living God, whom thou knowest not, who died to give us life. Him all we Christians obey, and follow, as the Restorer of our life, and the Author of our salvation." Dion instantly replied, "take thy arms, and receive the mark, or thou shalt suffer a miserable death." "But I shall not perish," says Maximilian; "my name is already enrolled with Christ;—*I cannot fight.*" Dion said, "consider then thy youth, and bear arms. The profession of arms becomes a young man." Maximilian replied, "*my arms are with the Lord. I cannot fight for any earthly consideration. I am now a Christian.*" The Proconsul continued, "among the life-guards of our masters, Dioclesian and Maximinian, and Constantius and Maximus, there are Christian soldiers, and they fight." Maximilian answered, "they know best what is expedient for them; *but I am a Christian, and it is unlawful to do evil.*" Dion said, "take thy arms; despise not the profession of a soldier, lest thou perish miserably." "But I shall not perish," says Maximilian; "and, if I should leave this world, my soul will live with Christ the Lord." Dion then ordered his name to be struck from the roll, and proceeded, "because out of thy rebellious spirit, thou hast refused to bear arms, thou shalt be punished according to thy deserts, for an example to others." Then he delivered the following sentence: "Maximilian! because thou hast, with a rebellious spirit, refused to bear arms, thou art to die by the sword." Maximilian replied, "thanks be to God."

He was little more than twenty years old; and, when he was led to the place of execution, he spoke thus, "my dear brethren, endeavor with all your might, that it may be your portion to see the Lord, and that he may give you such a Crown." Then, with a pleasant countenance, he said to his father, "give the executioner the soldier's coat thou hast gotten for me; and, when I shall receive thee in the company of the blessed martyrs, we may rejoice together with the Lord." After this he suffered. His mother, Pompeiana, obtained his body from the judge, and conveyed it to Carthage, and buried it near the place where the body of CYPRIAN the martyr lay. Thirteen days after this his mother was buried in the same place; and Victor, his father, returned to his habitation, rejoicing and praising God, that he had sent before such a gift to the Lord, himself expecting to follow after.

Let us now turn to a mixed case, yet still avowing the same principle. Marcellus was a centurion in the Legion called Trajana. At a festival, given in honor of the birth-day of Galerius, he threw down his military belt at the head of the Legion, and declared with a loud voice, that he would no longer serve in the army, because he had become a Christian. "I hold in detestation," says he, addressing the soldiers, "the worship of your gods; gods, which are made of wood and stone; gods, which are deaf and dumb." So far, Marcellus seems to have been influenced by the idolatry of the military service. But let us hear him further: "It is not lawful," says he, "for a Christian to bear arms for *any* earthly consideration." After a delay of more than three months

in prison, allowed for the purpose of sparing him, he was brought before the Prefect, and had an opportunity of correcting his former expressions; but, as he persisted in the same sentiments, he suffered. It is remarkable that, almost immediately after his execution, Cassian, the notary to the same Legion, refused to serve any longer, publicly throwing his pen and account-book on the ground, and declaring, that the sentence of Marcellus was unjust. When taken up by order of Aurelianus Agricolanus, he is described in the record preserved by Ruinart, to have avowed the same sentiments as Marcellus, and like him to have suffered death.

Here is another case on the same principle. Martin, of whom Sulpicius Severus says so much, had been bred to the profession of arms; but on his conversion to Christianity, he declined it. In his answer to Julian the Apostate for his conduct on this occasion, we find him using these words, "*I am a Christian, and therefore I cannot fight.*"

Let us quote the instance of Tarachus, another military man and martyr, and let this serve for all. He underwent his examination at Tarsus in Cilicia. Numerianus Maximus sat as President. "What is your name?" says Maximus. "I am called Tarachus," says the prisoner, "by my father; but my military name is Victor." "And what is your condition?" "I have led a military life, and am a Roman. I was born at Claudiopolis, a city of Isauria, and, *because I am a Christian, I have abandoned my profession of a soldier.*"

Such was the answer usually given on such occasions, without any specification as to which of the two principles had influenced the conduct of those who were brought before them; and, whenever we hear of such general apology or answer, we cannot doubt that they who made it, were actuated by both. *The unlawfulness of fighting* was as much a principle of religion in the early times of Christianity, as *the refusal of sacrifice to the heathen gods*; and they operated equally to prevent men from entering the army, and to drive them out of it on their conversion. Indeed, these principles always went together, where the profession of arms presented itself as an occupation for a Christian. He who refused the profession on account of its idolatry, would have refused it on account of the unlawfulness of fighting; and he who refused it on account of the guilt of fighting, would have refused it on account of its idolatrous services. Both alike were impediments to a military life; and, though the noble martyrs we have mentioned, grounded their apology for declining military service, some on its idolatry, and others on the unlawfulness of fighting, yet their *common plea* was, that *having become Christians, they could be no longer soldiers.*

III. We proceed now to the proof of our third point; *that not till Christianity became corrupted, did its followers become soldiers.* In the two first centuries, when Christianity was the purest, there are no Christian soldiers upon record; in the third century, when

it became less pure, there is frequent mention of such soldiers; but in the fourth, when its corruption was fixed, Christians entered generally upon the profession of arms with as little hesitation as they entered upon any other occupation of life.

The excellent character of the first Christians is well known; but they sadly degenerated even in the third century. We have already stated that a Christian soldier was punished for refusing to wear a garland, like the rest of his comrades, on a public occasion. This man had been converted while in the army, and objected to the ceremony on that account. Now, TERTULLIAN tells us, that this soldier was blamed for his unseasonable zeal, as it was called, by some of the Christians at that time, though all Christians *before* considered the wearing of such a garland as unlawful and profane. This blame or censure is the first expression upon record, from which we may date the *beginning* of conformity on the part of the early Christians with the opinions of the world. There were then, as TERTULLIAN confesses, certain Christian casuists, who had so far degenerated as to think that many of the heathen customs might be complied with, though strictly forbidden by the Church; in fact, that they might go any length, without the just imputation of idolatry, provided they did not sacrifice to the pagan gods, or become heathen priests. Indeed, his whole book on the *Worship of Idols*, is a continued satire on the occasional conformity of his brethren even in the third century; in other words, of an occasional mercenary compliance with the pagan worship. At this time there is no question but the Christian discipline began to relax. To the ease which the Christians enjoyed from the death of Antoninus to the tenth year of Severus, is to be ascribed the corruption that ensued. This corruption we find to have spread rapidly. TERTULLIAN lived long enough to see that several bearing the name of Christians, but who were no doubt the disciples of the casuists just mentioned, had entered the Roman armies. This fact we find in his *Apology*, one of his latest works; for when the pagans charged the Christians, as they had pretty constantly done, with being useless to the commonwealth, he answers the accusation in part by saying, that there were then Christians in the military service. "We serve," says he, "with you and your armies;" a very different answer this, to that which Origen gave Celsus on a similar charge respecting what had been the state of things in the second century, as appears in a former page! But the corruption did not stop here. The same TERTULLIAN was enabled to furnish us with the extraordinary instance of *manufacturers of idols* being admitted into the *ecclesiastical order*! Many corruptions are also noticed in this century by other writers. CYPRIAN complained of them in the middle, and EUSEBIUS at the end of it: and both attributed them to the ease and security which the Christians had enjoyed. The latter gives us a melancholy account of their change. They had begun to live in fine houses, and to indulge in luxuries; but, above all, *to be envious and quarrelsome, to dissemble, and cheat, and*

falsify their word, so that they had lost the character which Pliny, an adversary to their religion, had been obliged to give of them, and which they had retained for more than a century afterwards.

That there were Christian soldiers in this more corrupt century of the Church, it is impossible to deny; for such frequent mention is made of them in the histories of this period, that there were in the armies either men who called themselves Christians, or men who had that name given them by others. That they were *real* Christians, is another question. They were probably *such* Christians as the casuists of TERTULLIAN, or such as Dion mentioned to have been among the life-guards of Dioclesian and Maximilian, of Constantius and Maximus, of whom Maximilian the martyr observed, "these men may know what it is expedient for them to do; but I am a Christian, and therefore cannot fight." That *real* Christians could have been found in the army in this century is impossible; for the military oath full of idolatry, the worshipping of the standards, and the performance of sacrifice, still continued as services not to be dispensed with by the soldiery. No one, therefore, can believe, that men in the full practice of pagan idolatry, as every legionary soldier must then have been, were real Christians, merely because it is recorded in history, that men, *calling* themselves Christians, were found in the army in those times. On the other hand, if any soldiers professed Christianity at this period, or are related by authors to have professed it, and yet remained soldiers, it may be directly pronounced, that they could have been merely nominal or corrupted Christians.

Christianity was still more degenerate in the fourth century. Let us look at the evidence of LACTANTIUS in his book on the *Death of the Persecuted*. He tells us "the sacrifices did not do well, *when any of the Christians attended them.*" What! Christians present at the heathen sacrifices, and sitting at meat in the idol's temple! But this is not all. He gives us in the same book another piece of information about the Christian conformists of his time. "The Emperor," says he, "while in the East, made a sacrifice of oxen, and endeavored to ascertain, by inspection of the entrails, what was about to happen. At this time, some Christians, *who filled the inferior offices of the (heathen) priesthood, while giving their assistance to the high priest on this occasion,* marked their foreheads with the sign of the cross. The consequence was, that the aruspices were frightened, and could not collect their usual marks." Here then we see not only that Christians were present at some of the heathen sacrifices, but that they filled offices belonging to the lowest order of the pagan hierarchy. We may go still further, and assert upon authority undeniable, that it was *no uncommon thing in this age for Christians to accept heathen priesthoods*; for the Council of Elvira, in the beginning of the fourth century, was forced to *make several canons to forbid such scandalous usages*. But it is not necessary to detail these or other particulars; almost every body knows that more evils sprang up to the Church in this century, than in any other. Indeed, the *corruption of Christianity*

was then fixed as it were by law. Constantine, on his conversion, introduced many of the pagan ceremonies and superstitions in which he had been brought up. The Christians, rejoicing to see an Emperor of their own religious persuasion, submitted, in order to please or flatter him, to his idolatrous customs and opinions. Many who had always been heathens, professed themselves Christians at once, merely out of compliment to their Emperor. Thus there came to be a mixture of Christianity and Heathenism in the Church. Constantine, too, did not dispense with the blasphemous titles of Pontifex Maximus, Divinity and Eternity, given to his predecessors. After his death, he was considered also as a god; and, if Philostorgius is to be believed, the Christians, *for so he calls them*, prayed to and worshipped him as such.

Now, in this century, when the corruption of the Church was fixed, and Christians had submitted to certain innovations upon their religion, they were in a fit state to go greater lengths; and this they did *in the relaxation of their religious scruples respecting war*. This relaxation was also promoted by other means. The existing government, in order to make the military service more palatable to them, dispensed with the old military oath, and allowed them to swear "by God, by Christ, and by the Holy Spirit, and by the Majesty of the Emperor, which, next to God, was to be loved and honored by mankind." This political manœuvre did away, in some measure, *a part of the objection to a military life, which arose from its idolatries*. The grand tenet on war began also to be frittered down by some of the leading clergy themselves. It had been formerly held unlawful for Christians to fight at all; it was now insinuated as if it *was* allowable if they fought under the banners of *Christian Emperors*, for bloodshed in war was more excusable in the cause of virtue and *religion*. This new interpretation of the old tenet afforded a salvo to the consciences of many, and helped to take off *that other part of the objection to a military life, which consisted in the unlawfulness of fighting*. Hence the unlawfulness of fighting began to be given up. We find, however, that here and there, an ancient Father still retained it as a religious tenet; but, these dropping off one after another, it ceased at length to be a doctrine of the Church, and left her to all the deep war-degeneracy of subsequent ages.

Thus have we proved every point essential to our main positions:

1. That the early Fathers *generally* use language which obviously condemns all war, and not a few of them explicitly denounce it as utterly unchristian:

2. That they all speak of the ancient prophecies concerning the prevalence of peace under the gospel, as actually fulfilled in the Christians of that age:

3. That Christians then abstained from war as unlawful for them, and suffered martyrdom for their refusal to bear arms:

4. That ancient and modern infidels unite in ascribing to them these peculiar views :

5. That Celsus, near the close of the second century, charged them with refusing to bear arms under *any* circumstances, and Origen, in his reply fifty years after, did not deny the charge, but justified them on the ground, that Christianity forbids war :

6. That the war-degeneracy of the Church began very early in the third century, and went so far in the fourth, that under and after Constantine the Great, Christians engaged in war, as they generally have ever since, with as little scruple as they did in any occupation of life.

We cannot well conceive what farther proof any fair mind can ask ; but we might add, that a strong odium among Christians attached for centuries to the trade of blood, the canons of the Church expressly prohibiting the ordination of any that had *ever been* soldiers, and refusing it, so late as the Council of Toledo, to all such persons, even though they had never been concerned in the shedding of blood. War was an object of deep, utter abhorrence to the early followers of Christ ; and we deem it high time for his modern disciples to revive the primitive faith and practice on this subject. How would such a revival exalt the Christian name, recommend our religion to the world, and pave the way for its universal spread and triumph !

TESTIMONY OF DR. CAVE.—“No sooner did the gospel fly abroad, but the love and charity of Christians became notorious even to a proverb. There is one circumstance respecting it worthy of special notice, and that is, the universal extent of it ; *they did good to all*, though more especially to them of the household of faith. They were kind to all men, yea, to their bitterest enemies. This, indeed, is the proper goodness and excellency of Christianity, as Tertullian observes, it being common to all men to love their friends, but peculiar *only* to Christians *to love their enemies*.”

Athenagoras principally makes use of this argument to prove the divinity of the Christian religion, and challenges all the great masters of reason and learning among the heathens to produce any of so pure and refined a temper, as could, instead of hating, love their enemies, bear curses and revilings with an undisturbed mind ; and, instead of reviling again, bless and speak well of them, and pray for those that lay in wait to take away their lives. And yet this did Christians ; they embraced their enemies, and pardoned and prayed for them. Nay, they did not think it enough *not to return evil for evil*, or barely forgive their enemies, unless they did them all the kindness that lay in their power.”

WAR-DEBTS.

WE propose to sketch the war-debts, not of the whole world, but of Europe alone. Their exact amount it is impossible to ascertain, first, because its governments often conceal the sum total of their obligations; next, because the debts, even when reported, are frequently made up of items resembling the treasury-notes of Sweden issued without computation or limit; and, finally, because the provincial debts, which form so large a part especially in the south of Europe, are often omitted entirely from governmental reports. We can, therefore, make only an approximation to the truth; and, while quoting official estimates that are sometimes studiously false, and generally underrated, we must leave the reader to make such allowances as the foregoing considerations may seem to require.

I. GREAT BRITAIN.—Charles II., 1660, commenced the British debt by granting life-annuities for money furnished to support his habits of extravagance and profligacy; but it reached, at the abdication of James II., 1688, only \$3,300,000. William III., passionately fond of war, and deeply interested in the intrigues and contests of Europe, not only multiplied taxes, but augmented the debt more than \$100,000,000. The Spanish War under Anne, 1702–13, added \$187,500,000, and that of nine years, 1739–48, under George II., \$157,500,000 more. The Seven Years' War, 1756–63, added to the taxes of England \$175,000,000, and to her debt \$357,500,000. Her first war with us extorted from her in taxes \$240,000,000, and in loans \$515,000,000; in all, \$755,000,000! Nine years of war with France, from 1793 to 1802, added \$900,000,000, to her taxes, and \$1,460,000,000 to her debt; while her subsequent wars with Napoleon, 1803–15, cost her in loans \$1,680,000,000, and \$1,130,000,000 in taxes, carrying her entire debt in 1815 up to \$4,325,000,000!!*

* We subjoin a brief table of the British national debt from its origin to 1838; estimating a pound sterling in round numbers at five dollars:

1660–1689.	Debt contracted under Charles II. and James II.,	\$3,300,000
1689–1697.	Contracted in the Revolution under William III.,	105,000,000
1702–1713.	In the war of the Spanish Succession under Anne,	187,500,000
	Total Debt in 1713,	270,000,000
1739–1748.	In the war with Spain, and the Austrian Succession,	157,500,000
1756–1763.	In the Seven Years' War,	357,500,000
	Total Debt in 1763,	732,500,000
1775–1783.	In the American War,	515,000,000
	Total Debt in 1783,	1,195,000,000
1793–1802.	In the war of the French Revolution,	1,460,000,000
	Total Debt in 1802,	2,630,000,000
1803–1815.	In the peace of 1802–3, and war with Napoleon,	1,695,000,000
	Total Debt in 1815,	4,325,000,000
	Total Debt in 1838,	3,960,000,000

It is surprising that any nation on earth should be able to stand under a debt so enormous. No other one could; nor could England herself, if nearly the whole sum were not due to her own citizens. Sooner or later, however, a day of reckoning *must* come; and a terrible day will that be to England, or at least to her monied aristocracy.

What enormous taxes must such a debt impose! nearly \$150,000,000 a year to pay simply the interest and management! "Taxes," says the Edinburgh Review, "upon every article which enters the mouth, or covers the back, or is placed under the feet; taxes upon every thing which it is pleasant to see, hear, feel, smell or taste; taxes upon warmth, light and locomotion; taxes upon every thing on the earth, and in the waters under the earth; taxes on every thing that comes from abroad, or is grown at home; taxes on the raw material, and upon every fresh value that is added to it by the industry of man; taxes on the sauce that pampers man's appetite, and the drug that restores him to health; on the ermine which decorates the judge, and the rope which hangs the criminal; on the poor man's salt, and the rich man's spice; on the brass nails of the coffin, and the ribbons of the bride. Taxes we never escape; at bed or board, couchant or levant, we must pay. The school-boy whips his taxed top, the beardless youth manages his taxed horse, with a taxed bridle, upon a taxed road; and the dying Englishman, pouring his medicine which has paid seven per cent., into a spoon that has paid fifteen per cent., flings himself back upon his chintz bed which has paid twenty-two per cent., makes his will on an eight pound stamp, and expires in the arms of an apothecary who has paid a license of a hundred pounds for the privilege of putting him to death. His whole property is immediately taxed from two to ten per cent. Besides the probate, large fees are demanded for burying him in the chancel; his virtues are handed down to posterity on taxed marble; and then he is gathered to his fathers—to be taxed no more."

There is, however, one important benefit resulting from the British debt. It makes England reluctant to engage in war; and well were Canning and Brougham wont to say, *she was under bonds of eight hundred millions sterling to keep the peace*. Even she, with all her wealth, could not sustain another series of wars like those she waged against Napoleon and the French. There is now no alternative for her but peace, or bankruptcy and ruin.

II. FRANCE.—The history of her debt, written in the blood of her revolutions, it would be very interesting to trace; but it must suffice here to say, that in 1830, it was 4,515,605,834 francs, and in 1840, was slightly reduced to 4,457,736,996.

III. RUSSIA.—The resources of this empire are small in comparison with its vast extent, its annual revenue being rated at 380,000,000 rubles, or only about \$75,000,000. It is impossible to learn the precise amount of the Russian debt. McCulloch puts it at 956,337,574 rubles; but the Conversation's Lexicon says it amounted in 1840 to 869,411,191 rubles.

IV. HOLLAND.—The Dutch are, if possible, worse off than the English. The debt of Holland in 1840 amounted to 800,000,000 German dollars, and that of Belgium to 120,000,000. The solvency of Holland is very doubtful; for her expenses since 1830 have almost invariably exceeded her income, and thus her debt has been constantly increasing. The Dutch have tried every expedient to extricate themselves, reducing the perquisites of royalty so low as to make their king little more than a burgomaster, and paring down their protective duties so as to secure the largest possible amount of revenue; yet, after all, bankruptcy is staring them in the face. What a catastrophe for a nation that once stood at the head of the commerce of the world!

V. SPAIN.—The profligacy of Spain in repudiating or evading her obligations, renders it impossible to tell how much she now owes; but, according to semi-official statements, her entire debt, in October, 1841, was \$775,000,000. This sum is divided into an internal and an external debt. The latter is near \$316,000,000, chiefly due to English capitalists; but even the interest has not been paid for a long period.

VI. PORTUGAL.—The financial condition of Portugal resembles that of Spain. Her whole debt amounted in 1840 to 144,500,000 German dollars; and her income the same year was rated at 8,000,000 Spanish dollars, while her expenses were estimated at \$11,000,000.

VII. DENMARK.—Of the Danish debt, we can form no certain estimate; but, at the close of 1839, it was put at 62,786,804 rix dollars unfunded debt, 5,390,385 funded debt, and 1,423,841 annuities, with an internal debt of 69,601,031; in all, 134,202,061.

We have not space to give in detail the debts of other countries. The different principalities of Germany owed in 1840, a sum total of 650,000,000 German dollars; Austria, 733,200,000 convention florins; Prussia, 130,000,000 rix dollars; Bavaria, 126,550,907 florins; Naples, 108,000,000 ducats, and Sardinia, 87,000,000 crowns.

The sum total of European debts exceeds ten thousand millions of German dollars; and, if we make due allowance for the countries omitted, and for estimates below the truth, the whole in 1840 would probably not be less than the same number of Spanish dollars. Ten thousand millions! What an amount of war-debts for Europe alone! Five times as much as all the coin on the globe; the bare interest, at six per cent., \$600,000,000 a year, almost two millions every day! the simple interest nearly as much *every day* as all Christendom is giving *annually* for the spread of the gospel!

These liabilities we call *war-debts*. So they are; they were contracted almost exclusively for war purposes; had there been no war, there would have been no debt; and, were the war-system now discarded, all Europe could in fifty years, most of her states in far less time, pay off the last farthing of her enormous obligations, and thus start, unfettered and unclogged, upon a new, unparalleled career of prosperity

We subjoin a general view of European debts in German dollars, equal to about eighty-two cents each.

<i>Country.</i>	<i>Debts.</i>	<i>Inhabitants.</i>	<i>Aver. to each inhab.</i>
Holland,	\$800,000,000	3,000,000	\$266.67
England,	5,556,000,000	25,000,000	222.24
Frankfort,	5,000,000	55,000	90.91
France,	1,800,000,000	33,000,000	54.55
Bremen,	3,000,000	55,000	54.55
Hamburg,	7,000,000	155,000	45.16
Denmark,	93,000,000	2,100,000	44.57
Greece,	44,000,000	1,000,000	44.00
Portugal,	144,000,000	3,800,000	38.63
Lubec,	1,700,000	45,000	37.78
Spain,	467,000,000	13,000,000	35.92
Austria,	380,000,000	12,000,000	31.67
Belgium,	120,000,000	4,000,000	30.00
Papal States,	67,000,000	2,500,000	26.80
Hesse-Hamburg,	587,000	25,000	23.48
Saxe-Meiningen,	3,000,000	140,000	21.43
Anhalt-Kothen,	800,000	39,000	20.51
Brunswick,	5,000,000	260,000	19.23
Bavaria,	72,350,000	4,250,000	17.00
Naples,	126,000,000	7,600,000	16.58
Saxe-Weimar,	3,000,000	240,000	12.50
Hanover,	19,000,000	1,700,000	11.47
Prussia,	150,000,000	13,500,000	11.11
Nassau,	3,700,000	370,000	10.00
Russia & Poland,	545,000,000	60,000,000	9.09
Baden,	11,000,000	1,250,000	8.80
Wurtemberg,	14,000,000	1,600,000	8.75
Parma,	3,700,000	430,000	8.60
Hesse-Darmstadt,	6,250,000	800,000	7.81
Modena,	3,000,000	403,000	7.44
Sardinia,	32,000,000	4,500,000	7.11
Saxony,	11,000,000	1,700,000	6.47
Saxe-Altenburg,	700,000	120,000	5.83
Norway	4,125,000	1,000,000	4.13
Mecklenburg,	2,000,000	600,000	3.38
Saxe-Coburg,	1,600,000	—	—
Hesse-Cassel,	1,256,000	700,000	1.79
Schwarzburg,	150,000	116,000	1.29
	<u>\$10,499,710,000</u>	<u>201,053,000</u>	<u>\$52.23</u>

P. S.—For further information on this subject, see McGregor's *Commercial Legislation*, McCulloch's *Statistical Dictionary*, Hunt's *Merchants Magazine* for 1843, *Conversation's Lexicon der Gegenwart*.

RESULTS OF ONE WAR

AMONG NOMINAL CHRISTIANS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

WAR has ever been a mass of evils ; and a review of its history would exhibit, in every age and clime, essentially the same results, physical, political and moral. Every reader of history is familiar with the so called *Thirty Years' War*, which raged in the heart of Europe from 1618 to 1648. It was a *religious* war, and involved the great mass of Papists and Protestants,—the former under their *Catholic League*, the latter in their *Evangelical Union*. Schiller, in his history of this war, says, “from the interior of Bohemia to the mouth of the Scheldt, from the banks of the Po to the coasts of the Baltic, it desolated countries, destroyed harvests, and laid towns and villages in ashes ; extinguished, during half a century, the rising progress of civilization in Germany ; and reduced the improving manners of the people to their ancient barbarism.”

We have been wont to regard the wars consequent on the French Revolution, as teaching lessons of atrocity and horror unknown before ; but the following items, taken from the biographer of Wallenstein, furnish some parallels even to the Russian Campaign.

“Thirty years of war, carried on not with the surplus population and resources of the country, but with its very capital and substance, had brought the empire to the verge of ruin and barbarism ; and the pictures of desolation handed down to us by writers and chroniclers of the period, are absolutely frightful to contemplate.

Of all the commanders who appeared during the war, Gustavus Adolphus was alone able to preserve in his army a strict and humane system of discipline. In most of the armies, the mercenary soldiers, irregularly paid, and worse supplied, were obliged to tear by force from the citizens and peasants, the means of subsistence. The country people resisted wherever they were strongest ; acts of violence followed ; the peasantry slew and, in Catholic countries, tortured straggling soldiers, and attacked even small detached parties. The military avenged their comrades, neglecting too often to distinguish between the innocent and the guilty, till ruin and devastation tracked at last the progress of every march.

The war was carried on without plan or system. Expeditions were undertaken, apparently with no other view than to desolate hostile provinces ; and, in the end, provisions and winter quarters formed the principal objects of the summer campaigns. Want,

sickness, distress, and the total absence of discipline, by which these evils were fearfully augmented, destroyed far more troops than the sword, and entire armies were swept away before they had even seen an enemy. Soldiers left the ranks singly, or in bands, as it suited them, and generally took to plundering; in 1642 the whole of Marshall Gubriant's army dispersed itself, and broke into robber hordes that committed the most fearful depredations.

The enormities charged against the French troops of the period, are equal to those charged even against the Croats; but Gubriant's army was in fact the remains of the army which had been raised by the Duke of Weimar, and was composed of adventurers from all countries. It must also be observed, that the French soldiers of the early part of the seventeenth century, were in a great proportion vagrants and vagabonds, taken up as bad subjects by the police, and sent to the army, either because troops were wanted, or because the individuals pressed could give no satisfactory account of themselves.

Historians mostly assert, that Europe was thrown back a whole century by the ruinous consequences of this war. In many parts of Germany learning was no doubt retarded, in others altogether swept away along with the population. An entire generation grew up amid scenes of strife, licentiousness, and the uncertainty of the morrow. But the amount of knowledge existing could not be destroyed; and thousands of learned, able and industrious Germans emigrated, and carried along with them into other and less enlightened countries, the arts and knowledge for which their own was already distinguished. The Danes, Swedes, Poles and Scots, who fought in Germany, there came in contact with a state of civilization superior to what existed in their own countries; and, along with much unworthy spoil, some fair and honorable booty would at least be carried home by the military adventurers.

But, whatever advantage Europe may have gained by the contest, Germany purchased its share of the benefit at a fearful price. Law, justice, equity, in many places, all the decencies of life, had entirely vanished from a land in which force alone wielded the arbitrary sceptre of command. The country is said to have lost *twelve millions* of inhabitants by the contest; and the population, which amounted to sixteen millions when the troubles first broke out, counted hardly more than four millions when the war closed! Though this statement may perhaps be exaggerated, it seems pretty well ascertained that the population of the Duchy of Wirtemberg was reduced from half a million to forty-eight thousand; that of Bohemia had already been reduced from three millions to eight hundred and ninety thousand before the death of Ferdinand II.; and Saxony and Brunswick suffered in the same proportion;—a reduction in one case of nearly three-fourths, in another of more than nine-tenths!

In the Electorate of Hesse, seventeen towns, forty-seven castles, and three hundred villages had been burnt to the ground. In the

Dutchy of Wirtemberg, eight towns, forty-five villages, and thirty-six thousand houses, had been laid in ashes, and seventy thousand hearth fires completely extinguished. Seven churches, and four hundred and forty-four houses, had been burned at Eichsted. Many towns that had escaped destruction, were almost depopulated. Three hundred houses stood empty at Nordheim; and more than two hundred had been pulled down at Gottingen, merely to serve for fuel. The wealthy city of Augsburg, which contained eighty thousand inhabitants before the war, had only eighteen thousand left when it closed; and this town, like many others, has never recovered its former prosperity. No less than *thirty thousand* villages and hamlets are said to have been destroyed; in many others the population had entirely died out; and the unburied corpses of the last victims of violence or disease, were left exposed about the streets or fields, to be mangled, and torn to pieces by birds and beasts of prey.

In the last campaign of the war, the French and Swedes burned no less than a hundred villages in Bavaria alone; and the skulls of St. Cosmas and St. Damianus had to be sent from Bremen to Munich, in order to console Maximilian for the ruin he had brought over his beautiful country. But even these pitiable relics failed to allay the fears of the unhappy Elector; the share which he had taken in bringing about this desolating contest, pressed heavily on the latter years of his life. In vain he prayed and fasted; the dreadful future was constantly before his sight, and the once valiant soldier and ambitious prince died at last a trembling and despairing bigot.

The crimes and cruelties of which the troops were frequently guilty, would appear almost incredible, were they not attested in a manner to render doubt altogether impossible. But independent of private accounts, we have various reports from the authorities of towns, villages and provinces, complaining of the atrocities committed by the lawless soldiery. Peaceful peasants were hunted for mere sport, like the beasts of the forest; citizens were nailed up against doors and walls, and fired at like targets; while horsemen and Croats tried their skill at striking off the heads of young children at a blow! Ears and noses were cut off, eyes were scooped out, and the most horrible tortures contrived to extract money from the sufferers, or to make them disclose where property was concealed! Women were exposed to every species of indignity; they were collected in bands, and driven, like slaves, into the camps of the ruffian soldiery, and men had to fly from their homes to escape witnessing the dishonor to which their wives and daughters were subjected!

Houses and villages were burnt out of mere wantonness, and the wretched inhabitants too often forced into the flames, to be consumed along with their dwellings. Amid these scenes of horror, intemperance, dissipation and profligacy were carried to the highest pitch. Intoxication frequently prevented the Austrian General, Goltz, from giving out the countersign; and General

Banner was, on one occasion, so drunk for four days together, that he could not receive the French ambassador, Beauregard, who had an important message to deliver. 'Such was the state of triumphant crime,' says a writer of the period, 'that many, driven to despair, denied even the existence of a Deity, declaring that, if there were a God in heaven, he would not fail to destroy with thunder and lightning, such a world of sin and wickedness.'

The peasants, expelled from their homes, enlisted with the oppressors, in order to inflict upon others the sufferings which they had themselves been made to endure. The fields were allowed to run waste, and the absence of industry on one side, added to destruction on the other, soon produced famine which, as usual, brought infections and pestilential diseases in its train. In 1635, there were not hands enough left at Schweidnitz to bury the dead, and the town of Ohlau had lost its last citizen. Want augmented crime, even where an increase was thought impossible. In many places hunger had overcome all repugnance to human flesh, and the tales of cannibalism handed down to us are of far too horrible a nature to be here repeated.

The cup of human suffering was full even to overflowing, and the very aspect of the land was undergoing a rapid change. Forests sprung up during the contest, and covered entire districts, which had been in full cultivation before the war; and wolves, and other beasts of prey took possession of the deserted haunts of men. This was particularly the case in Brunswick, Brandenburg and Pomerania, where heaps of ashes in the midst of wildernesses, served long afterwards to mark the spots where peace and civilization had once flourished. In many parts of the country, the ruins of castles and stately edifices still attest the fury with which the war was carried on; and on such spots tradition generally points out the surrounding forests, as occupying the sites of fertile fields, whence the lordly owners of the mansions derived food and subsistence for themselves and their numerous retainers."

If the evils of war can of themselves dissuade men from the practice, why did not such evils as these prevent the terrible wars of the next century? How came all Europe to plunge into the wars of the French Revolution? Why have the latter done so much more to bring the custom of war into discredit, disuse and abhorrence? Mainly, if not solely, because the friends of peace have kept its leading facts before the world, culled from them lessons of peace, and pressed these lessons incessantly upon the public mind.

This it is that has under God held Europe for thirty years (1845) back from her former wars, and led her cabinets to begin the policy of adjusting their difficulties by pacific means. Let this policy continue a century, and 'it would probably put an end forever to the war-method of settling their disputes. This *can* be done; make public sentiment what it *should* be, and it *will* be done.

NECKAR ON PEACE,

OR

THE CALAMITIES OF WAR, AND THE BLESSINGS OF PEACE.

BY M. NECKAR.*

WITH what impatience have I wished to discuss this subject! How irresistibly has my heart been led to expatiate on the evils which are ever attendant on this terrible calamity! War, alas! impedes the course of every salutary plan, exhausts the sources of prosperity, and diverts the attention of governors from the happiness of nations. It even suspends, sometimes, every idea of justice and humanity. In a word, instead of gentle and benevolent feelings, it substitutes hostility and hatred, the necessity of oppression, and the rage of desolation.

The first idea that occurs to me when reflecting on the origin of most wars, is, that those great combinations of politics which have so often kindled the torch of discord, and occasioned so many ravages, have very seldom merited all the admiration that has been so lavishly bestowed upon them. I have also been forcibly struck with this consideration, that most governments appear satisfied, if at the conclusion of a bloody and expensive war, they have made an honorable peace; but each should consider what *would* have been its situation at the period when the treaty was concluded, if war had not interrupted the course of its prosperity.

Let us suppose France obliged to alienate from fifty to sixty million francs of its annual revenue for the prosecution of a given war; and let us next take a cursory view of the different uses to which such a revenue might have been applied, not only for the advancement of the national happiness, but for the augmentation of the military force. With eighteen millions of that annual revenue, the regimental companies might have been completed to their full complement, and the army augmented by fifty thousand infantry, and ten or twelve thousand horse. Two millions of that revenue would pay the interest of a loan of forty millions, which would have added to our navy thirty men-of-war, and a proportionate number of frigates; and this augmentation might have been maintained by four millions yearly. Thus we see twenty-four millions of that revenue devoted solely to the military service.

Let us now apply the surplus to the various parts of administration, and consider the result. With eighteen millions yearly, the price of salt might have been rendered uniform throughout the kingdom, by reducing it one-third in the provinces of little gabels, (the excise on salt,) and two-thirds in those of the great, and not

* Formerly Minister of Finance. From his celebrated work on the *Finances of France*.

increasing the charges of the privileged provinces. With from four to five millions annually, the interior parts of the kingdom might have been freed from all custom-house duties. With 2,500,000 livres, all the necessary canals might have been executed, that are still wanting in the kingdom. With one million more per annum, government might be enabled to bestow sufficient encouragement on all the establishments of industry that can advance the prosperity of France. With 1,500,000 livres, the sums annually destined to give employment to the poor, might be doubled; and, while great advantages would thus accrue to the inhabitants of the country, the neighboring communications might be multiplied. With the same sum, the prisons throughout the kingdom might in a few years be improved, and all the charitable institutions brought to perfection. And with 2,000,000 annually, the clearing of the waste lands might proceed with incredible vigor. These distributions amount to thirty-one millions, which, joined to twenty-four millions for military expenses, make together the annual revenue of fifty-five millions employed as above; a sum equal to that which I have supposed to be alienated for the disbursements of the war.

Nor is this all; for, if we estimate the diminution of commerce which results from a war of five or six years' duration, it will be found that the kingdom is deprived of a considerable increase of riches. In fine, war, and the loans which it occasions, create a very sensible rise in the rate of interest. On the contrary, peace, under a wise administration, would lower it annually, were it only in consequence of the increase of specie, and of the influence of the stated reimbursements. This successive reduction of interest is likewise a source of inestimable advantages to commerce, agriculture, and the finances.

Let these effects be now compared with the advantages which a fortunate war (and all wars are not so) would secure; and it will be found that ten seeds have been sown, in order to gather the fruit of one. A government may humble its rivals, and extend its dominions; but to employ its resources for the happiness of its subjects, and command respect without the assistance and dangers of an ever restless policy, is a conduct which alone can correspond to the greatness of its situation, or secure all the advantages to be derived from it. It is not war, but a wise and pacific administration, that can procure all the advantages of which France may be yet in want. The quantity of specie in the kingdom is immense; but the want of public confidence very often occasions the greater part of it to be hoarded up. The population of the kingdom is immense; but the excess and nature of the taxes impoverish and dishearten the people. The revenue is immense; but the public debt consumes two-fifths of it. The contributions of the nation, in particular, are immense; but it is only by the strengthening of public credit, that government can succeed in finding sufficient resources in extraordinary emergencies. Finally, the balance of commerce in favor of the kingdom is an immense source of riches; but war interrupts the current.

What, then, would be the case, if we join to all these considerations, the calamities inseparable from war? How would it appear, should we endeavor to form an estimate of the lives and sufferings of men? In the midst of a council convened to influence the opinion of the sovereign, the most upright of his servants might address him in this language:—

“Sire, war is the source of so many evils, it is so terrible a scourge, that a gracious and discerning Prince ought never to undertake it but from motives of justice that are indisputable; and it behoves the greatest monarch in the world to give that example of the morality of kings which assures the happiness of humanity, and the tranquillity of nations. Do not give way, Sire, to vain anxieties, or to uncertain expectations. Ah! what have you to fear, and what can excite your jealousy? You reign over 26,000,000 of men. Providence, with a bountiful hand, has diffused the choicest blessings through your empire by multiplying the productions of every kind. The war proposed will cost you eight or nine hundred millions; and, were even victory every where to follow your arms, you will devote to death, or cruel sufferings, so great a number of your subjects, that were any one, who could read futurity, to present you this moment with the list, you would start back with horror. Nor is this all; your people, who have scarcely had a respite, you are going to crush with new taxes. You are going to slacken the activity of commerce and manufactures, those inestimable sources of industry and wealth; and, in order to procure soldiers and seamen, the men accustomed to the cultivation of the earth, will be forced from the interior provinces, and a hundred thousand families deprived of their supporters.

“And when crowned by the most splendid success, after so many evils, after so many calamities, what may you perhaps obtain? An unsteady ally, uncertain gratitude, an island more than two thousand leagues from your empire, or some new subjects in another hemisphere. Alas! you are invited to nobler conquests. Turn your eyes to the interior parts of your kingdom. Consider what communications and canals may still be wanting. Behold those pestilential marshes which ought to be drained, and those deserted lands which would be cultivated on the first tender of support from government. Behold that part of your people whom a diminution of taxes would excite to new undertakings. Look, more especially, on that other truly wretched class, who stand in immediate need of succor in order to support the misery of their situation. In the mean time, in order to effectuate so many benefits, a small part of the revenues which you are going to consume in the war to which you are advised, would perhaps be sufficient. Are not the numerous inhabitants of your extensive dominions sufficient to engage your paternal love? And is not their happiness equal to the greatest extent of good which it is in the power of a single man to perform?

“But if you are desirous of new subjects, you may acquire them without the effusion of blood, or the triumphs of a battle; for they will spring up in every part of your empire, fostered by the benefi-

cent means that are in your hands. A good government multiplies men as the morning dews of the spring unfold the buds of plants. Before you seek, therefore, beyond the ocean, for those new subjects which are unknown to you, reflect that, in order to acquire them, you are going to sacrifice a greater number of those who love you, whom you love, whose fidelity you have experienced, and whose happiness is committed to your protection.

“What personal motive, then, can determine you to war? Is it the splendor of victories for which you hope? Is it the ambition of a greater name in the annals of mankind? But is renown confined to bloodshed and devastation? And is that which a monarch obtains, by diffusing ease and happiness throughout his dominions, unworthy of consideration? Titus reigned only three years; and his name, transmitted from age to age by the love of nations, is still introduced in all the eulogies of princes.

“Do not doubt it, Sire, a wise administration is of more value to you than the most refined political system; and if, to such resources, you unite that empire over other nations which is acquired by a transcendent character of justice and moderation, you will enjoy at once the greatest glory, and the most formidable power. Ah! Sire, exhibit this magnificent spectacle to the world; and then, if triumphal arches be wanting, make the tour of your provinces, and, preceded by all the good you have diffused, appear surrounded by the blessings of your people, and the ecstatic acclamations of a grateful nation made happy by its sovereign.”

Such would be the language of an honest minister; nor can I believe that such reflections would be foreign to political deliberations. At first, they would be thought extraordinary, and the minister who should argue thus, would not be allowed the views of an enlightened statesman. But the minister who, devoid alike of fear and every selfish view, should dare to advance great truths, might perhaps force his way through prejudice, or habitual ideas.

Ideas of this kind have a most extensive influence. I cannot remember without shuddering, to have seen the following statement, in an estimate of the money requisite for a war:

Forty thousand men to be embarked for the colonies . . .	40,000
To be deducted one-third for the first year's mortality . . .	13,333

Remainder 26,667

A clerk in office makes his calculation in cool blood. A minister, on the perusal, has seldom any other idea than of the expense, and turns with unconcern to the next leaf for the result of the whole.

How can one here refrain from indulging very melancholy sensations? Alas! if by any law of nature unknown to me, mankind deserved so much indifference, I should be very wrong to write, and to be so earnestly solicitous for their welfare. I should be myself but a vile heap of dust, which the wind of life agitates for a moment. But I entertain a more exalted idea of our existence, and of the spirit that informs it.

Mankind, say apologists for war, have in every age been accustomed to it. Certainly; and, in every age also have storms de-

stroyed the harvests; the pestilence has spread around its envenomed breath; intolerance has sacrificed her victims; crimes of every kind have desolated the earth. But reason has also obstinately fought against folly, morality against vice, art against disease, and industry against the rigor of bad seasons.

But I hear it stated, as a last objection, that men delight in hazards, and often seek them of their own accord. I allow it; but, admitting that some men have voluntarily placed themselves in a situation which they know to be exposed to calamities, will the nature of these calamities be changed by that consideration? The ignorance of the vulgar is a protracted minority; and in every situation in which they may be impelled by circumstances, neither their first choice, nor their first impulse, is to be considered in this argument. We must study their sentiments in those moments when, distracted by a thousand excruciating pains, yet still lingering in existence, they are carried off in heaps from the fatal field in which they have been mowed down by the enemy. We must study their sentiments in those noisome hospitals in which they are crowded together, and where the sufferings they endure, to preserve a languishing existence, so forcibly prove the value they set upon the preservation of their lives, and the greatness of the sacrifice to which they had been exposed. We ought also to study their sentiments in those moments in which, perhaps, to such a variety of wo, is added the bitter remembrance of that momentary error which led them to such misery. We ought, more especially, to study their sentiments on board those ships on fire, in which there is but a moment between them and the most cruel death; and on those ramparts where subterraneous explosion announces, that in an instant they are to be buried under a tremendous heap of stones and rubbish. But the earth has covered them, the sea has swallowed them up, and we think of them no more. Their voice, extinguished forever, can no longer arraign the calamities of war. What unfeeling survivors are we! While we walk over mutilated bodies and shattered bones, we exult in the glory and honors of which we alone are the heirs.

Let me not be reproached with having dwelt too long on these melancholy representations. We cannot exhibit them too often; so much are we accustomed, in the very midst of society, to behold nothing in war, and all its attendant horrors, but an honorable employment for the courage of aspiring youth, and the school in which the talents of great officers are unfolded; and such is the effect of this transient intoxication, that the conversation of the polite circles in the capital is often taken for the general wish of the nation. Oh! ye governors, do not suffer yourselves to be deceived by this mistaken voice. For my part, far from regretting that I have opposed, to the best of my abilities, those chimeras which are subversive of the happiness of mankind, and of the true greatness of states; far from believing that I have displayed too much zeal for truths that are repugnant to so many passions and prepossessions, I believe these truths to be so useful, so essential, and so perfectly just, that after having supported them by my

feeble voice in the course of my administration, and endeavored even from my retirement to diffuse them wide, I could wish that the last drop of my blood were employed to trace them on the minds of all.

This subject is of importance to every nation; and the spirit of the reflections I have made, is applicable not merely to the nations whose interests are regulated by the pleasure of an individual. I address myself equally to you, Great Nation (England) to whom the spirit of liberty communicates all its force. Let the energy of your soul, let that abundance, or that *community* of knowledge which results from it, lead you to those sentiments of political humanity which are so well connected with elevated thoughts. Be not influenced by a blind avidity for riches, by the pride of confidence, or a perpetual jealousy of others; and, since the waves of the ocean free you from the imperious yoke of disciplined armies, recollect that your first attention is due to the preservation of that precious government you enjoy. Tremble, lest you one day become indifferent to it, if from the excessive taxes which war accumulates, you expose to the dreadful conflicts of private interest, that public and patriotic sentiment which has so long been the source of your greatness and your felicity.

And may you, young and rising Nation (United States of America,) whose generous efforts have released you from your European yoke, make the rights you have acquired still more respected through the world, by employing yourselves constantly in promoting the public happiness. Sacrifice it not to vague notions of policy, and the deceptive calculations of warlike ambition. Avoid, if possible, the passions which agitate our hemisphere; and long may you preserve the simplicity of the primitive ages.

What more can be said? Here I should stop, for my feeble voice is altogether unequal to so important a subject; nevertheless, I venture once more to solicit a moment's attention. It is in considerations of public good, and just conceptions of true power, that I have hitherto sought motives to deter sovereigns from war; but I should imperfectly perform my task, if I did not endeavor to interest them in truths, the defence of which I have undertaken, by urging on them the close connection of these truths with their personal happiness.

How much has ambition, however dazzling and renowned, disquietude and remorse for its attendants! In the midst of battles and of ruins; in the midst of heaps of cinders, where the flames have destroyed flourishing cities; from the graves of that field where whole armies are buried, without doubt a name is raised and commemorated in history, even that of a sovereign who, to satiate his thirst for glory, has commanded these ravages, has willed these desolations. I will depict to myself this prince in the zenith of his glory and his triumphs, and imagine him listening to the flatteries of his courtiers, and feeling intoxicated with their praises, then retiring alone, holding in his hand the details of a battle. He reads attentively the recital, not as a mere curious inquirer who, having nothing to reproach himself with, calmly

takes a view of the events, but as the author of such an accumulation of wrongs, and of which there is not one, perhaps, for which, in the inmost recesses of his soul, his conscience does not reproach him. He is at the same time on the point of giving orders for a fresh effusion of blood, of increasing the weight of the taxes, of aggravating the misfortunes of his people, of laying his conquering arm heavily on them. What distressing reflections must present themselves to him! At this moment he would fain recall the crowd that had surrounded him. 'Return,' he would spontaneously exclaim, 'return, and repeat to me all that has even now intoxicated me. Alas! you are far off, and I find myself in a frightful desert, in solitude. I no longer discover the traces of my former sentiments; the light which dazzled me, is extinguished; my joy is departed, and my glory vanished!'

Such is nearly the train of reflections that would present themselves to the monarch when alone. In the mean time night comes on, darkness and silence cover the earth, peace appears to reign every where except in his breast. The plaintive cries of the dying, the tears of ruined families, the various evils of which he is the author, present themselves to his view, and disturb his imagination. A dream, the noise of the wind, a clap of thunder, are sometimes sufficient to agitate him, and remind him of his own insignificance. 'Who am I,' he is impelled to say, 'who am I, that I should command so many ravages, and cause so many tears to flow? Born to be the benefactor, I am the scourge of mankind. Is this the use to which I should appropriate the treasures at my disposal, and the power with which I am entrusted? Hereafter I shall have to deliver up an account; and what will this account be?' It is then in vain for him to attempt to prop up his pride, and exculpate himself in his own eyes, by presenting to the Supreme Being his successes and his triumphs; he feels an invisible hand repulsing him, and apparently refusing to acknowledge him. Disturbed with these cogitations, he endeavors at last to bury in sleep the moments which thus annoy him, impatient for the dawn of day, for the splendor of the court, and the concourse of his servants, to dissipate his anguish, and restore to him his illusions.

Ah! what a different picture does the life of a beneficent king present! He finds in the inclination of his soul a continual source of pleasing sensations. The shadows of the night, by gathering around him consoling recollections of the past, enliven his retirement; the concussions of agitated nature, far from disturbing his imagination, awaken in him ideas which sweetly harmonize with his feelings; the love of mankind with which he is smitten, the public benevolence with which he is animated, that order which he has been desirous to maintain, recall to his mind the most delightful recollections. In such a career, the beneficent king sees his days pass away; and, when warned that the period draws nigh in which his strength must give way, he surveys with tranquillity this inevitable hour, and satisfied with the wise use he has made of his power, resigns himself to those hopes of which virtuous and sensible souls alone are capable.

How different is the closing scene of that sovereign whose views were influenced only by ambition and the love of war! How often does this last moment appear terrible to him, and of what avail are his most glorious exploits? Weighed down by age and sickness, when the shades of death surround him with melancholy reflections, does he then command his attendants to entertain him with a recital of his victorious battles? Does he order those trophies to be spread before him, on which he might discern the tears that watered them? No; all these ideas terrify and distract him. *I have been too fond of war*, was the last speech of the most powerful of kings; such were the words he addressed to his great grandson. Too late regret! which certainly did not suffice to calm the agitations of his soul! Ah! how much happier he would have been, if, after a reign similar to that of Titus and Antoninus, he had been able to say to the young prince, 'I have experienced all sorts of pleasures; I have been acquainted with all kinds of glory: believe a dying king; I have found no real content but in the good I have been able to do. Tread in my steps; entertain for your people the same tender affection I have felt for them. Instead of destroying the establishments I have formed for the prosperity of the state; instead of rejecting my principles of order and economy; instead of abolishing the laws I have promulgated for the benefit of the lower class, and the comfort of the wretched, proceed still farther, and let our names, blended together, be equally blessed. The only just opinion of us, is that which we leave behind; the only glory, that which remains attached to our memory.

'My task is now at an end, and you are going to begin yours. Yes, a moment longer, and those courtiers who surround me, will attend on you; a moment longer, and the drums of the guards will announce your accession, and all the splendor of the throne will be displayed before your eyes. Do not suffer yourself to be dazzled by these brilliant seductions of the supreme rank; but more especially resist those wrong ideas of the greatness of kings, which ambitious or interested men will endeavor to inculcate on you. You will be rendered envious of the power of other nations, before you have time to be acquainted with your own; you will be urged to destroy their felicity, before you have time to reflect on the good you may do to your own subjects; you will be solicited to overturn the peace of the world, before you have secured the maintenance of order within your own kingdom; and you will be inspired with the desire of increasing your dominions, before you have even ascertained what cares and informations are necessary to govern with prudence the smallest of your provinces. Mistrust all those measures with which they attempt to make sovereigns forget, not only the limits of their faculties, but the shortness of their life, and every thing that they have in common with other men. Stay by me a little longer, my son! to learn that the sovereign of a most powerful empire vanishes from the earth with less noise than a leaf falls from the tree, or a light is extinguished.'

PEACE PRACTICABLE.

SETTING aside persons who hold political or military office, or who by their connection with government are led to imagine they have an interest in war, it is believed there are few intelligent or benevolent men who now advocate that cruel practice as a good in itself or its results; but there are many sincere philanthropists, who, fully perceiving the vast amount of suffering and corruption caused by this custom, believing such calamity to be unalleviated, and uncompensated by any resulting good, and earnestly desiring the extinction of war, still doubt the practicability of that extinction by any means in the power of the friends of peace to apply.

First, it is objected that the magnitude of the evil is such as to be irremovable by private effort. The insatiable ambition, the pride of honor, fancied interest, and deep-rooted customs of nations, the enthusiastic canonization of warriors, the brilliant examples of classic history, the flattering voice of poetry, the splendor of monumental arts, the chivalry of patriotism, and the imposing fascinations of military display, all combine to drown the still small voice of humanity,—altogether form an overwhelming power, against which individual or associated philanthropy must strive in vain. What can a few peace societies and their friends effect against the gigantic pride and customs of sovereign rulers and the political world?

It is not to be wondered at, that men,—even intelligent and considerate men,—make an objection like this; for the world has hitherto seemed to be governed or revolutionized by force; and they are naturally incredulous of any important change without the perception of physical power to effect it. But it is overlooked, that many of the most signal revolutions of the globe have originated in some new or disregarded principle,—religious, moral or political,—brought out by some obscure, perhaps despised individuals, which afterwards proved to be the actuating soul of the great physical movement. Such was the case with the Crusades, the Reformation, the discovery of America, the American and French Revolutions. The most remarkable revolution of the earth was the promulgation of Christianity by a few fishermen of Galilee, and their associates, changing the religion and moral habits of a large portion of the civilized world. It may be thought that this should not be adduced as an instance, as it was under the special and miraculous direction of the Most High; but we are taught that all events are, in reality, guided by his Providence; and, if the progress of peace principles is predicted, and their promotion enjoined by this revelation, there is as much rea-

son to expect his divine aid in their extension, as in that of the gospel, of which it forms so essential a part.

Again, it should be recollected, that under the perpetual advance of Christianity and civilization, mere physical power is every where losing, and moral power gaining social and political influence. In former ages, it might perhaps be said, that before the proud thrones or passion-led multitudes of the world, moral effort would avail but little in presenting truth, or advocating humanity. Already has the religious and intellectual change been such, that no oppressive abuse of physical power can be long continued in face of the unequivocal rebuke of religious enthusiasm, or philosophical philanthropy; and under the obvious progress of society we have every promise that the claims of enlightened benevolence must be heard, and will be effectual. But the friends of universal peace, if guided by truth, and warmed with zeal, are plainly possessed of a moral influence superior to the power of brute force, however imposing; and, if efficiently sustained by those who are in sentiment with them, so that they could bring all the religious and benevolent of the civilized world into an united, energetic protest against the practice of war, neither despotism, nor custom, nor chivalric delusion, could withstand it; the pride of the martial world must bend before the frown of Christian reproof. Let us not, then, in timid distrust of moral power, withhold it. Give it in sanguine faith, and it will be decisively victorious.

But we meet with a more serious objection to specific efforts for the cause of peace, among those religious and enlightened men on whom our chief reliance is placed as instruments of the cause. They doubt not the power of Christianity to overthrow the power of war; but they consider the process proposed on this subject as wrong in its order; general Christian faith must precede it. "Make men Christians," they say, "and universal peace will follow." They have no expectation that peace principles will ever be received, until Christianity, as they understand it, is made to prevail in the world; and they accordingly think time and money wasted in any previous attempts to diffuse them. And yet a little attention will make it plain, that the whole strength of this objection lies in its ambiguity; an examination of what is here meant by Christianity, will dissipate it. If a Christianity is made to prevail over the world which involves the doctrines of forbearance and peace as essential elements, undoubtedly the prevalence of such a Christianity would forever extinguish war; and the course of the peace-makers is precisely that which the objectors would desire, but which they refuse to aid; for these peace-makers strive to engraft this very feature inseparably on Christianity, and may be considered as missionaries of that religion in its genuine pacific form.

But the objectors have not in mind this idea of Christianity in making the objection; they mean Christianity as each understands it, according to the doctrines laid down by his sect or denomination respectively, in few of which, (with the exception of

the Friends and Moravians,) is the peace principle included as fundamental. The extension of such a Christianity will never produce peace. History is full of instances of pious and devoted men, under every form of religious faith, who have not only sanctioned, but participated in, the revolting violence and cruelties of war. No one will call in question the religious character of the early fathers of the church, the reformers with Luther, the Covenanters of Scotland, or the pilgrims who landed on the Rock of Plymouth. Perhaps even the crusaders to Palestine, the German invaders of Saxony, and the Spanish conquerors of South America, may be allowed to have been actuated by a sincere faith in what they received as Christianity; but in none of these instances or similar ones which history records, has the aspect of the Cross, in any of its varied lights, obliterated the heathen spirit of Mars; and what reason is there to believe that any view of Christianity, which includes not its peace principle as essential, whatever ascendancy it may gain, will ever spread over the future a forbearing tranquillity which it has always failed to do in the fairest trials of the past? The true teachers of Christianity then, are the peace-makers. They alone preach a gospel from which peace can spring forth. They alone exhibit its love in connection with its faith.

Another objection to the practicability of peace efforts comes from a numerous class, confiding less in the power of Christianity. The war-spirit is said to be ineradicable, as founded in nature. All brute animals are by instinct prone to violence and conflict, and human beings have been engaged in war and bloodshed from the earliest ages, and in every realm. War must, then, ever continue, while man retains his present passions; and his race must be miraculously changed in nature, or extirpated from the earth, for a new creation, before peace can dwell over its extensive sphere. We then strive to counteract the laws of Providence, when we oppose war; every generation must pass through its bloody trials, and look to a future life for a regenerated, pacific constitution.

The fact of the universal custom of conflict, brutal and human, is indisputable; that in brutes it is founded in their unalterable nature, will not be questioned; but when this law is applied also to man, the whole truth is not shown; it is forgotten that man has higher and freer impulses, which counteract and modify his animal nature. His calculating reason, and penetrating foresight of consequences, direct his very passions to an action, by which their present gratification is sacrificed to future good. Moral principle, too, is perceived by his mind, and an instinct, nobler than the animal, bends him into obedience to it. Man, by nature, is acquisitive and grasping; and yielding only to this nature, the world would be a universal scene of robbery and plunder. Civilization, pointing through experience to general good, has brought him under laws which respect the right of property, and induce scruples of honesty, restricting desire where no punishment would follow its violation. Man, naturally, is indolent and self-indul-

gent; the view of future melioration rouses his energy, sloth is shaken off, self-denial practised, and active enterprises undertaken, which ultimately lead to exertions and privations for the good of others. Naturally, man is ambitious and despotic; how seldom is the person seen, who does not love to rule; but civilization again has induced a general respect for equal rights, and the thrones of despotism are fast sinking before the rising claims of universal freedom.

Now, enlightened interest, justice and humanity, all plead strongly for the abolition of war. They call on man to modify his nature for peace, as he has done for other blessings. Christianity enforces this demand with higher authority, and still more imposing motives; and, if his animal nature has given way before weaker impulses for other objects, there can be no reason to despair of a conquest over it in this case, when all the lights of reason, humanity and religion are made to bear upon it, and in full view, all the horrors, depravities and sufferings of war, and the rich blessings of unbroken peace, are duly presented and appreciated.

If it is still objected that these reasonings are merely theoretical, and ought to be sustained by facts, the reply is, that ultimate facts are, from the nature of the case, future; but the progress already made in this cause is a full warrant of its practicability. This progress is seen in the collected testimonies of the most eminent statesmen in Europe and America to their desire and expectation of universal peace. It is seen in the altered tone of the literary and political press, now ever deprecating war; in the evident reluctance of civilized governments to this cruel resort, so that irritating collisions, which formerly would have kindled immediate hostility, are now (1845) settled by compromise, and in the consequent prevalence of peace for the last thirty years; but above all in the fact, that proposals made for arbitration or a permanent Congress to settle international disputes, are every where received with favor, both by rulers and people, and believed by many to be safe and adequate substitutes for the dreadful appeal to the sword. And these circumstances may be all traced to the action of the associated friends of peace.

These replies are offered to the consideration of intelligent men, who entertain the objections stated. To the confiding Christian who relies on the revealed will of God, a decisive answer can be made to every discouraging argument. God has, by his prophets, declared there shall be a reign of universal peace, when men shall beat their swords into plough-shares, their spears into pruning-hooks, and shall learn war no more. Christ has enjoined, with peculiar emphasis and repetition, that forbearing love from which peace must necessarily result. These predictions and injunctions are the warrant of the peace-makers. Fortified with these, they are assured they shall not labor in vain; they see in them certain pledges of divine assistance, and ultimate success.

SUBSTITUTES FOR WAR.

WAR is now tolerated only as a *necessary evil*; but there is in truth no more necessity for it than there is for duelling, the slave-trade, or any other species of folly or crime. War comes solely from the wrong choice of men; that choice *may* be changed; and whenever it shall be, nations, like individuals, will find other methods for the settlement of their disputes, far better than the sword for all purposes of protection and redress.

I. The first substitute, then, would be NEGOTIATION. So long as nations keep cool and kind enough to adjust their own difficulties, this method is decidedly the best of all. If the code of national honor did not goad them at once into blood; if they made the sword really their last resort, instead of their first; if popular sentiment should always hold them back from conflict till mutual forbearance, explanation and concession had exhausted their utmost power, this expedient alone would, in nine cases out of ten, prevent an appeal to arms.

II. Should this expedient fail, our next resort would be to ARBITRATION; a substitute adopted when the parties are unable to adjust their own difficulties, or prefer the decision of an umpire mutually chosen. Better for the parties to agree among themselves, if they can; but, if they cannot, we wish nations in every case to settle their disputes as individuals do theirs, by some mode of reference. We urge this as an established, permanent principle. Nations should, in accordance with the recommendation of the First General Peace Convention in London, 1843, incorporate in every treaty a clause binding the parties to adjust whatever differences may arise between them, not by the sword, but by reference to umpires mutually chosen, and agree to abide by their decision, and to claim, if dissatisfied, only the privilege of renewing or changing the reference.

To such a substitute, what objection can be urged? It relinquishes no right; it sacrifices no interest; it would startle few, if any prejudices; it can offend neither the strong nor the moderate peace-man, neither the Quaker nor the warrior; it is adapted to the present state of the world, and consistent alike with the precepts of Christianity, and the dictates of sound policy; a measure level to the comprehension of all, and commending itself to their common sense as simple,

feasible, and likely to prove successful. Nor is the principle new, but as old as human society; it lies at the bottom of every trial in our courts; we often find the wisest and best men preferring it in their own case even to a regular course of law; and we merely ask nations to use the same degree of justice, candor and good sense in adjusting their difficulties, that individuals do in theirs. Can they not do so?

III. Should both these expedients fail, we should still have in reserve the principle of **MEDIATION**. When rulers become so exasperated against each other, as to withdraw from official intercourse, and the strange, semi-barbarous code of national honor requires them to keep aloof, or to meet only on the field of battle, a third power friendly to both, interposes with the offer of its services as mediator; such services the parties are now bound in courtesy to accept; and this simple expedient, a new development of the pacific tendencies of the age, promises to obviate the most delicate and difficult cases of misunderstanding. It is well known that duellists cannot fight so long as a mutual friend stands between them as mediator; and, if so effectual for the prevention of duels, the principle, equally applicable to war, would be likely to prove still more successful here, from the longer delay necessary, from the greater publicity of the transaction, and from the overwhelming majority on both sides interested in a peaceful issue of the dispute. Thus might a single cabinet, by the well-timed tender of its services, hold in check the war-spirit of the whole civilized world, and keep its nations in permanent peace. Not unfrequently has this expedient been employed since the downfall of Napoleon; and every one can remember with what speedy and signal success, England alone acted, in the course of only a few years, as mediator between France and ourselves, between Holland and Belgium, between Sweden and France, and between France and Switzerland. It is a new antidote to war, and may do much to insure the steady and lasting peace of Christendom.

IV. But the perfection of all substitutes for war, would be a **CONGRESS OF NATIONS**. By this we mean a congress, or meeting in convention, of as many nations as could be brought into the measure, to agree upon a full code of international law, and next a High Court of Nations, or board of international arbitrators, to interpret and apply that code, to adjudicate whatever cases might be referred to them by consent of parties, and to act for the great brotherhood of nations as the guardian of their common rights and interests. It would perform for nations substantially the same services that a civil tribunal does for individuals, or the Supreme Court of the United States does for the different States in our confederacy

It would have no right to touch any case not voluntarily referred to it by the nations in dispute; and all its decisions would be merely advisory, and become binding only by the consent of each party, and efficacious solely by the force of public opinion in their favor. There would be at its command no fleets, no armies, no power whatever besides the influence of its own reputation, the voice of the civilized world, and perhaps an application in extreme cases of peaceful penalties, to awe refractory states into acquiescence. An expedient founded on the very same principle with our codes and courts of law; an expedient as old, in one form or another, as civil government or human society; an expedient just as applicable to nations as to individuals, and likely, if once established, and used aright, to prove as successful in the former case as it has in the latter; an expedient that could certainly do no harm, and might suffice at once to prevent forty-nine wars in fifty, and eventually supersede forever the whole war-system.

Here, then, are four substitutes for war, each simple, easy and effective; substitutes which every man of the least sense or candor must admit to be infinitely better than an appeal to the savage argument of lead and steel; substitutes which recognize right instead of might, reason in place of brute force, as the arbiter of national disputes; substitutes which nations could, if they would, adopt in part, without delay, and ere-long, the whole of them; substitutes which would at once supersede every plea of necessity for war, insure far more justice in the intercourse of nations, and guaranty in due time their permanent peace and prosperity.

Now, we insist on the duty of nations to adopt such substitutes as these. If they are moral agents like individuals, they are equally bound to an amicable, bloodless adjustment of their difficulties; and, if war is held by none to be justifiable except as a last resort, and should never be employed till after all other expedients have failed, then must nations, on the lowest principles of peace or common sense, abstain from the sword until they have not only tried in good faith negotiation, reference and mediation, but established a congress of nations, and submitted their disputes to its high and impartial arbitrament. All this they *can* do, if they *will*; and, until they do it, how can war be called their *last* resort?

‘But nations have no common judge, and hence they *must* decide each its own case.’—True, they have *at present* no such judge; but they *might* have, if they *would*; and we call upon them by every motive of reason, duty and self-interest, to establish one as soon as possible.

‘Meanwhile, however, what shall settle their disputes?’—

Surely not the sword, but some one of the substitutes we have proposed. War settle disputes! Never! The parties invariably sheath the sword before they dream of a settlement, and then despatch, not men of blood to fight, but men of peace, plenipotentiaries, to negotiate. And why not do this *before* fighting, and thus obviate all necessity of war? We had a controversy with England about our north-eastern boundary; and, had we gone to war, would that have settled the dispute? No; it would only have aggravated its difficulties. There is no logic in bullets and bomb-shells; the butchery of millions on the disputed territory could not have thrown a single ray of new light on the points in controversy; and, after wasting myriads of treasure, and shedding oceans of blood, we should have been obliged to employ for the final adjustment the very same pacific means that might have been used even more successfully before the war than after it.

‘True, if the parties were willing; but can you make them willing before they have fought awhile?’—Yes, we could, if we would; but how little effort is made for peace in comparison with what *must* be for war? No two nations could *begin* a war in earnest without sacrificing, in one way and another, scores of millions; but a tenth or even a hundredth part as much, if wisely spent in the use of moral means for the purpose, would form such a public sentiment, that no power on earth could goad the parties into conflict.—Unwilling for a peaceful adjustment!—who is unwilling? Am I? Are you? We resent the charge; and, should you go through both countries, you would find scarce a man that would not profess to be equally anxious for a bloodless issue of the dispute.

‘Perhaps the *people* are willing; but the *rulers* are not.’—Rulers not willing!—why not? Because the people do not call loud enough for a peaceful settlement. Rulers will generally go either for peace or for war, just as the people go; they *can*, if they will, settle their disputes without war, quite as well as individuals can theirs without duels; they *will* do so, whenever the people shall come every where to demand it aright; the people *will thus demand it*, whenever they shall be duly enlightened on the subject; and hence do we urge the pulpit and the press, every sect in religion, and every party in politics, all Christians, philanthropists and patriots, to unite in filling every community with such an abhorrence of war, and such strong desires for peace, as shall hereafter constrain rulers to employ pacific expedients alone for the settlement of all national disputes.

ARBITRATION,

AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR WAR.

ADDRESSED ESPECIALLY TO RULERS.

THE evils of war are coming to be more generally known, and more deeply felt than in ages past. Its suspension or derangement of business;—its havoc of life and property;—its crippling of agriculture, manufactures, and the various arts that minister to individual and national prosperity;—the obstructions it opposes to commerce, to travel, and every kind of useful intercourse between nations;—its baneful influence on morality and religion, on the cause of liberty and popular improvement, on the various enterprises now in progress for the welfare and redemption of our whole race, on the dearest interests of mankind for time and eternity; all these and many other results of this custom are rapidly conspiring more and more to make every good man deplore it as a terrible scourge, and earnestly desire its speedy, universal abolition.

Such views are no longer confined to peace societies; but the mass of the people, wherever enlightened on the subject, and free to utter their sentiments, are beginning to call for peace. It is fast becoming the popular demand of the age, the cry of millions sighing for relief. They begin to discover in war the source of their worst evils. It is the origin and support of the tyranny that rules them with a rod of iron; its enormous burdens have long been grinding them into the dust all over the old world; the war-debts of Europe alone, secured by mortgage upon their bones and sinews, exceed by far the entire amount of specie now on the globe; more than four-fifths of all their taxes go to pay the interest on these debts, and to maintain even in peace some three millions of standing warriors as moths on the community; and, when they remember how many centuries this monster has revelled in their blood, and how often it has plundered and burnt their cities, and laid waste their villages, and trampled down their harvests, and desolated their peaceful homes, and butchered their sons upon the battle-field, and subjected their wives and daughters to a fate still more deplorable, can we wonder, that the people, always the chief sufferers from war, are at length demanding of their rulers to obviate its alleged necessity by the adoption of other means than the sword for the settlement of national disputes?

Nor is this demand unreasonable. Rulers could, if they would, adjust their difficulties, and regulate the entire intercourse of nations, without war. There is no real need of this custom; and, were they so disposed, they could supersede it at once and forever by substitutes far better than lead and steel. They compel the people to settle *their* quarrels without bloodshed; and we see not with what sort of consistency they can require or permit the wholesale butchery of their subjects in war for the adjustment of differences in which the combatants themselves have no personal concern. It is a cruel outrage upon the people, as well as a bitter mockery of common sense; and it is quite time this foul stain were wiped from the escutcheon of Christendom forever.

And can it not be done? Yes, with ease and safety. Do you ask how? We might suggest a variety of feasible and efficient methods; but we now restrict ourselves to one which relinquishes no right, and sacrifices no interest, contravenes no important principle, and startles few, if any prejudices; a measure adapted to the present state of the world, and consistent with the precepts of Christianity, and the dictates of sound policy; a measure level to the comprehension of all, and commending itself to their common sense; simple, practicable, and likely to prove successful. It is *ARBITRATION as a recognized substitute for war*. Better to agree among themselves, if they can, without the intervention of a third party; but, if they cannot, we wish nations in every case to settle their difficulties, as individuals in society do theirs, by *some* form of reference. The method we propose has been occasionally employed; but we urge its adoption as an established, permanent principle. We would have nations incorporate in every treaty a clause binding the parties, as their last resort, to adjust whatever differences may arise between them, not by an appeal to arms, but by reference to umpires mutually chosen. The arrangements for this purpose might safely be left in every case to the contracting parties; but they should invariably bind themselves in good faith to abide by the decision of their referees, and claim, if dissatisfied, only the privilege of renewing or changing the reference.

Here is the outline of our plan. It speaks for itself, and may seem too clear to require either argument or illustration. Common sense decides, that no man should be allowed to judge in his own case; and this principle is quite as applicable to communities as to individuals. The former, equally liable to all the influences that bias the judgment, and lead to wrong conclusions, should never be permitted, any more than individuals, to act as witness, jury and judge in their own

case. The voice of common sense, in every age and clime, cries out against it as manifestly wrong, and demands, that parties in dispute, whether individuals or communities, should in the last resort leave their differences to impartial judges. This is all we ask. Nations are only large communities; and we insist merely on their adopting this simple, equitable principle for the settlement of their difficulties.

Nor is this principle new or untried. It is as old as human society; it has been acted upon more or less from the earliest dawn of civilization; we often find the wisest and best men preferring it even to a regular course of law for the amicable adjustment of their own differences; and we simply ask, that nations should exercise an equal degree of sense, candor and justice, by referring their disputes in like manner to competent and impartial arbiters.

The same principle lies at the bottom of all our courts. Every trial in them is a reference. No litigant is allowed to decide, or even to testify in his own case; but he must, whether willing or unwilling, submit to the judgment of his peers on the testimony of credible witnesses. Nor has he any direct voice in the selection of his arbiters; society chooses them for him; and before a judge and jury thus appointed, he is compelled to go, and abide their decision. Such is the ordinary course of justice, the common, legal mode of reference; and ought not governments, in the adjustment of their difficulties, to act on principles as equitable and elevated as those which they prescribe to their own subjects? Shall common sense, common honesty, the established rules of right and wrong, never be extended to the intercourse of nations? Must this highest earthly province of duty and interest be abandoned forever to savage, brutal violence as the arbiter of right? Are rulers idiots that they cannot, or villains that they will not, use, in the settlement of their own disputes, and the regulation of their intercourse, as much reason, justice and common sense, as the humblest of their subjects do in theirs?

We appeal to acknowledged authorities in the case. All writers on international law represent nations as subject to the same general rules of right as individuals. Chancellor Kent says, "they are properly regarded as moral persons;" and Vattel considers them as 'under the same obligations that are binding upon men in their intercourse one with another, and the law of nations as no more than the law of nature applied to nations.' No respectable writer, since the time of Grotius, has ventured to call this principle in question; but does it not obviously require governments to settle their disputes in essentially the same way that individuals do theirs?

If the latter may not decide their own case, and wreak vengeance at will on the objects of their displeasure, why should the former be allowed to do so? Why should nations be indulged in principles of action that would in individuals outrage common sense, trample on all law, and subvert the very foundations of society?

Let us quote from the great masters of international law. Grotius says, "war should never be declared until all other means of redress have been faithfully tried;" and Vattel asserts, that "the law of nature, which recommends peace, concord and charity, obliges nations to attempt the mildest methods of terminating their differences.—Nature gives us no right to have recourse to force, but where mild and pacific methods are ineffectual.—When sovereigns cannot agree about their pretensions, they sometimes trust the decision of their disputes to arbitrators. This method is very reasonable, and very conformable to the law of nature. Though the strict right may be mistaken by the arbitrator, it is still more to be feared that it will be overwhelmed by the fate of arms."

On this point, Vattel adduces a series of striking examples. "The kings of Denmark formerly condescended by solemn treaty to refer to those of Sweden the differences that might arise between them and their Senate; and the kings of Sweden did the same with regard to those of Denmark. The princes and states of West Friesland, and the burgesses of Embden in the same manner constituted the republic of the United Provinces the judge of their differences. The princes of Neufchatel established in 1406 the canton of Berne the judge and perpetual arbitrator of their disputes. The Swiss have had the precaution, in all their alliances among themselves, and even in those they have contracted with the neighboring powers, to agree beforehand on the manner in which their disputes were to be submitted to arbitrators, in case they could not themselves adjust them in an amicable manner. This wise precaution has not a little contributed to maintain the Helvetic Republic in that flourishing state which secures its liberty, and renders it respectable throughout Europe."

Such was the law of nations on this point centuries ago; but within the last twenty or thirty years, the principle has come into still higher repute, and more general use. Often has it been employed by the leading cabinets of Europe for the adjustment of their differences; and we ourselves have in several instances resorted to it with a degree of success calculated to encourage its general adoption. A question relative to the interpretation of our last treaty of peace with Great Britain, was referred to the Emperor of Russia, and decided to mutual satisfaction in our favor. The dispute con

cerning our north-eastern boundary, we submitted to the King of the Netherlands; and, though his award, being a compromise not authorized by the terms of reference, failed to satisfy either England or ourselves, yet it doubtless served to prevent for the time a resort to arms, and to secure in the end a settlement very nearly resembling that award, and satisfactory to both parties. Our difficulties with Mexico had brought us to the brink of war; but the danger was instantly averted by a reference of the points in dispute to the King of Prussia. Thus is the practice of enlightened and powerful nations strongly tending to establish this principle as a most important part of international law. Already is it a favorite antidote or remedy for war, a substitute proved by actual experience to be far better than the sword; and all we now ask, is the formal incorporation of this principle in every treaty between nations as the last resort for the adjustment of their difficulties.

The voice of public opinion, that mistress of the civilized world, is also coming to demand this substitute for war. The people, whose treasures and blood have been so recklessly wasted in the quarrels of rulers, are already in favor of the plan, and may be expected ere-long to become clamorous for its general adoption. They begin to learn that rulers *can* settle their disputes without the butchery of their subjects, and will one day insist that they *shall*. That day is coming on apace; and, when it does come, no congress, no cabinet, no despot in Christendom will be able to withstand the united, inflexible demand of the whole people for the adjustment of national difficulties without the shedding of their blood.

We speak not at random; the popular will has already expressed itself on this point in ways not to be misunderstood. There is not in Christendom any intelligent community, scarce a solitary press, or respectable writer, that would not favor the adoption of our principle as a substitute for war. The question has been fairly submitted to some of them. A friend of peace in Massachusetts, some fifteen years after the fall of Napoleon, brought it before a large number of persons in several States, and readily obtained from men of every rank, profession and employment,—from farmers and mechanics, from merchants, lawyers and physicians, from judges, governors and Christian ministers of every name,—some thousands of signatures in favor of having all national disputes settled by amicable reference. The principle commends itself at once to every man; and, if fully understood, not one in a thousand of the people but would instantly prefer it to the blind and brutal arbitrament of the sword.

To this voice of the people some of our legislators have

already given a partial response. The late accomplished Legare, in his report from the Committee on Foreign Relations, says "they heartily concur in recommending a reference to a third power of all such controversies as can safely be confided to any tribunal unknown to the constitution of our own country." The legislature of Massachusetts had previously gone still further, and passed resolves, with perfect unanimity in the House, and with only two dissenting votes in the Senate, recommending not only "the practice of arbitration as an occasional substitute for war, but a Congress and Court of Nations as a permanent system to carry the principle into effect." In 1844, they adopted still stronger resolutions in favor of both these modes of reference; nor would any legislature, when fully informed on the subject, refuse their sanction to principles so obviously reasonable and salutary.

Long ago did the fathers of our Republic cherish similar desires for *some* preventive of war. Jefferson says, "nations, like individuals, stand towards each other only in the relations of natural right; and might they not, like them, be *peaceably* punished for violence and wrong?—Wonderful has been the progress of human improvement in other respects; let us hope that the law of nature will in time influence the proceedings of nations as well as of individuals, and that we shall at length be sensible, that *war is an instrument entirely inefficient towards redressing wrong, and multiplies instead of indemnifying losses.*" Franklin, who used so often to repeat his favorite maxim, "*there never was a good war, or a bad peace,*" said, "we daily make great improvements in natural philosophy; there is one I wish to see in moral—the discovery of a plan that would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats. When will human reason be sufficiently improved to see the advantage of this? When will men be convinced, that even successful wars become at length misfortunes to the victorious themselves?"

The time for which Franklin and Jefferson thus longed, is well nigh come. Already are the people in this country, if not in others, sufficiently prepared for such a measure as we propose; and, should rulers adopt it as a permanent substitute for war, we doubt not they would find themselves at once sustained and applauded by the popular voice. The general sentiment of Christendom would soon ratify the act as a glorious era in the history of the world; and countless millions yet unborn would bless the wisdom, patriotism and philanthropy which had thus stayed the stream of blood, and left nations at liberty to start anew upon a career of unexampled prosperity and happiness.

In favor of our scheme, we might marshal a host of arguments and motives. Should it utterly fail, there is no possibility of its doing any harm; but, should it succeed according to our hopes, how many evils would it prevent, how many blessings confer! What myriads of treasure, what rivers of blood, what numberless forms of crime and woe, would it save! How many wives would it rescue from widowhood; how many children from orphanage; how many families from ruin; how many provinces from plunder and devastation; how many cities from fire and sword; how many countries from all the nameless calamities of war! It would give the world a jubilee hitherto unknown. Free from the dangers of war, its teeming myriads could gird themselves, with new zeal and hope, to every enterprise for their own or the general good. Millions of warriors, no longer drones fed from the public crib, might return to the arts of peace, and contribute their share to the common weal. Population would swarm anew; agriculture would spread its golden harvests over hill and vale; the various mechanic arts would ply afresh their thousand forms of improved machinery; commerce without fear would unfurl its canvass on every sea, and barter its commodities in every port; learning, and philanthropy, and religion would pass without obstruction from land to land, and ere-long cover the globe with their blessings. Every interest of man calls aloud for such a policy. The prosperity of our own country, the welfare of Christendom, the happiness of the world; patriotism, humanity and religion; the great and glorious movements of the age; all, all demand it.

And what excuse can we plead for refusing a demand so reasonable? Is it impossible to bring nations into the measure? We have seen that the people are even now ready for it; and why should rulers object or hesitate? What interest or claim of theirs would it sacrifice or endanger? Would it cripple their power, or interfere with any of their rightful prerogatives? No; it would rather confirm them all, and ere-long endear itself both to rulers and subjects, as a most effectual safeguard of their respective rights and interests. War is the enemy, and peace the friend of them both.

But is arbitration inconsistent with the dignity of governments? If so, why and how? We deem it honorable for individuals to refer their disputes to competent, impartial umpires; and why should it be dishonorable for nations to do the same? When a dispute arises between two of our towns or counties, they appeal to the courts of the State, and when between two States, to the supreme court of the United States,

as their last resort, without a suspicion in either case of its being disreputable for them thus to settle their difficulties; and, as some of our States contain more inhabitants than many a nation both in ancient and modern times, we see not what should make it inconsistent with the dignity of the latter to adjust their differences in the same way. It is now shameful for individuals to fight like bull-dogs about any matters in dispute between them; and, when public opinion becomes what it should be, and is likely ere-long to be, it will be equally dishonorable, a deep, everlasting disgrace, for nations to butcher one another for the adjustment of their difficulties, or to employ for the purpose any other means than those of amicable agreement, or mutual reference.

‘But governments may be reluctant to *pledge* themselves in advance to this or any other mode of settling their disputes.’—Such a plea is more plausible than sound; for it would, if carried out, forbid *all* agreement between nations. Every treaty binds them in advance; and, if we discard such pledges, we must abjure all treaties; but, if nations may consistently pledge themselves on one point, they may on another, and agree beforehand to the settlement of their disputes by reference, just as well as they now agree to a reciprocity of trade, or a mutual surrender of fugitives from justice. The principle is the same; nor is there any more dishonor or inconsistency in one case than in the other. Nay, a pledge in advance is the very thing we need, to prevent a sudden rush to arms under the blind and reckless impulses of passion or prejudice. It is a dictate of common sense; and often do we find shrewd, sensible men forestalling the evils of litigation by mutual promise to adjust their affairs in the last resort by arbitration. It might not be safe to wait for the hour of trial; for nations it is even less so than for individuals; and hence we deem it especially desirable for them, while both parties are calm and candid, to agree beforehand upon the mode of settling whatever difficulties may arise between them.

But it may be said, ‘we can take care of ourselves, and decide our own controversies.’—Be it so; but *how* will you do it? Is *your* will to be law? Is no voice but your own to be heard in the case? A dispute implies at least two parties; and can one decide it without consulting the other? Would *you* concede to your antagonist such a claim? If not, you must both unite in settling the dispute; and, if you cannot agree between yourselves, no method remains but some form of reference.—Tell us not, you rely on your sword. Your antagonist may say the same; but will both, or either, be satisfied with the decision of such an arbiter? Can there be, in the murderous enginery of war, any logic likely to satisfy

each party?—*Nor does the sword ever settle such disputes*; for well has Vattel said, “it is an error, no less pernicious than absurd, to suppose that war is to *decide* controversies between nations.” The sword decides nothing; it leaves the points in dispute just where it found them, and merely makes the parties willing, after enduring its countless evils for years, to settle the whole controversy by negotiation, reference, or some other pacific expedient, generally without touching the original bone of contention.

Perhaps you plead the uncertainties of arbitration. But are these to be compared with the evils inseparable from war? Is the latter more certain in its results than the former? Should you draw the sword, can you after all be sure of gaining your point? Well does an able writer say, “We can scarcely anticipate any future national difference which it would not be more safe and prudent to submit to arbitration, than to the chances of war. However just may be our cause, however united our people, we cannot foresee the issue of the conflict, nor tell what new enemies we may be called to encounter, what sacrifices to bear, what concessions to make.”

But do you doubt whether such pledges of mutual reference would be kept by nations? “It is readily admitted,” says a worthy son of the immortal Jay, “that if the only guarantee for their faithful performance consisted in the virtue and integrity of statesmen and politicians, the confidence to be reposed in them would be but faint. Happily, however, we have a far stronger guarantee in national interest, and in public opinion. Every government that felt disposed to violate such a treaty, would be conscious that, by doing so, it would be sacrificing substantial interests for precarious advantages, exchanging the blessings of continued peace for the hazards and calamities of war. It would, indeed, require some very powerful temptation to induce a people to forego the peace, security, and exemptions from military burdens, conferred by such a treaty. Public opinion, moreover, would unite with self-interest in preserving these treaties inviolate. A government who for the purpose of avoiding war, had pledged its faith to abide by the award of umpires, would, by going to war in defiance of that award, and in palpable violation of its solemn engagements, shock the moral sense of mankind, and would probably disgust even its own subjects. At the present day all governments are more or less controlled by public opinion; and the progress of education, and the power of the press, enable every individual to sit in judgment on the conduct of his rulers. Such a war would be odious, because it would be felt by all to be unjust and dishonorable. It would also be reprobated by the umpires

whose decision would thus be contemned, and by every nation which had entered into a similar treaty. It ought, also, to be remembered, that each new treaty would tend to secure the observance of all the preceding ones, as each nation would feel that the value of its own treaty would greatly depend on the faithful performance of all the others; since, if one were violated with impunity, the power of the others to preserve peace would necessarily be weakened. In short, such a war would most probably be prevented, or speedily terminated by the interference of other powers interested in enforcing treaties for the preservation of peace.

“But surely it would be the height of folly to refuse entering into an advantageous treaty, because it might possibly be violated. What profitable commercial treaty was ever rejected on this ground? Even admitting the case supposed, our local situation, our population and resources, relieve us from all danger of a sudden and hostile attack. No future enemy of the United States will ever indulge the idea of conquest; and the only serious consequences we could apprehend from unexpected hostilities, would be the interruption of our commerce, while the nation, strengthened in all its resources by her past exemption from war, could immediately place itself in the attitude of defence.

“Dismissing, then, all idle fears that these treaties honestly contracted, and obviously conducive to the highest interests of the parties, would not be observed, let us contemplate the rich and splendid blessings they would confer on our country. Protected from hostile violence by a moral defence more powerful than all the armies and navies of Europe, we might, indeed, beat our swords into plough-shares, and our spears into pruning-hooks. The millions now expended on our military establishments, could be applied to objects directly ministering to human convenience and happiness. Our whole militia system, with its long train of vices, and its vexatious interruptions of labor, would be swept away. The arts of peace would alone be cultivated, and would yield comforts and enjoyments in a profusion and perfection of which mankind have witnessed no parallel. In the expressive language of Scripture, our citizens would each ‘sit under his own vine and under his own fig-tree, with none to make him afraid,’ and our peaceful and happy republic would be an example to all lands.

“It is impossible that a scene so bright and lovely, should not attract the admiration of the world. The extension of education in Europe, and the growing freedom of her institutions, are leading her people to think, and to express their thoughts. The governments of the eastern continent, what-

ever their form, are daily becoming more and more sensitive to popular opinion. The people, already restive under their burdens, would soon discover that those burdens would be reduced, if not wholly removed, by the adoption of such an American policy, and they would inquire why they were denied the blessings of peace. Before long, some minor states would commence the experiment, and the example be followed by others. In time, these treaties would be merged in more extensive alliances, and a greater number of umpires would be selected; *nor is it the vain hope of idle credulity, that at last a union might be formed of every Christian nation for guaranteeing the peace of Christendom, by establishing a tribunal for the adjustment of national differences, and by preventing all forcible resistance to its decrees. That such a court formed by a congress of nations in obedience to the general wish, would, next to Christianity, be the richest gift ever bestowed by heaven upon a suffering world, will scarcely be questioned by any who have impartially and candidly investigated the subject.*"

Here is high testimony to the importance and ultimate practicability of a CONGRESS OF NATIONS; a system based on the principle of mutual reference, and embodying that principle in a permanent and perfect form. Well does one of the most enlightened legislatures in Christendom, while "regarding *arbitration* as a practical and desirable substitute for war," still say, "that a *system* of adjudication, founded on a well-digested code of international laws, and administered by a standing court or board of mutual reference, is preferable to the occasional choice of umpires who act without the aid or restriction of established principles or rules."

PRINCE EUGENE.—"The thirst of renown sometimes insinuates into our councils, under the garb of *national honor*. It dwells on imaginary insults; it suggests harsh and abusive language; and people go on from one thing to another, till they put an end to the lives of half a million of men. A military man becomes so sick of bloody scenes in war, that in peace he is averse to re-commence them. I wish that the first minister who is called to decide on peace and war, had only seen actual service. What pains would he not take to seek, in mediation and compromise, the means of avoiding the effusion of so much blood!"

LORD BROUGHAM.—"My principles—I know not whether they agree with yours; they may be derided, they may be unfashionable; but I hope they are spreading far and wide—my principles are contained in the words which that great man, Lord Faulkland, used to express in secret, and which I

now express in public—*Peace, PEACE, PEACE.* I abominate war as unchristian. I hold it the greatest of human crimes. I deem it to include all others—violence, blood, rapine, fraud, every thing which can deform the character, alter the nature, and debase the name of man.”

LOUIS BONAPARTE.—“I have been as enthusiastic and joyful as any one else after victory; yet I confess that even then the sight of a field of battle not only struck me with horror, but even turned me sick. And now that I am advanced in life, I cannot understand any more than I could at fifteen years of age, how beings who call themselves reasonable, and who have so much foresight, can employ this short existence, not in loving and aiding each other, and passing through it as quietly as possible, but in striving, on the contrary, to destroy each other, as though time did not itself do this with sufficient rapidity. What I thought at fifteen years of age, I still think, that war, and the pain of death which society draws upon itself, are but organized barbarisms, an inheritance of the savage state.”

SENECA.—“Some deeds, which are considered villanous, while capable of being prevented, become honorable and glorious, when they rise above the control of law. The very things which, if men had done them in their private capacity, they would expiate with their lives, we extol when they perpetrate them in their regimentals. We punish murders and massacres committed among private persons; but what do we with wars, the glorious crime of murdering whole nations? Here avarice and cruelty know no bounds. Barbarities are authorized by decrees of senate, and votes of the people; and enormities, forbidden in private persons, are here enjoined by legislatures.”

FRANKLIN.—“After much occasion to consider the folly and mischiefs of a state of warfare, and the little or no advantage obtained even by those nations which have conducted it with the most success, I have been apt to think *there never has been, nor ever will be, any such thing as a GOOD WAR or a BAD PEACE.*—All wars are follies, very expensive and very mischievous ones. When will mankind be convinced of this, and agree to settle their differences by *arbitration*? Were they to do it by the cast of a die, it would be better than by fighting and destroying each other.”

CONGRESS OF NATIONS.*

SECTION 1.—ITS GENERAL PRINCIPLE.

THERE are only two ways of settling disputes either between individuals or communities—one by amicable agreement between the parties themselves, and the other by reference to a third party. In the intercourse of nations, the former is called negotiation; but the latter principle is applied either by the interposition of a friendly power as mediator, by reference to an umpire mutually chosen, or by some international tribunal resembling more or less our courts of law for the adjustment of difficulties between individuals. Mediation and arbitration are only different modes of reference; and a congress of nations, like our statute-books and civil courts, would merely embody both principles in a permanent form.

All writers on international law consider nations as moral agents subject to the same obligations as individuals. Here is the clue to all our plans and arguments for an international tribunal that shall, like our codes and courts of law for individuals, regulate their intercourse, and settle their disputes, vindicate their rights, and redress their wrongs, without the effusion of blood. We wish nations to treat each other as individuals are required to do, and to provide, in a code and court of nations, essentially the same system for an equitable, peaceful adjustment of their difficulties, that every civilized, well-regulated community has for its own members.

SECT. 2.—PLAN OF THE PROPOSED CONGRESS.

We shall not enter into the details of a plan for a congress of nations. We are not sticklers for any particular plan or name, but propose merely to incorporate the grand principle of reference in some standing tribunal for the peaceful adjustment of all international difficulties. How it shall be constituted or controlled; what shall be the number or qualifications of its members; in what way, or for what term, they shall be

* This synopsis is furnished mainly to prompt the reader to a more thorough investigation of the subject in the Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations, published by the American Peace Society; a volume of great ability and research, that well deserves to be carefully studied by every intelligent Christian, philanthropist and patriot.

chosen; whether the states associated shall each send an equal number of delegates, or, if not, on what principle the representation shall be regulated; what shall be the form of the tribunal, its rules of procedure, and the length or frequency of its sessions; all such points must be left for time and trial to determine, and would very easily be settled by men fully bent on carrying into effect any plan of the kind. A right purpose would soon find a feasible way; and, wishing merely to start and guide inquiry concerning such a tribunal, we will give only a few of its outlines.

1. Our plan includes two measures—one temporary, or occasional; the other settled and permanent. We would have first a congress of nations, a grand convention of delegates plenipotentiary from all parts of the civilized world that could be brought into the measure, to deliberate and agree upon a code of international law. We would have them invested like ambassadors with power, not to establish such a code, but merely to recommend its principles in detail to their respective governments for their adoption or rejection. The next measure would be the establishment of an international tribunal to interpret that code, and adjudicate whatever cases any nations in dispute might refer to their decision.

2. *The character of its members* would of course be pre-eminent, all master-spirits. The lawgiver of nations, the judge between cabinets and courts, kings and emperors, it would be the most august tribunal on earth; a seat in it might come ere-long to be regarded as the climax of human ambition; every state would desire to be represented by its purest and ablest men; and thus would it soon become, far more than the senate of Rome, or the Areopagus of Athens, the admiration of the world.

3. *Its jurisdiction* should extend only to matters connected with the intercourse of nations; and no case should come before it except by consent and choice of parties. Its decisions should be final, and preclude by mutual agreement all right of appealing to any further means of adjustment, except a new hearing, an amicable consultation, or reference to special umpires mutually chosen.

4. *Its decrees* should be merely advisory. Whether legislative or judicial, they should bind no party without their consent, and depend for success entirely on the high repute of the tribunal, on the obvious equity of its decisions, and the strong tide of public opinion in their favor. It should act as a diet of ambassadors to mature terms for the ratification of their respective constituents, or as a board of referees whose arbitrament the parties would still be at liberty to accept or reject.

5. *Its sanctions* should never include or involve a resort to the sword. Its decrees should be enforced only by moral or peaceful means. Penalties there might be; but they should all be pacific, and consist in the recoil of public opinion, in the withdrawal of friendly intercourse, or the curtailment of commercial and other privileges.

These outlines should be constantly borne in mind; for they obviate most of the objections hitherto brought against the project of a congress of nations, and would at least render such a tribunal perfectly harmless. If it did no good, it certainly could do no evil.

SECT. 3.—OBJECTS SOUGHT.

The measure we propose, aims at a variety of results, each highly important to the welfare of nations. It would seek mainly to preserve peace without the sword; but this purpose, however prominent and sublime, is only one among the multitude of its appropriate objects. It would be not only the peace-maker of nations, but the regulator of their entire intercourse, and the guardian of all their common interests. It would perform for the kingdoms associated no small part of the services that our own Congress does for the different members of our republic, and would thus have three distinct departments of duty—to settle and complete the law of nations, to adjust all disputes between them without an appeal to the sword, and direct their intercourse and combined energies in ways best adapted to the improvement, prosperity and happiness of the whole human race.

Few are aware how unsettled and imperfect is the present law of nations. We have in truth no such law; and what passes under the name, is of recent origin, and insufficient authority. This code, scarcely recognized at all by Greece or Rome, and little heeded or known in Christendom itself till after the Reformation, owes more to Grotius than to all other writers put together. He was its grand architect. He found it a chaos of clashing precedents and principles; but his learning, and his powers of analysis and combination, reduced its heterogeneous materials to a system which has won universal admiration, and exerted a benign influence over the intercourse of all civilized nations. Still, neither Grotius nor his commentators have furnished a code of international law. They possessed not the requisite authority, and have given us only a compilation of precedents, opinions and arguments. It is the work, not of legislators, but of scholars; no law-making power was ever concerned in enacting any of its statutes; and all its authority has resulted from the deference spontaneously paid to the genius, erudition and wisdom of its com-

plers. It is not law, but argument; not decrees, but rules; not a code, but a treatise; and the nations are at liberty, except from the force of custom and public opinion, to adopt or reject it as they please. A code of international law is still a desideratum; to supply this deficiency would be one of the first and highest duties of the tribunal we propose; and a mere glance at the subjects which would thus come before it, must suffice to show its necessity and vast importance.

Our limits will hardly allow us even to name these subjects—articles contraband of war;—protection of neutral commerce;—security of private property in war;—the rights and rules of blockade;—right of search and impressment;—protection of non-combatants;—property in navigable rivers;—the armed interposition of one nation in the domestic affairs of another;—right of interference with a nation at war;—passage of belligerents through a neutral territory;—surrender of fugitives from justice or oppression;—various meliorations of war;—measures for the entire extinction of the custom;—the settlement of national boundaries;—the regulation of cartels, and flags of truce;—the rules and rates of salvage;—the improvement and expansion of commerce;—the adoption of some common standard of weights and measures;—the interpretation of treaties by definite and established rules;—the naturalization of foreigners, and the transfer of their allegiance;—the determination of what shall be deemed the inalienable rights of man, such as life, liberty of conscience, and the use of his own powers;—the reconciliation of laws that come into conflict in the intercourse of nations, such as those respecting contracts, majority, evidence, and the law of domicile;—improvements in various parts of the international code;—measures in common for the relief of nations, as in the case of Greece, or the Cape de Verd Islands, and for the suppression or punishment of such practices as torture, infanticide, human sacrifices, the slave-trade, and similar outrages upon humanity.

This enumeration includes only a part of the subjects that would come before a congress of nations; but, for the sake of a brief illustration, just glance at a few of the topics we have mentioned. Take the question of blockade. The law of nations is very loose on this subject; the practice of belligerents has taken a still wider license; and the exigencies of the case call aloud for some means to prevent the repetition of such outrages. Some writers have questioned the propriety, under any circumstances, of blockade against neutrals; but, right or wrong, it ought certainly to be restrained from that immense sweep of mischief to which it has so often aspired in modern times. All the ports of a nation, most of

those skirting an entire continent, have, by a mere stroke of the pen, been closed against all neutral vessels. England once declared the whole coast of France to be under blockade, and Napoleon in return did the same to all England, without a fleet in either case sufficient to enforce a tenth part of the blockade. It was a mere scare-crow, a blockade only on paper, a shallow pretence for licensing a species of wholesale piracy; yet did an English admiral, in the late war between Great Britain and ourselves, declare our whole coast, two thousand miles in extent, under blockade, without a twentieth part of the ships requisite to enforce a blockade so extensive. The evils of such a practice must be immense; for the blockade of a single port might cripple the commerce of the world. The blockade of Canton by the English (1840) injured the United States alone at the rate of some ten million dollars in a single year.

Glance next at the *conflict of laws* in the intercourse of nations. A man is legally of age in the United States at twenty-one, but in France, we will suppose, not till twenty-five; and, consequently, should a Frenchman, only twenty-one years old, purchase goods in this country, he would not there be bound in law by the bargain, because deemed incapable of making such a contract. A man, making his will according to our laws, but not in accordance with those of Holland, would, by removing to that country, and dying there without any change in the instrument, render it null and void. In the same way might a marriage contract be nullified, and a man's whole family be disinherited and disgraced.

Look, also, at *articles contraband of war*. On this point the opinions of writers, the decisions of courts, and the practice of nations, have been extremely variant; and this diversity or collision has been a prolific source of irritation, disputes and wars. Each party condemns as contraband nearly every thing it pleases; and hence have come not only vast losses to commerce, but fierce and bloody conflicts. The door is open to almost interminable disputes; and the most trifling articles of trade have thus become bones of protracted contention between some of the first states in Christendom. Vessels have been condemned for having on board a barrel of tar, a keg of white lead, or even a single gross of buttons! and two considerable nations were actually plunged into a long and bloody war by the paltry question, whether a bar of iron is, or is not, contraband of war!!

There is, moreover, the question of *private property in war*. Such property on land is now secured in a time of war; but shall the same guaranty be extended to the ocean? Shall the law of nations spread its broad ægis over the property of non-

combatants in all circumstances? Shall privateering cease, and no more letters of marque and reprisal be allowed? Shall this practice of legalized piracy be utterly abolished, and commerce be left, alike in peace and war, to traverse every sea, and barter its commodities in every port, safe from the attacks of privateers or of public ships? A consummation incalculably important to the commerce and prosperity of the whole world. It would strip war of more than half its remaining pecuniary evils, and hasten its entire abolition.

We may allude, also, to *the right of interference with a nation at war*. May troops be raised in one country to fight against another, without violating the laws of neutrality? Was the part taken by some of our own citizens in the troubles of Canada, or in the war of Texas, an infringement of our amicable relations with England and Mexico? This practice has for ages prevailed more or less throughout Christendom. English officers have in India raised considerable armies avowedly on purpose to fight for pay; English admirals and American commodores have sold their services to other nations in the trade of human butchery; and whole regiments went, year after year, from England to engage in the civil broils of the Peninsula. There is scarce a country in Europe that has not occasionally furnished mercenaries for foreign wars.

There is, likewise, *the question of search and impressment*. This right, boldly claimed by some nations, is resolutely denied by others; and this collision of views and practices must be a fruitful source of strife. Here was the main cause of our last war with England; but the point, left at the close of that war just where it was before, still remains a magazine of mischief ready to be kindled by a spark into such an explosion as might convulse each nation to its centre, and cover its fairest fields with carnage and devastation.

But far more important would be *measures in concert for the abolition of the whole war-system*. This would be the grand aim of such a congress as we propose; but a result so mighty and glorious, can be reached only by a gradual process. A resort to arms should be allowed, if at all, in less than a tithe of its past or present cases; ample means should be provided even in such cases for a peaceful adjustment of the dispute; the conflict, if inevitable, should still be, like ancient wagers of battle, under the strictest regulations to check its tendencies to unnecessary mischief; and the grand provocative to war, found in standing armies, and other military preparations, should be removed, as far and as fast as possible, by a reduction of all such establishments through the civilized world. The alleged necessity of them is deplored by all as a most enormous evil; but no nation dares to reduce its own estab-

lishment without an assurance that all the rest will do the same. This difficulty would be met at once by a congress of nations; one of its earliest acts would probably be to propose a simultaneous, proportionate reduction of all standing armies; and this process could easily and speedily be carried so far as to leave a force barely sufficient for the preservation of internal order and peace.

This synoptical view will suffice to show the necessity of some measure to settle the law of nations as a means of preserving peace between them, of regulating their intercourse, and promoting a vast variety of common interests. The importance of our scheme in this as well as other respects, is readily admitted; but not a few doubt both its feasibility and its efficacy. These are the main points, and deserve a more minute and thorough discussion than our present limits will allow.

SECT. 4.—PRACTICABILITY OF THE MEASURE.

There is certainly no impossibility inherent in the nature of our project. Nations can, if they will, call such a convention, and establish such a tribunal as we propose; and the only question is, whether they can be induced to do so. Can they be made to see the vast importance of such a measure. its absolute necessity to their highest welfare? Can they be brought into the requisite degree of concert? Will they ever consent to come into such a confederacy?

A partial answer to these questions might be inferred from the obvious necessity of a congress of nations. The deficiencies of their present code can never be supplied, the evils now incident to their intercourse never be remedied, and their highest welfare, or their perfect safety secured, without some tribunal of the kind as their acknowledged lawgiver and judge. No treatises on the law of nations, no decisions of admiralty courts, no treaty stipulations, no rectitude, capacity or vigilance of rulers, no degree of intelligence or honesty among the people, no force of custom or public opinion, can ever meet all the exigencies of the case, and thus supersede the necessity of an international tribunal for the various and vastly important purposes already suggested. Can such a chasm in the wants of the world never be filled?

We find a bright augury for our cause in the general progress of society. The genius of universal improvement is abroad. The whole age is instinct with new life, and power, and impulse. The world is all awake and astir. Its intellect is on the stretch for new discoveries, inventions and improvements. *Onward* is the watchword; and every thing that has wings, is spreading them for a wider range, and a loftier

flight. Art, and science, and manufactures, and commerce, and agriculture, and every department of human effort, are catching the inspiration of the age. What enterprises of philanthropy! What plans of reform in education, society and government! How much has already been gained, how much more in certain prospect, for the welfare of mankind!—And will this spirit of the age never reach the great subject of international law and intercourse? While hewing down forests, and converting entire provinces into gardens; while intersecting almost every land with canals and railroads; while making a thousand applications of steam-power to manufactures and commerce; while remodelling entire systems of science and philosophy, of education and government; while combining high and low, rich and poor, old and young, in successful efforts to supply every hamlet in Christendom with the word of life, to send the gospel through the world, and to banish from the earth such evils as intemperance and the slave-trade; will such a spirit pause before accomplishing a task so needful as that of a code and court of nations?

Mark especially the increase of popular power. Knowledge is power; and this mighty engine is fast going into the hands of every man in Christendom, and giving him an influence over the destinies of the world. Even despots are beginning to educate their subjects, and legitimacy is sheltering itself under the wing of the schoolmaster. The press, like the sun in the heavens, is pouring a flood of light on the mass of common minds, and revealing to them their rights and prerogatives. The power of the world is passing into their hands; and ere-long will they wield it, not to gratify war-loving despots, but to subserve their own interests by preserving peace, and promoting agriculture, commerce and the arts. Cannot the people be brought to favor such a project as ours? Most certainly; and, if so, its ultimate success is beyond a doubt.

Observe still more especially the influence of popular opinion upon rulers. It is exerting a wider and stronger sway over their policy. Even now does it silently control them, and is daily becoming more and more powerful. It is mightier than monarchs or warriors. No throne, no army, no fortress can long stand before it. Napoleon, in the zenith of his power, quailed before the pen of a British reviewer; and the press, as the chief organ of public sentiment, will ere-long give law even to rulers. Here is the secret of the people's power; and it is forcing the high and mighty to respect them. They are coming to be courted even by emperors and autocrats as the real depositaries of power; their wishes, perhaps not in form, but in fact, are now consulted; and no cabinet in Christendom dares to contravene a general and decided ex-

pression of their will. Monarchy, aristocracy, all the cherished forms of legitimacy, may still remain; but they will be, in the spirit of our own government, only different modes of serving the people, whose fiat must one day become law to the whole civilized world. Give us the people; and we are sure, sooner or later, of our cause.

But mark, also, the special direction of the popular mind. It is busy with what most immediately concerns its own interests. It is looking into government, detecting its hoary abuses, and calling aloud for reform. It is forcing old opinions, usages and institutions through the ordeal of its own scrutiny and judgment. Like Samson grasping the pillars of Gaza, it is laying its brawny hands on the great principles of government, and demanding reform or demolition. One or the other *must* come; and the final result of this popular interference with the government of states, and the intercourse of nations, will doubtless facilitate the establishment of some international tribunal as the guardian of popular rights, and promoter of the general weal.

Another favorable circumstance is the establishment of free, representative governments. Here we see the result of the people's voice demanding that their rights shall be respected, and their interests faithfully consulted. During the last half century, there have been, besides some abortive attempts, more than eighty new written Constitutions established in Europe and America; and about one hundred millions of people are now ruled by them. Most of these cases recognize the representative principle; a principle which, as carried into practice in England and France, but especially in the republics on this continent, may be regarded as the grand political discovery and characteristic of these later times. When a little more extended, and brought fully into action, it will doubtless operate a change in the international policy of the world highly favorable to the welfare of the people. Their representatives, acquainted with their wishes, and sympathizing in their wants, sufferings and prejudices, will of course plead for their interests. The policy of nations has hitherto been essentially belligerent; but popular representation will be adverse to this policy, and propitious to the great objects sought by a congress of nations. The mass of mankind, so far from being disposed to abet those ruinous contests which have blighted and cursed the earth for so many ages, will be found, when left to themselves, to be decidedly in favor of a pacific policy; and the principle of representation, when fully developed, cannot fail to give vast expansion and influence to their wishes in this respect.

Another strong omen of good, then, is found in the changes

of general opinion concerning war. These changes have been rapid and great. Once the right of war was questioned by few, if any; now its lawfulness is boldly denied by large and growing numbers. Once philosophers commended it, statesmen applauded it, and men of letters made it the chief theme of their eulogies; now they all unite in execrating it as a mass of abominations and woes, to be tolerated only as a dire necessity. Once it was deemed the pastime of master-spirits, the sole pathway to glory; now it is fast coming to be held in universal contempt and abhorrence as fit only for brutes or fiends. Once it formed the main business of nations; now it is professedly their chief aim to avoid it. Once it was their only theatre of competition; now the scene is changed to manufactures, commerce, and other sources of improvement and comfort, wealth and power. Public opinion on this subject is rapidly changing in many other respects. The time-hallowed delusions of war are vanishing; its strange and guilty spell is losing its hold of five thousand years upon the popular mind; men begin to reflect on its incalculable waste of blood and treasure, on the fearful accumulation of its crimes and its woes; its evils will ere-long tell on the ballot-box to the sore dismay of all war-making aspirants after place and power; and, if the custom *can* be superseded, the people will soon demand that it *shall* be, and will thus hasten the adoption of some scheme like the one we propose, that shall put an end to its horrors forever.

War is at length rallying all classes against it as their common foe. Once the high favored it, while the lower and middling classes, on whom its evils chiefly fell, had few means of opposition or remonstrance. The principle of representation has given to the latter the power of speech; this power has called into exercise that of inquiry, reflection and reason; and now a voice, unheard before, has come up, as from "the vasty deep," loud and terrible, that war shall be no more. Not merely the suffering millions, its chief victims, but men of wealth, and learning, and high authority, are beginning to brand with infamy this wholesale destroyer of human interests. The open and avowed advocates of peace in the various classes of society, have increased an hundred-fold; and the increase of boldness, intellectual power, and consistent zeal, has corresponded to the augmentation of numbers. And why should we not expect it to be thus, when any considerable body of men is brought to reflect on the subject? What source of misery, which is under the direction and control of man himself, can be compared to this? When some terrible disease advances from country to country, when the seeds of the pestilence are scattered abroad by the Almighty,

it becomes us to bow in submission, and hide ourselves in the dust before that Holy Being who knows our ill deserts, and whose secret ways are inscrutable to man. But in the devastations of war, it is not an Almighty Being whose prerogatives we are not at liberty to question, but one of the feeble, erring creatures of his footstool, that seizes the burning thunderbolt, and scatters it through the world. And what renders the act the more astonishing, it is not the mere impulse of an unforeseen phrenzy, the ebullition of a momentary madness, but a matter of calculation, and cool reasoning, carried on in the very face of heaven, and in defiance of the divine precept. *thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*

It is well ordered in Providence, however, that criminal principles and practices do not fail to expose themselves, and ultimately to work their own cure. The cries of widows and orphans had been heard from every quarter, mingling on every breeze; but they were too little regarded. The symptoms were at last observed of a great political commotion; the clouds came; the thunders muttered; the lightnings gleamed; there was a quaking and rocking of the earth, and then there suddenly opened the grand volcano of the French Revolution of 1790, to the wonder and bountiful edification of all the advocates of war. At that dreadful period there were certain experiments, which had a wonderful effect in enlightening the sentiments of some classes of people. It was found that the glittering sword of war could strike upward, as well as downward; among the high and the mighty, as well as among the poor and powerless peasants. The scythe fell upon the neck of princes; those, who had been clothed in purple and fine linen, were arrayed in beggar's rags, and ate their crumbs in a dungeon; the innocent children died with the guilty fathers; delicate women, the delight of their friends, and the ruling star of palaces, were smitten by the hand of the destroyer, and bowed their heads in blood. And then were beheld the hundred guillotines, the horrid invention of the fusillades, the drownings in the Loire, the dreadful devastations of La Vendee, the gathering of armies on the plains of Italy, the bridge of Lodi, and the battle of Marengo. These were the beginnings of terrors, the opening of the incipient seal; but the end was not yet. For twenty successive years the apocalypse of the book of war opened itself from one end of Europe to the other, and on the ocean as well as on the land, in the thunders and fires which at once shook, and enlightened, and awed the world, of the Nile and Trafalgar, of Jena and Austerlitz, together with the dashing of throne against throne, and of nation against nation. At length the "white horse of death" was seen taking his way through the

centre of Europe, and power was given to him to kill with the sword and with hunger; and he was followed by "the beasts of the earth," an army of five hundred thousand soldiers; and they were all offered up as victims on the frozen fields of Russia; and the Kremlin, and the ancient and mighty city of Moscow were burnt upon their funeral pyre. The earth shook to its centre; a howling and a lamentation went up to heaven; the living ate the dead, and then fed upon their own flesh, and then went mad; the wolves and the vultures held their carnival, while Rachel wept for her children, and would not be comforted. Nevertheless the sickle of the destroyer was again thrust among the clusters; and the wine-press of war was trodden at Dresden, and Leipsic, and Waterloo, till the blood "came out of the wine-press, even to the horse-bridles."

The increased intercourse of nations, and a consequent intermingling of their interests and sympathies, are tending strongly to such an international tribunal as we propose. It has heretofore been the policy of nations to be as independent of each other as possible, and to regard the injury of a neighbor as a benefit to themselves; but they are fast learning, that God made nations, like individuals in a family, like the cluster of families in a town, or the multitude of towns constituting a state, for a system of reciprocal dependence, and so interwoven their interests as to render the prosperity of one tributary to that of all the rest. Hence the wonderful impulse given to the commerce, population and general thrift of Christendom. This happy state of things war would interrupt; and its evils, felt not only on the tax-book of the belligerent, but in the workshops and counting-rooms of the neutral, are combining against it nearly all the pecuniary interests of the world.

Observe, also, the growing disposition of Christendom to employ pacific expedients for the adjustment of national disputes. These substitutes,—negotiation, arbitration and mediation,—are fast coming to supersede entirely the actual use of the sword. There seems to be a general, established concert for avoiding war by such means. Holland and Belgium referred their difficulties to England and France; points in dispute between Great Britain and ourselves were submitted first to Russia, and next to Holland; the United States and Mexico called on the king of Prussia to act as their umpire; and the five powers of Europe, extending their benevolence beyond the limits of Christendom, offered to mediate between the Pacha of Egypt, and the Grand Sultan. Here are the elements, all the essential principles, of the tribunal we propose; and they must pave the way, sooner or later, for its actual establishment. There is even now a strong and grow-

ing predisposition in favor of such a scheme. It is already a favorite. Every body hails the proposal as a magnificent conception; even the skeptic deems it a glorious dream of philanthropy; and all profess themselves anxious to see it realized, if it can be, in the permanent peace and amity of the civilized world. The current of the age is setting towards it in a gulf-stream. The pursuits, the habits, the sympathies of nearly all Christendom encourage it, invite it, demand it; nor can the general mind ever be put to rest without it. Come it must; and the only question is, how soon?

Mark, also, the degree of actual preparation for such a tribunal. The age even now is well nigh ripe for it. The intercourse of civilized nations by travel and commerce, by enterprises of benevolence, and interchanges of art, and science, and literature, has woven their sympathies, habits and interests into the web of a vast and glorious brotherhood. They form one community, one great family. Christendom has already become, in many important respects, a confederacy of nations; and, sooner or later, they must have a common tribunal to regulate their intercourse without the sword, and to watch over their common interests. They deeply need it now; and they might come at once under its supervision with little or no violence to their present habits; for the frequent resort of late to mediation, arbitration, and other pacific expedients for the adjustment of their difficulties, has paved the way for the speedy establishment of a congress embracing all Christendom.

Review, likewise, the history of international law and intercourse. Trace its progress from the earliest times through Egyptians and Persians, through Greeks and Romans, through the chaos of the dark ages, through the confederacies, and leagues, and diplomacies of later periods, down to the arbitrations and congresses of the last century or two; and you will find ourselves drifted already to the very brink of this final improvement in the law of nations. Only one breeze more, and we reach the port.

To the same conclusion would a review of consolidated governments lead us. If we go back to patriarchal ages, and observe how families expanded into tribes, how tribes were formed into petty states like the twelve hundred in ancient Italy, how such states were at length combined into large kingdoms like those of modern Europe, we shall see that only one step more in this process of fifty centuries is required for a general confederacy of Christendom under a common congress and court. Such a result, however sublime and momentous, would be only the extension of an old and well-established principle. It would merely be pushing the car of

improvement a little farther on the same track of ages. It would only do for large communities or states what has been done a thousand times over for smaller ones.

All the materials, indeed, are ready for the edifice. We need no new principles; only an application of those which have been for ages at work in every well-regulated government on earth. Trace the gradations of civil courts from the justice's bench through the court of common pleas, and the supreme court of a state, up to the judiciary of the United States; and you will perceive that we can go no farther without reaching a high court of nations. The whole art of government must either stop here forever, or come, sooner or later, to this glorious result, this climax of political improvement.

SECT. 5.—EFFICACY OF THE MEASURE.

The measure we recommend, might well be expected to accomplish, in a good degree, *all* the objects heretofore specified; but we shall now consider merely its influence in preserving peace, and endeavor to prove, both from history, and the nature of the case, its probable efficacy for such a purpose.

Listen, then, to *the teachings of history*. The experiment has already been made in a variety of ancient and modern cases; and the general result justifies the belief, that such a tribunal as we propose, would eventually put an end forever to the wars of Christendom. The Amphictyonic Council of Greece, composed of delegates from each of its states, and empowered to examine and decide all their disputes, did much to preserve peace between them for a long series of ages; and, though unable, in times so barbarous and warlike, to keep the sword continually in its scabbard, still it must have saved rivers of blood. The Achæan League did the same, and was often solicited, even by foreign nations, to act as the arbiter of their disputes. We might also quote almost every government in Europe as a virtual illustration of this principle; for Austria, France, Great Britain, all the leading states of Christendom, kept for the most part in domestic peace for centuries, are each a cluster of small tribes or baronies so long associated under one head as to have lost in some cases their original distinctions as independent principalities. Austria and Great Britain are obvious, striking examples; and the fact that the three kingdoms of the latter, and the numerous principalities of the former, are preserved in amity by the general government common to them all, goes far to prove the efficacy of our principle. This principle has likewise kept peace between our own states for more than

sixty years, (1844,) and between the confederated cantons of Switzerland for more than five centuries. Even the occasional congresses or conferences, so frequently held during the last two centuries between the leading powers of Europe as to average one every four years, have seldom failed either to preserve or restore peace. Not that they have always been completely successful; but they have fully evinced the efficacy of the principle, and added strong confirmation to the hope of an eventual confederacy of all Christendom under a congress or court that shall keep its members in constant and perpetual peace. If experiments so partial, and under circumstances comparatively so unfavorable, have still accomplished so much even for pagan or half-christianized nations, what may we not expect from a tribunal perfect as the highest wisdom of modern times can make it, cheerfully recognized by the whole civilized world, and enforced by a strong, universal, omnipresent public opinion?

Look at *the nature of the case*. Such a tribunal would either produce or imply a state of public sentiment strongly favorable to the peaceful adjustment of all difficulties between nations. There would be a general, most decided aversion to the sword; a feeling like that which made Franklin say, *there never was a good war, or a bad peace*; a willingness, a full determination to preserve peace at almost any sacrifice short of national destruction or dismemberment. Would not such sentiments alone, if universally prevalent, well nigh suffice to keep all Christendom in perpetual friendship and peace?

But a congress would remove the grand incentives to war. It would crush, or chain, or neutralize the war-spirit. It would make the warrior's business odious like that of the hangman, and render it the chief glory of rulers, not to wage successful war, but to preserve unbroken, universal peace. It would give a new direction to the energies of all Christendom, and turn the ambition of princes and statesmen into peaceful channels. It would sweep away the grand nurseries of war by superseding all war-establishments. It would eventually convert standing armies into handfuls of police-men, and leave war-ships to rot, arsenals to moulder, and fortifications to crumble into ruins. Here are the chief combustibles of war; and, when these are all removed, it will be well nigh impossible to kindle its fires on any emergency.

But such a congress would obviate nearly all the occasions of war. These are now found in points of national honor;—in sudden bursts of passion among rulers;—in occasional outrages of officers or citizens;—in clashing views, customs or interests;—in temporary misconceptions and animosities;—in claims for redress denied, or unduly delayed;—in mutual

jealousies, suspicions and fears. Most of these difficulties, such a tribunal would either prevent, or easily settle; and for the rest, it would provide an antidote sufficient to supersede ninety-nine wars in a hundred.

Nay; would not this grand expedient suffice for the worst emergency possible to such a state of Christendom? It would make nations, just like the members of a Christian church, cease to think of settling their disputes by arms. They could never draw the sword at the outset; and the long delay occasioned by an appeal to the congress, and by subsequent preparations for conflict, would give ample time for passion to cool, and reason to gain such an ascendancy as she seldom, if ever, had in any declaration of war by men. If the parties disliked the first decision, they might claim repeated hearings; and every new trial would create new obstructions in the way of appealing to the sword. Such an appeal would draw down upon them universal displeasure; they might be put, as a species of temporary outlaws, under the ban of all Christendom, and excluded from both political and commercial intercourse; and such measures, enforced by the high authority of a court representing all civilized nations, and venerated by the whole world for its integrity and wisdom, could hardly fail to hold back the most reckless from bloodshed.

SECT. 6.—OBJECTIONS.

1. *Public opinion is not yet ripe for such a measure.*—Then, let us make it so. It is in some degree prepared even now for the measure; and soon might the wise and good, by the right use of means within their reach, form through Christendom such a public sentiment as would ere-long secure this or some other permanent substitute for war. Public opinion is certainly ripe enough to start in earnest the train of efforts indispensable to the final accomplishment of our object.

2. *We have other means now in use sufficient for the preservation of peace.*—True, they *might* suffice; but they do not in fact supersede war. So might similar means suffice for the adjustment of all disputes between individuals; but we still deem it expedient, if not necessary, to have our codes and courts of law. In spite of all methods now in use, the war-system still continues, and we wish to introduce a substitute that shall actually supersede it entirely and forever.

3. *Christendom is unwilling to give up the war-system.*—If rulers are, the people are not; and the results of the French Revolution made even the sturdiest despots anxious for peace as their only security. All Europe, crushed beneath the

enormous burdens of war, is even now panting for release from its evils, and would hail with joy any effectual antidote or remedy.

4. *But nations would shrink from the expense.*—We cannot believe it; such a tribunal would cost scarcely a thousandth part of what the war-system does even in peace. England spent for war an average of more than one million of dollars every day for twenty years, and the war expenses of all Christendom cannot be less even in peace than two or three millions a day; while a congress of one hundred members, even with a salary for each equal to that of our own president, would cost only two millions and a half, and a single million would support a congress of fifty members at a yearly compensation of \$20,000 each, or nearly sixty dollars a day for every member.

5. *But diversities of language, and religion, and manners, and government, and pursuits, would surely defeat the project.*—None of these would oppose insuperable or very serious impediments to the slight degree of union required in such a confederacy. Not a few of them were overcome in the formation of our own general government; and they were all found in the Diet of Switzerland, where each of the twenty-two cantons is internally as independent as any nation on earth, where the form of government varies from the purest democracy to the stiffest aristocracy, and where the people differ in language, manners and religion.

6. *But such a tribunal would be dangerous.*—To whom or what? Would it trample on the weak? No; it would have no power for such a purpose; but its first care would be to guard them against encroachment and abuse. Would it endanger liberty and popular governments? Called into existence by their voice, it would become of course a servant to their wishes, and a guardian of their rights and interests. Would it interfere with the domestic concerns of states? It would itself be the surest check upon such interference. Would it become a conclave of political intrigue, and serve only to embroil the nations? History refutes the charge; and the supposition is just as absurd as it would be to expect that ambassadors appointed to negotiate peace, would only foment new wars. Would it become a tool in the hands of some future Alexander or Napoleon to subjugate all Christendom? Such monsters are the offspring only of war; and the peaceful policy inseparable from a congress of nations, would put an end forever to the whole brood. By what process, then, could such a tribunal be thus perverted? With no fleets or armies at their command, with no offices of emolument or honor to bestow, with no right to touch any subject

not submitted to them by their constituents, how could such a body become an engine of conquest, tyranny and blood?

7. *Composed chiefly of representatives from monarchies, such a tribunal would, at all events, be unfriendly, if not dangerous, to republican governments.*—We see not how it could be; for it would have no power to interfere with the internal affairs of *any* government, or to sit in judgment on any dispute not voluntarily referred to it by the parties. No nation would be bound by any of its decisions without their own consent; and we might as well say, that *treaties* with monarchies, and still more such references as we ourselves have repeatedly made to them, must endanger the freedom of our institutions. Such a court, guided by a common code, and responsible to the whole world for the rectitude of their adjudications, could not be half so dangerous as those kings and autocrats whom we have occasionally selected as umpires. Yet who has ever dreamed of the least danger to our government from such references?

8. *But the congress, after all, would be powerless.*—Why? Because it would wear no crown, wield no sword, hold no purse? Such logic mistakes the age. Opinion is now the mistress of the world. Her voice could light or quench the fires of a thousand battle-fields. It changed the government of France in a day, and reformed the parliament of England without bloodshed. It made us free. It once marshalled all Europe in the crusades. It called up the demon-spirits of the French Revolution, and sent hurricane after hurricane of war howling in wrath over the fairest portions of Christendom. All this it has done; and, when embodied in the grand Areopagus of the world, would it then be powerless?

SECT. 7.—MEANS REQUISITE FOR SUCH A MEASURE.

Such a tribunal will of course be the work of time and extended concert. The train is already started; but we must pass through a long process to the final consummation. The frequency of national intercourse, and the peaceful methods of negotiation, and of reference in its various forms, for the settlement of national disputes, are rapidly preparing the way for such a result, but can never reach it without the use of special, appropriate means.

We must first rouse the people to demand some such expedient. Rulers *can* find one, if they *will*; but they never will, till driven to it by a voice from the people like that of many waters. We must spread before the community a flood of light on this subject; we must paint before them, in burning colors, the guilt and the evils of war; we must show them how easily those at the helm of government could avoid it, if

they would ; and we must make them resolve not to bear this load of gratuitous mischief and misery any longer, but insist on some device for the permanent peace of Christendom.

Thus roused, let millions pour their united voices upon the ear of parliaments, congresses and cabinets, till statesmen shall be constrained to take hold of the work in earnest, and push it onward to its full consummation. Let some Burke or Brougham, some Franklin or Jefferson, grasp the grand idea, and hold it up before his own nation, till it comes, like the sun in the firmament, to fill the whole hemisphere of their vision ; let the government of England, France or America adopt the project as its own, and commission some of its first minds to press it upon the attention of other governments ; let the process go on, till a call, loud as the longings of a crushed and bleeding world for relief from the woes of war, shall come forth to summon the wisdom of all Christendom to a consultation of peace, amity and love. This done, the result would be certain ; for the smaller states would rush for safety to the sheltering wings of such a confederacy, nor would any Christian or civilized nation long stand aloof, and brave the scorn of a world.

The work is already begun ; and we would urge every lover of his kind or his country to lend it his aid. Petitions have already been presented to the British Parliament ; and the attention of our own Congress, and several legislatures, has been repeatedly called to the subject. The project is now before the nation and the world with fair omens of success ; and fain would we call upon all ministers of peace, upon all churches of the Prince of Peace, upon all teachers in Christian seminaries of learning, upon all editors as the lawgivers or guardians of public opinion, upon all persons in place and power, upon every one that has a tongue, a pen or a purse for any cause of philanthropy, to co-operate in an enterprise fraught with so many blessings to mankind through all coming time.

SECT. 8.—SKETCH OF PAST ATTEMPTS FOR SOMETHING LIKE AN INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL.

History furnishes no exact or adequate model of what we propose. Something more or less like it, has been attempted under the name of Councils or Leagues, Diets or Congresses ; but none of them included what we deem most essential to our scheme, while they all relied on the sword for the accomplishment of their purpose. Our plan, excluding the chief causes of their failure, obviates nearly all the objections urged against those attempts, of which we will briefly sketch the most important.

1. *The Amphictyonic Council*, embracing at first twelve, and finally thirty-one states or cities, was established 1497 B. C. Rollin says, "it was, in a manner, the holding of a general assembly of the Grecian States. Its establishment is attributed to Amphictyon, king of Athens, whose chief aim was to unite in amity the several States of Greece, and thus oblige them to undertake the defence of each other, and be mutually vigilant for the tranquillity and happiness of their country. Each city sent two deputies, and had two votes in the Council. *They had full power to discuss all differences which might arise between the Amphictyonic cities.*" "They decided," says Rees, "all public differences and disputes between any of the cities of Greece; and their determinations were received with the greatest veneration, and were ever held sacred and inviolable." The Council, though not always successful, did much to preserve peace among its members, and continued in spite of its own degeneracy, and the intrigues of Philip of Macedon, more than fifteen centuries!

2. *The Achaean League*, formed at a very early period, and renewed in 284 B. C., continued one hundred and thirty-four years longer. "Although each city," says Rees, "was independent of the others, yet they formed one body; and so great was their reputation for justice and probity, that the Greek cities of Italy referred their disputes to their arbitration. The Lacedæmonians and Thebans also referred to them an interesting matter of dissension between themselves. Having long retained their liberty, they ceased not to assemble when the necessity of public deliberation required it, and even when the rest of Greece was threatened with war and pestilence."

3. Passing over other confederacies of antiquity, we come down to the *Hanseatic League*, begun in the twelfth century, and completed near the middle of the thirteenth. It held every ten years an extraordinary general assembly to renew their league, expel refractory members, and admit new ones. This League, commenced between Lubec and Hamburgh, comprised at one time, nearly eighty cities; and in 1730 its regular number was sixty-three, besides forty-four towns considered as allies. *A system of international laws was adopted in their general assemblies.* While pursuing a pacific policy, they flourished beyond all precedent; but, on becoming so rich, powerful and ambitious as to raise fleets and armies, they provoked the jealousy of other powers, and were eventually reduced to three cities—Lubec, Hamburgh and Bremen.

4. *The Helvetic Union* began so long ago as 1308, and has sufficed to preserve peace among its members during the greater part of five centuries. "The code of public law between the combined republics of Switzerland," says Rees, "is

founded on the treaty of Sempach, in 1393, on the Convention of Stantz, and the treaty of peace in 1712 at Arau between the Protestant and Catholic cantons. From these several treaties, it appears, that the Helvetic Union is a perpetual defensive alliance between independent powers, to protect each other by their united force against all foreign enemies. Another essential object is, *to preserve general peace and good order*, for which purpose it is covenanted, that *all public dissensions shall finally be settled between the parties in an amicable manner; and, with this view, particular judges and arbitrators are appointed with power to compose the dissensions which may arise.* To this is added a reciprocal guarantee of their respective forms of government. No separate engagement of the cantons can be valid, if it be inconsistent with the fundamental articles of this general union; but, with these exceptions, the combined states are independent of each other, and may perform every act of absolute sovereignty. The ordinary meeting of the general diet is annually in January; and each canton sends as many deputies as it thinks proper."

"No diversities of character and state," says another writer, "are greater than those which exist in this confederation. It comprises people of three distinct nations, speaking three of the prominent languages of Europe;—the German in the east, the French in the west, and the Italian in the south-east. They are divided into twenty-two independent states, each of which has a dress and manners in some degree peculiar to itself, and a dialect often scarcely intelligible to those around it. The forms of government vary from the purest democracy, in which every male above the age of seventeen is a member of the body which makes the laws, to the most rigorous aristocracy, in which the offices are confined almost entirely to patrician families. *Their diet is a mere convention of ambassadors who merely treat with each other according to the strict tenor of their instructions, and can vote for no law without the consent of the government which sends them.*"

5. *The Grand Scheme of Henry IV.*, called by the French their *Good King*, was started in 1601. Whether his real aim was to defend Christendom against Mohammedans, or, more probably, to humble the house of Austria, he proposed to divide Europe into fifteen states,—six hereditary monarchies, five elective monarchies, and four republics,—all of which he would fain have united in one grand confederacy, pledged with the sword to preserve peace among its members, and to resist all foreign invasion. Henry gained the consent of Holland, Hesse Cassel, Anhalt, Hungary, Bohemia, Lower Austria, several towns and provinces in Germany, the republic of Switzerland, and Queen Elizabeth of England; but the dag-

ger of the assassin Ravillac put an end in 1610 to the life of Henry, and to his great scheme.

Since the death of Henry IV., no government has agitated the question of a permanent international congress. The Holy Alliance of 1815 did not aim at any such result; and, though the allied sovereigns did well in "declaring their unalterable determination to take for the rule of their conduct alike in the administration of their respective states, and in their political relations with other governments, the precepts of our holy religion, which, far from being applicable only to private life, ought on the contrary to influence directly the resolves of princes, and guide all their measures, as being the only means of consolidating human institutions, and remedying their imperfections," yet the sudden death, if not the jealousy, of Alexander, the leader in the movement, prevented any serious benefit from it to the world. It was in itself a noble avowal; and well did Ex-President Adams say to the late William Ladd, "the Holy Alliance was itself a tribute from the mightiest men of the European world to the purity of your principles, and the practicability of your system for the general preservation of peace."

Nor can we regard the Congress of Panama (1826) as nearly resembling our scheme. It was a grand movement; and its failure was owing not so much to the nature of its objects, as to the character of the people who called it, to the obscure and inconvenient place where it was convened, and still more to its chief promoter, Bolivar, "the Napoleon of this hemisphere," as John Quincy Adams called him, "who had no more honest regard for peace or human liberty than had his prototype in Europe."

The movement of Henry IV. has served to keep before Christendom, the idea of *some* common tribunal for the great brotherhood of nations. In 1693 William Penn wrote an essay, in which he says of Henry's scheme, "his example tells us that *it is fit to be done*; Sir William Temple's History of the United Provinces shows, by a surpassing instance, that *it may be done*; and Europe, by her incomparable miseries, that *it ought to be done*." Saint Pierre, who died in 1743, published on the same subject, and by his zeal provoked from Voltaire the petulant remark, that "he was forever insisting on the project of a perpetual peace, and of a sort of parliament of Europe, which he called the European Diet." Rousseau, charmed with the scheme, reviewed it, and lent to it all the power and fascination of his genius. We are not aware that any other men of note took up the subject before the rise of peace societies near the downfall of Napoleon.

From the first, however, have these societies aimed at a

congress of nations as the perfection of all expedients for the adjustment of national disputes without the sword. The London Society early said, that "a court of nations is the end of the operations of the peace societies." The American Society from its origin took so deep an interest in the subject as to publish, soon after its organization, the first essay in modern times on a congress of nations, from the pen of the late William Ladd, and, in 1840, a large and splendid volume of Essays for which a premium of one thousand dollars had been offered, and more than forty competitors had contended for the prize. The First General Peace Convention (1843) in London recommended "A CONGRESS OF NATIONS to settle and perfect the code of international law, and a HIGH COURT OF NATIONS to interpret and apply that law for the settlement of all national disputes."

Before the year 1830, a devoted friend of peace in Boston had circulated a document recommending "the reference of all international disputes to a Court of Nations," and readily obtained from individuals of every rank and profession, the signature of nine in ten of those to whom he presented it. The Legislature of Massachusetts, in the year 1837, recommended "a Congress or Court of Nations as at present the best practical method by which disputes between nations can be adjusted, and an appeal to arms avoided;" and requested "the Executive of the United States to open a negotiation with other governments with a view to effect so important an arrangement." In 1838 the same legislature, with perfect unanimity in the House, and only two dissenting votes in the Senate, passed resolves still more explicit, in favor of "a Congress of Nations for the purpose of framing a code of international law, and establishing a high court of arbitration for the settlement of controversies between nations;" and desired "the Governor to transmit a copy to the President of the United States, and to the Executive of each State, to be communicated to their respective Legislatures, inviting their co-operation."

While the subject was thus pending in Massachusetts, friends of peace in several states petitioned Congress in 1837 to settle by mutual reference our difficulties with Mexico, and also to incorporate the same principle in a Congress of Nations as a permanent substitute for war. The subject was referred; and the committee in their report acknowledged, "that the union of all nations in a state of peace under the restraints and protection of law, is the ideal perfection of civil society; that they concurred fully in the benevolent object of the memorialists, and believed there is a visible tendency in the spirit and institutions of the age towards the practical accomplishment of it at some future period; that they heartily

agree in recommending a reference to a third power of all such controversies as can safely be confided to any tribunal unknown to the constitution of our country; and that such a practice will be followed by other powers, and will soon grow up into the customary law of civilized nations."

Such a response might well encourage the friends of peace to continue their petitions. It is still before Congress; and, in 1844, the Legislature of Massachusetts, in reply to a single petitioner, took the noblest stand ever yet taken in favor of this scheme. After representing war as "among the chief destroyers of human happiness," and saying that, "if any method can be devised for the settlement of national controversies without the evils of war, the adoption of that method is 'a consummation devoutly to be wished,'" they state, that "the peace societies formed in this country and in Europe within the last twenty-eight years, and enrolling some of the purest and most gifted minds in either hemisphere, have poured the light of reason and revelation upon the practice of war, until multitudes have come to the conclusion, that a custom so fraught with evil, and so hostile to the first principles of religion, *cannot be necessary*. It begins to be extensively acknowledged, that *individuals* and *communities* are subject to the same divine authority, and are bound to conduct their affairs, and regulate their mutual intercourse on the same principles; and therefore, that legal adjudication should take the place of physical force, for the maintenance of national rights and interests, as it has already with regard to those of a personal and domestic nature."

In the spirit of these suggestions, the Legislature, with great unanimity, passed the following resolves:—

1. That we regard *arbitration* as a practical and desirable substitute for war, in the adjustment of international differences.

2. That a *system* of adjudication, founded on a well-digested code of international laws, and administered by a standing court or board of mutual reference, is preferable to the occasional choice of umpires, who act without the aid or restriction of established principles and rules.

3. That it is our earnest desire that the government of the United States would, at the earliest opportunity, take measures for obtaining the consent of the powers of Christendom to the establishment of a General Convention or Congress of Nations, for the purpose of settling the principles of international law, and of organizing a high court of nations, to adjudge all cases of difficulty which may be brought before them by the mutual consent of two or more nations.

4. That His Excellency the Governor be requested to transmit a copy of these resolves, with the accompanying report, to the Senators and Representatives of Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States, with instructions to use their influence, as they may find occasion, in furtherance of this important object.

EXTINCTION OF WAR.*

BY HON. JOSIAH QUINCY, L.L. D.

"IN all experience and stories," says the great Bacon, "you shall find but three things that prepare and dispose an estate for war—the ambition of the governors, a state of soldiery professed, and the hard means to live among many subjects, whereof the last is the most forcible and the most constant."

In reference to these causes of war, it may be asserted that three facts exist in the nature of man, and the condition of society, which give rational ground for the opinion, that they will be gradually limited in their influence, and may be made ultimately to cease altogether. The first fact is, that man is a being capable of intellectual and moral improvement; the second, that the intellectual and moral improvement of our species has already advanced in this very direction and on this very subject, wars being in fact far less bloody than in former periods of society; and the third, that the intellectual and moral influences which have arisen, and are extending themselves in the world, necessarily lead to a favorable change in all the enumerated causes on which the existence of war depends, repressing the ambition of rulers, diminishing the influence of the soldiery, and ameliorating the condition of the multitude.

At what previous time did the world exhibit the scenes we at this day witness? When did science ever, until this period, present itself to the entire mass of the community as their inheritance and right? No more immured in cells, no more strutting with pedant air and forbidding looks, in secluded halls, it adapts itself to real life, to use, and to man. It is seen in the field, leaning on the plough; at the work-bench, directing the plane and the saw; in the high places of the city, converting by their wealth and their liberality, merchants into princes; in the retirement of domestic life, refining the virtues of a sex in whose purity and elevation man attains at once the noblest earthly reward, and the highest earthly standard of his moral and intellectual nature. And can knowledge advance, and virtue be retrograde?

If such be the fact, why should not the species continue to advance? Is nature exhausted? On the contrary, what half century can pretend to vie with the last in improvement in the arts, in advancement in the sciences, in the zeal and success of intellectual labors? Time would fail to enumerate all; let one suffice. Scarcely ten years have elapsed, since the projects of Fulton were the common sneer of multitudes. He indeed has already joined the great congregation of departed men of genius; but where are his

* From Pres. Quincy's Address before the Mass. Peace Society in 1820.

inventions? Penetrating the interior of this new world, smoking along our rivers, climbing without canvass the mountains of the deep, carrying commerce and comforts, unknown and unanticipated, to inland regions, and already establishing a new era in navigation, and new facilities for human intercourse, incalculable in benefits and in consequences.

So far from having any reason to believe that human improvement is stationary, or is henceforth to be retrograde, there is just reason to believe that it will advance with a rapidity and universality never before witnessed. There are two facts characteristic of the present age, which encourage this belief; the first is the universal diffusion of knowledge, and the second is the facility with which this diffusion is effected. At the present day, not the few only, but the many are every where rising gradually into influence and power. Moral and intellectual cultivation are no more restricted to a few favored individuals, but proffered to the whole species. The light and warmth of science are permitted to penetrate the lowest strata of society, reaching depths never before explored. The press, also, by its magic power almost annihilates time and space, pervading every class and every climate, approximating the world to a state of general society, in which the bond of man to man is recognized, and humanity is becoming every day less and less the dupe of intrigue and artifice. Mind embraces mind, in spite of intervening seas, or wildernesses.

A people highly moral and highly intellectual, would not endure the existence of such a distinct class as Bacon's "soldiery professed." They would realize that the principle of military life resulted in making moral agents machines, free citizens slaves; that a soldier can have no will but his officer's, and know no law but his commands; with him conscience has no force, Heaven no authority, and conduct but one rule,—implicit, military obedience.

If it be asked, how a nation destitute of a military class, can be safe from foreign violence and invasion, it may be answered, first, that the existence of such a class is ever a main inducement both to the one and the other. For either your military force is weaker than your neighbor's, in which case he is insolent; or it is stronger, in which case you are so; or it is equal, in which case the very uncertainty begets in both a spirit of rivalry, of jealousy and of war. Secondly, all experience has shown that a well appointed militia, defending their own altars and homes, are competent to every purpose of repelling foreign violence and invasion. Thirdly, a society which should engage in no intrigues, covet no foreign possessions, and exemplify in all its conduct a spirit of justice, moderation, and regard for the rights of others, would assume a position the most favorable to predispose its neighbors to adopt towards it a kind and peaceable demeanor.

The amelioration of the moral and intellectual condition of man, is not, however, at this day peculiar to any one nation. In a greater or less degree, it is incident to all. By commerce, by the press, by a very general acquaintance with each other's language, by identity of pursuits, similarity in the objects of religious faith,

and coincidence of interests, the various nations composing the civilized quarters of the globe, have mutually elevated and instructed, and are every day mutually elevating and instructing one another. Thought and invention, in any one nation, exist for the common benefit of all.

It is impossible not to perceive, that the extension of these influences among the mass of mankind must, even in Europe, tend to diminish the recurrence of war, not only from the reasons and consequences already urged, but also from the actual state of European soldiery; the necessary result of their education, their habits, and their relations to society. We can scarcely form an idea of the degraded moral and intellectual condition of the mere soldiery of Europe. Their own statesmen and historians seem at a loss to express their abhorrence of the whole class. "War makes thieves," says Machiavel, who was himself no enemy to the profession, "and peace hangs them. For those who know not how to get their bread in any other way, when they are disbanded and out of employ, disdaining poverty and obscurity, are forced to have recourse to such ways of supporting themselves, as generally bring them to the gallows." The experience of our own day is not very different. And what better can be expected from men sold like slaves from one despot to another, contracting to do the work of murder for hire, careless for whom, indifferent against whom, or for what?

It is impossible, without recurrence to feelings and sentiments of a higher and purer nature than those induced by common life, to do justice to the deep moral depravity, and the cruel, blood-stained scenes of ordinary warfare. Alas! how must they be viewed by higher intelligences! Imagine one of these celestial spirits bent on this great purpose, descending upon our globe, and led by chance to an European plain at the point of some great battle. On a sudden, the field of combat opens on his astonished vision. It is a field which men call glorious. A hundred thousand warriors stand in opposing ranks. Light gleams on their burnished steels. Their plumes and banners wave. Hill echoes to hill the noise of moving rank and squadron, the neigh and tramp of steeds, the trumpet, drum and bugle-call.

There is a momentary pause, a silence like that which precedes the fall of the thunderbolt, like that awful stillness which is precursor to the desolating rage of the whirlwind. In an instant, flash succeeding flash pours columns of smoke along the plain. The iron tempest sweeps, heaping man, horse and car in undistinguished ruin. In shouts of rushing hosts, in shock of breasting steeds, in peals of musketry, in the roar of artillery, in the clash of sabres, in thick and gathering clouds of smoke and dust, all human eye, and ear, and sense are lost. Man sees not, but the sign of onset. Man hears not, but the cry of *onward!*

Not so the celestial stranger. His spiritual eye unobscured by artificial night, his spiritual ear unaffected by mechanic noise, witness the real scene, naked in all its cruel horrors. He sees

lopped and bleeding limbs scattered; gashed, dismembered trunks outspread; gore-clotted, lifeless brains bursting from crushed skulls; blood gushing from sabred necks; severed heads whose mouths mutter rage amidst the palsy of the last agony. He hears the mingled cry of anguish and despair issuing from a thousand bosoms in which a thousand bayonets turn, the convulsive scream of anguish from heaps of mangled, half-expiring victims over whom the heavy artillery wheels lumber and crush into one mass, bone, and muscle, and sinew, while the fetlock of the war-horse drips with blood starting from the last palpitation of the burst heart on which his hoof pivots. "This is not earth," would not such a celestial stranger exclaim? "this is not earth,—this is hell! This is not man, but demon tormenting demon!"

Surely it needs no aid from prophecy, none from revelation, to foretel that such a custom, the greatest yet remaining curse and shame of our race, shall retire to be remembered only with a mingled sentiment of disgust and wonder, like the war-feast of the savage, like the perpetual slavery of captives, like the pledge of revenge in the skull-bowl of Odin, like the murder of helots in Greece, and of gladiators in Rome, like the witch-burnings, the Smithfield-fires, and St. Bartholomew-massacres of modern times.

If these anticipations have any color of hope amid the antique customs and thronged population of Europe, how just and how bright are they in this favored country, where God and nature combine to invite man to lay the foundations of a new and happy era for our race! How does the moral, intellectual and local condition of the United States combine to repress all the three causes "which prepare and dispose states for war," first, by elevating and improving the condition of the people; secondly, by restraining the ambition of rulers; and thirdly, by rendering it easy, if we will, to expunge the entire class of "soldiers professed."

The reasons of this belief, take with you into life. Carry them into the haunts of men, and press them upon all who guide and influence society. Make, if possible, a recognition of them a condition of political power. Above all, satisfy the people of their true interests. Show your fellow-citizens of this country, and the men of every other, that war is a game ever played for the aggrandizement of the few, and for the impoverishment of the many; that those who play it voluntarily, do it always for selfish, never for public purposes; that war-establishments are every where scions of despotism; that, when engrafted on republics, they always begin by determining the best sap to their own branch, and never fail to finish by withering every branch except their own. Be not discouraged. Set before your eyes the glorious nature of the object at which you aim. Absolute failure is impossible, because your purposes concur with all the suggestions of reason, with all the indications of nature, with all the testimony of history, and all the promises of religion.

WAR UNCHRISTIAN.

THE Bible, as the record of God's will, is the Christian's rule of duty. By this standard have a multitude of practices once current in Christendom, been already tried, and condemned as unchristian; every other usage of society, however hallowed by time, must eventually be brought to the same test; and we propose now to look at war in the light of revelation, and inquire whether *the GOSPEL allows it in ANY case.*

Let us first clear our way to this point. Many of the *old* arguments for war are too absurd or too cold-blooded to deserve a moment's consideration. It used to be gravely asserted, that war is a healthful stimulus to the body politic; that it tends, if it be not indispensable, to preserve nations from degeneracy; that it is the natural state of mankind, the general law of their being, and peace the exception; that it acts as a sewer to drain off the dregs of ignorance, vice and crime; that it is even necessary, like occasional depletion in the human frame, to prevent a superabundance of population and wealth. Such assumptions, however strange and savage, have been seriously maintained by eminent statesmen, philosophers and theologians; but, true or false, what have they to do with the question, whether the gospel sanctions war? Dram-shops, gaming-houses and brothels serve in like manner to drain off the refuse of society; but can such a fact prove that the Bible allows all the abominations practised in those purlieus of hell?

We are told, however, that war furnishes employment and a livelihood for vast multitudes.—So does idolatry; so does the slave-trade; so do counterfeiters, robbers and pirates live by their villanies; but does this prove such practices to be consistent with the gospel?

We are often reminded, that war developes some of the noblest traits of character, such as spirit, courage, talent, ingenuity, skill, indomitable perseverance.—Be it so; but every species of high-handed wickedness calls forth the same qualities. It requires the union of them all to make a consummate villain, a man that can rob, or forge, or counterfeit with success on a large scale; and in our state-prisons you will find some of the strongest, shrewdest, boldest minds, the very metal that makes heroes. Will this prove that the Bible tolerates such crimes? If war occasionally produces instances of self-sacrificing patriotism, we reply that such patriotism is not the fruit of war; and, even if it were, you may often find essentially the same in a crew of pirates, every one of whom is just as selfish in fighting for the whole gang, as he would be in fighting for himself alone.

It is said, however, that war, unlike the offences we have specified, is enjoined by government, and thus becomes the duty of its subjects.—War right because rulers enjoin it! Can they make it right to do what God forbids? Does he authorize any of his creatures to nullify his own statutes? Because governments nominally Christian have legalized the slave-trade, and duelling, and licentiousness, and idolatry, are such iniquities for such a reason consistent with the gospel?

But our ablest writers on ethics aver, that *self-defence will justify ANY extremes*.—We admit this to be the common notion; but is it a doctrine of the gospel? We challenge you to find the slightest intimation of it in the New Testament. Does Christ or his Apostles tell me I may do *any* thing I please, to save my life? May I renounce his gospel, and worship idols? If not, then there *is something* which I may *not* do even in defence of my life. You say, however, I *may* kill my assailant for such a purpose; but how do you know I may? Does the gospel tell me so? Where? Show me the chapter and verse.—The early Christians could have escaped the stake by denying their Savior, and joining anew in the worship of idols. Did the gospel permit them to save their life on such terms? Did *any* of them so understand it? Then there was *one* thing which they might *not* do even to save their lives; but why not do that? Solely because God forbade it; and, if he does not expressly permit me to kill in self-defence, then have I no more right to transgress the command, *thou shalt not kill*, than I have to renounce Christianity, or violate any and all the other precepts of the Bible.—But let me suppose myself in a Mohammedan country under such circumstances, that I cannot save my life by taking that of my assailant, but can by renouncing my religion. A follower of Mohammed, with his foot on my neck, and his scimitar brandished over my head, exclaims, ‘deny the Nazarine, and believe in God’s Prophet, or die.’ Now, I cannot kill the savage zealot, but can comply with his terms. May I do so? Why not? Simply because God does not permit it; and I have just as little right, without his permission, to save my life by killing my assailant. It can avail nothing to say, that such a man *deserves* to die; for this would not prove, that I have a right to kill him. So may the persecutor equally deserve death; but what martyr ever dreamed of taking the life of his persecutors to save his own? Where does the gospel allow it?

Still we are triumphantly told, that *self-preservation is the first law of our nature*.—If it be so, every one knows that *self-denial* is the first law of Christ’s kingdom; and the only question is, which law is paramount? Is instinct the rule of our duty, the Christian’s standard of right and wrong? It may be said, as it has been, that these instincts are the first edition of God’s revelation to mankind; but we are now inquiring what he teaches in the last and perfect edition of his revealed will. This very argument infidel libertines, in the time of Voltaire and Rousseau, employed to justify unrestrained licentiousness, and insisted on its being right for the debauchee to indulge at will those passions which God im-

planted in his nature. Do you scout such logic? Well may you; but wherein does it differ from your own? You plead instinct; so did they; and we see not why infidels may not, if Christians may, appeal to the instincts of our fallen nature against the commands of God.—But we admit both the right and the duty of preserving our own lives, yet insist that we are not at liberty for this purpose to do any thing which God forbids. I must, if not worse than an infidel, provide for “those of my own household;” but does this authorize me to use for the purpose any means I choose? May I steal, and rob, and murder? You say these are not necessary, just as *we* say they are not necessary for self-defence; but, *if* necessary, does the right or even the duty of supporting or defending myself and my family, justify a resort to such crimes? If admissible in one case, they are equally so in the other; but the truth is, we are neither required nor permitted to support our families, or preserve our lives, unless we can do it without disobeying God. The right of self-defence does not involve the right to kill for the purpose, unless God requires or permits it; and hence the original question returns in its full force, does God allow us, when we honestly think we must either kill or be killed, to take the life of our assailant rather than lose our own? Here is the whole point at issue; and it can be met only by an express permission in the New Testament, since the plea of self-defence, or self-preservation, does not even touch it.—If it did, however, it would not settle the lawfulness of war; because you cannot find in all profane history any war in which the only alternative for a people was either to kill or be killed. After they began to fight, that *was* the alternative; but, had they at the outset chosen to submit, they might have been spared. The only exception I recollect, is found in the Jewish wars of extermination against the inhabitants of Canaan; and it is quite remarkable, that in those cases the aggressors were justified, and the defenders condemned by Jehovah himself.

We are next referred to the Jewish wars which God expressly enjoined or permitted.—But this command or permission just neutralizes their example as a guide to us. God *bade* Abraham sacrifice Isaac. Will this justify parents now in murdering their children at pleasure? God *commanded* Moses to stone the Sabbath-breaker to death. Are we bound to do the same? God indulged patriarchs in polygamy and concubinage. Does their example make such things lawful for us?—We are reminded, however, that God could never have enjoined or permitted any thing that is *necessarily* wrong. Few things are so; but, if *not* necessarily wrong, who now regards filicide, and polygamy, and concubinage, and arbitrary divorce, and many other practices allowed to the Israelites, as lawful under the gospel? Ours is a higher dispensation than theirs; our Savior expressly condemns things in which they had been confessedly indulged; and hence the question for us to meet is, whether the *gospel* sanctions the practice of war; a question not to be answered by appeals to the *Old Testament*.—But the wars of the Israelites were properly *penal executions*;

merely the infliction of such penalties as God himself prescribed against transgressors of his law. Should a bevy of constables attempt to imprison or execute a gang of sentenced criminals, and meet from them a desperate and bloody resistance, would the conflict deserve to be called war? Yet such were the wars of the Israelites. The idolaters of Canaan had committed high treason against Heaven; God denounced upon them the penalty of utter extermination; the Israelites were commissioned to inflict this penalty; and all they did, resembles an execution far more than it does war. God assumed the whole responsibility of the deed; the Israelites were mere executioners of his will.—But those wars were distinguished from all others by two peculiarities; they occurred under a theocracy, a government of which God himself was the head; and they were expressly enjoined or permitted by him. Since the close of revelation, men *cannot* be placed in the same circumstances, and therefore can never apply to themselves this example of the Israelites.—If applied, however, the example would prove too much. The chief wars of the Israelites were wars of aggression, conquest and utter extermination; and such an example, if it proves any thing, would justify the most horrid, wholesale butcheries ever committed in war. Does the objector aim to prove *such* wars consistent with the gospel? If not, he should never quote those of the Israelites.

We will merely say further, how suspicious it is, that Christians, with God's last and best revelation in their hands, should leave this, and go back in search of apologies for war, to a dispensation acknowledged by all to have been comparatively imperfect and dark! Why plunge thus from the splendors of noon into the darkness of midnight, or the duskiess of early dawn? We ask what the *gospel* says; and why not let the gospel at once speak for itself? Go to its heaven-illuminated pages, and show the passage that sanctions war; then, and only then, can any honest mind be satisfied.

But we are sometimes told, that God, even before the birth of Abraham, proclaimed to the whole human race as a universal, irrevocable law, "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."—Now, admitting what is nevertheless denied by some of our ablest commentators, that the common interpretation of this passage is correct, it would still puzzle any one to tell what bearing it can have on the custom of war, except to condemn this blood-leech of the world. Taken literally, it would allow us to kill an assailant only *after* he had actually shed blood, and would moreover require *all* warriors, whose sole business is the shedding of blood, to be hung without mercy.

Passing to the New Testament, we are met first with the plea, that John the Baptist did not require the soldiers who came to him for instruction, to quit the army.—Now, we submit, that John, the forerunner of Christ, belonged not to the Christian, but to the Jewish dispensation; and hence his reply, whatever it might be, could not prove war to be consistent with Christianity, because it *has* no bearing on the point. Even if admitted, to what does it

amount? He did not bid the soldiers abandon their occupation; nor did Christ tell the woman of Samaria to cease from her adulteries, or any others to relinquish the business in which they had been engaged. The grossest idolatry formed a part of the Roman military service. Did John's answer justify that? "Do violence to no man, and be content with your wages," said the Baptist; and what sort of a soldier would he be who should "do violence to no man?"

'But the New Testament nowhere condemns war by *name*.'—We deny the assertion; but, if true, what does it prove? The New Testament does not in *this* way condemn polygamy or concubinage, gambling or suicide, duelling, the slave-trade or piracy; but does the gospel allow such practices merely because it does not denounce them by *name*? It does condemn what constitutes them, every one of their moral elements; a mode of condemnation much less equivocal, and far more decisive.

Equally futile is the plea, that neither Christ nor his Apostles ever expressly censured the profession of arms.—Nor did they thus censure other professions or employments; and this argument, if it proves any thing, would justify almost every species of wickedness prevalent in their day. Because our Savior did not condemn the *religion* of the Syrophenician woman that came to him, Matt. xv. 21—28, does the gospel sanction idolatry? Because he did not reprove the woman of Samaria at Jacob's well, for the adultery and concubinage in which she had lived for years, John iv. 7—30, are we to regard his silence in the case as an approval of such things? Because he did not expressly condemn the former profession even of the penitent Magdalene, Luke vii. 37—50, does the gospel connive at harlotry? Surely a cause must be hard pushed, that seeks refuge in such sophistries.

Essentially the same answer may be given to the case of the "centurion having soldiers under him," who besought that his servant might be healed, and of whom our Savior said, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel," Matt. viii. 5—13; and to the still more striking case of "Cornelius, a centurion, a devout man, one that feared God, gave much alms, and prayed to God always," Acts x. 1—35. Make the most of these cases; and what do they prove? Merely that men, under the *Jewish* dispensation to which they both belonged at the time, might be devout, and still remain soldiers; a position which nobody disputes. Neither Christ nor Peter says a word respecting their profession, but they leave us to determine in other ways whether it is consistent with the gospel; their *usual* mode of treating the former profession or employment of converts to Christianity. Idolatry was an *essential* part of the profession of those centurions; and, if the notice taken of them as devout men, proves the military part to be right, it equally proves the idolatrous part to be so. The truth is, those men were first soldiers, then Christians; nor have we the slightest proof that they remained in the profession of arms, but strong presumptive evidence that they relinquished it, both from the idolatrous rites

which it enjoined, and from the fact that there is no authentic record, for the two or three first centuries, of a single Christian continuing in the trade of blood.

But we are gravely told, that our Savior, with a scourge of small cords, drove the dealers in cattle from the temple, John ii. 14—17.—But what has this case to do with war? Before it can touch the present question, you must prove, not only that Christ drove out the *cattle* with the cords, but actually killed their owners, since this alone resembles war; and that his example, thus explained, he left on record expressly for the guidance of *governments* in settling their disputes!!

We are reminded, however, of our duty to obey civil government as “an ordinance of God;” and hence the alleged right and even obligation of Christians to engage in war at the call of their rulers.—Now, there is not in all the New Testament a syllable that requires or permits us to disobey God at the bidding of our rulers; and both Christ, his Apostles, and all his early disciples, uniformly refused, at the hazard of their lives, to obey *any* requisition of civil government that involved disobedience to God. The question then returns, does the gospel allow war? If so, then we *may* wage it at the command of our rulers; but, if not, no human authority can make it right for us to do so.

‘But our Savior himself bade his disciples procure swords even by selling their garments.’ Luke xxii. 35—38; Matt. xxvi. 51—53.—We will not here attempt a full explanation of this vexed passage; it is enough for our present purpose to say, that no interpretation can make it sanction *any* use of the sword even in self-defence. When one of his disciples said, “Lord, here are *two* swords,” he replied, “it is enough.” *Two* swords enough to arm twelve men against the whole power of the government arrayed against them!! When one of them, at the crisis of danger, asked, “Lord, shall we smite with the sword?” he gave no answer that is recorded; but his influence in restraining the disciples from violence, proves again that he did not design the effusion of blood. Nor did he need the sword for his protection, since he might at will have brought to his rescue “more than twelve legions of angels.” When Peter, mistaking his Master’s design, or yielding to his own passions, drew his sword, and smote the servant’s ear, Christ performed a miracle to heal the wound, and added this decisive rebuke of violent self-defence, “put up thy sword; for all they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword.” When brought before Pilate, and taunted for his easy surrender by his disciples, he states the reason why they did not fight in his defence: “My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom *were* of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews.” John xviii. 35, 36. Can any thing be plainer than that our Savior did not, in this whole transaction, countenance *any* use of the sword?

‘But war is occasionally expedient, even indispensable to our liberties, and our very existence as a nation.’—These points we are not now arguing. We simply inquire whether the *gospel*

sanctions war; and the moment you begin to plead its expediency or necessity, you abandon the Bible, and virtually concede that you cannot justify the custom from its pages. Does the gospel any where permit us to wage war *when we deem it expedient or even necessary?* If so, we may; but, if not, then no degree of expediency or necessity can prove it consistent with the gospel.

'The Bible, however, allows to *government* what it forbids to *individuals*.'—True, in *some* cases it does; but in *such* cases there is a *clear exception* in favor of government. Government, as the representative of associated individuals, is regarded by all writers on international law, and by the common sense of the world, as a moral person, subject to the same obligations with individuals *in all cases not excepted by God himself*; and, unless he has expressly exempted government, the general principles of the gospel are just as binding upon rulers as upon subjects. Every precept of his word, unless an exception is made in their favor expressly, or from the nature of the case, is as applicable to nations as to individuals, and bind the former as truly as they do the latter. God has no where prescribed one set of moral principles for individuals, and another for nations or governments; and, unless the general principles of his word are obligatory alike on them both, the latter have no obligations to bind them, and no rules to guide them.

The apologists for war are very fond of representing it as 'a judicial trial, a process of justice, a mode of condign punishment.'—This plea is quite plausible; but will facts justify it? In every judicial trial, we see first a law common to the parties; next a judge and jury as umpires between them; then the accuser in presence of the culprit, stating his charges, and bringing witnesses to prove them; and finally, the sentence delivered and executed according to law. Is war like this? Where is the law common to both parties? Where the umpires to whose decision they refer the points in dispute? Where the process of proving the charges by fair testimony? Where the verdict of the jury, or the sentence of the judge? Where the penalty inflicted on the guilty alone after legal conviction? There is not in war even the shadow of any thing like this; the plea is as sheer a fiction as was ever conceived; and we might as well speak of a duel, a street brawl, or a fight between two madmen or a dozen tigers, as a process of justice.

But we are confidently referred to the passage which speaks of civil government as ordained of God, and of the magistrate as a minister of God, armed with the sword to execute wrath upon evil-doers, Rom. xiii. 1—7.—Now, the whole aim of this passage is to enforce the duty of implicit submission to government, though it be as bad as that of Nero himself then on the throne;—a principle which cuts up by the roots the assumed right of armed resistance and revolution, which all advocates of defensive war take for granted. The Apostle is prescribing the duty, not of rulers, but of subjects alone, and authorizes only by implication, if at all, merely the sword of the magistrate, not the sword of the warrior; the sword being used here, not as an instrument of death, but only

as an emblem of authority. He is looking, not at the intercourse of one nation with another, but solely at the relation and duties of subjects to their own governments. Not a word does he say about international wars; nor does the passage express or involve a solitary principle that would, in our opinion, justify any species of war. The most it can possibly mean, is that government may *enforce* its laws upon its *own subjects*, and punish them at discretion for disobedience.

Yet it may be said, for it has been, that this right of government to punish or restrain its own subjects by force, *involves* the right of war. Here is the pivot of the whole controversy; and on this point we join issue, and contend, that the right, if admitted, to inflict capital punishment, and to use the sword in suppressing mobs and insurrections, does not include in itself the right of one *nation* to wage war with *another* nation under any circumstances whatever. If individuals come from a foreign country, and commit robbery, murder, or any other crimes, they become of course amenable to our laws as transient citizens, and the government clearly has a right to punish them in the same way it would offenders from its own subjects. But war is not an affair between *individuals* and *governments*; it is a conflict between **GOVERNMENTS THEMSELVES**; and the agents employed in carrying it on, are treated, not as individuals, but as representatives of their respective governments. What then is the sole point of inquiry? Not how government may treat *its own subjects*, but *how one NATION may treat ANOTHER nation*. The former is the *government* question, the latter the *peace* question; points entirely distinct, and ought never to be confounded.

Take an illustration. As the head of a family, I will suppose I have a right from God to punish my children; but this right does not authorize me to punish my *neighbor's* children, much less will it justify bloody contention between the two families. My authority is restricted to my own household; and from what I may lawfully do there, you cannot argue to what I may do to any *other* family. They are distinct, independent domestic communities under the protection of a government common to them both; if one injures the other, redress must be sought in the way which that government prescribes; and their duties and rights in respect to one another must be determined, not by what the father of each family may do in *his own sphere*, but by the laws under which they live. If these laws permit families to fight each other, then have they such a right, so far as the government over them can give it; and on the same principle, if the government of God, the only one over nations, allows them to war against each other, then, and only then, have they a right from God to do so.

Such is the application of our argument. From what a government may properly do to *its own subjects*, we cannot infer what it may rightly do to *another government*. Like families under a civil government, they are placed under the common jurisdiction of Jehovah, and must consult *his* will to learn by what means they may lawfully protect their rights, and redress their wrongs; and thus

we come back once more to the question, still unsettled, whether the gospel authorizes nations to wage war in any case.

Before proceeding to the New Testament, let us make some preliminary statements which few, if any will gainsay :

1. The deeds of war, in themselves considered, are confessedly forbidden in the Bible, and can be justified only on the ground, that government has a right in war to reverse or suspend the enactments of Heaven. The New Testament gives no such right.

2. The *spirit* of war is acknowledged by all to be contrary to that of the gospel. But can we have war without its *spirit*? What is the spirit of *any* custom or act but the *moral character* of that custom or act? Blasphemy without the *spirit* of blasphemy! Intemperance and adultery, injustice and oppression, fraud and theft, robbery and piracy, all without the *spirit* of such practices, all from motives directly opposed to their very nature!! The supposition is an insult to common sense; and we wonder how any sane man should dream of perpetrating the deeds of war without the spirit of war, and imagine he can destroy property, life and happiness by wholesale from motives of pure benevolence! Kill men just for their own benefit! Send them to perdition for their good!! Tremendous logic; yet the only sort of logic that ever attempts to reconcile war with the gospel; a logic that would fain make the veriest hell upon earth a nursery of pure, benevolent affections, and require us to suppose, that thousands of cut-throats by profession, generally unprincipled and reckless, fierce, irascible and vindictive, the tigers of society, will shoot, and stab, and trample one another down in the full exercise of Christian patience, forgiveness and love!!

3. The qualities required of warriors, are the *reverse* of those which characterize the Christian. Even Paley, the ablest champion of war, avers that "no two things can be more different than the Heroic and the Christian characters;" and then proceeds to exhibit the two in striking contrast as utterly irreconcilable. Must not war itself be equally incompatible with Christianity?

4. Wars of aggression all now condemn; but the New Testament makes no distinction between offensive and defensive wars.

5. The gospel enjoins no virtue which the soldier may not discard without losing his military rank or reputation; nor does it forbid a solitary vice which he may not practise without violating the principles of war.

6. While the gospel prescribes rules for every lawful relation and employment in life, it lays down not a single principle applicable to the soldier's peculiar business, and evidently designed for his use. If war is right, why this studious avoidance, this utter neglect of its agents?

7. The Old Testament predicts that the gospel will one day banish war from the earth forever. But, if consistent with Christianity, how will the gospel ever abolish it? The gospel destroy what it sanctions and supports!

8. The first Fathers of the church held war to be unlawful for Christians; and neither Christ, nor his Apostles, nor any of his

early disciples before the church became degenerate, ever engaged in war, or any thing like it, but the very reverse.

9. Christians, in the warmest glow of their love to God and man, shrink with instinctive horror from the deeds of cruelty and blood essential to war; nor can they, in such a state of mind, perpetrate them without doing violence to their best feelings.

10. Converts from paganism, in the simplicity of their first faith, have, not only without the guidance, but even in opposition to the previous views of the missionaries, understood the gospel as forbidding all war. Such was remarkably the case in the South Sea Islands; and the fact goes far to prove, that no mind, not under the hereditary delusions of war, would ever find in the gospel any license for its manifold abominations.

But let the New Testament speak for itself. It may forbid war either by a *direct condemnation of it*, or by the *prohibition of its moral elements*, the things which go to constitute war; and we contend that the gospel does forbid it in both these ways.

I. Note first *its express condemnation of war*. "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence even of your lusts?" James iv. 1. We cannot well conceive a denunciation more direct or more decisive. Our Savior before Pilate declared, "if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight; but now is my kingdom *not* from hence." John xviii. 36. A most unequivocal condemnation of war as inconsistent with Christianity. "Follow peace with *all* men." Heb. xii. 14. Or, as it is in the original, seek earnestly, with all your might, after peace not only with your own countrymen, but with foreigners; not with your friends alone, but with your enemies, with the whole human race. What language could, if these passages do not, condemn all war as unchristian?

II. But look at the still more decisive mode of forbidding war by the *condemnation of its moral elements*. The gospel puts them all under ban. Every species of war contravenes the *fundamental principle of Christianity*. This principle is, enmity subdued by love, evil overcome with good, injury requited by kindness. It pervades the whole New Testament; it is the soul of the Christian system. It was on this principle alone our Savior came from heaven to the cross, and his Apostles went from continent to continent, through fire and blood, for the salvation of a lost race. The peculiar precepts of the gospel all rest on this principle; nor can we take it away without subverting the entire fabric of Christianity. But this principle is incompatible with war in *any* form, because war *always* aims to overcome evil *with* evil, to return injury *for* injury, to subdue our enemies by making them wretched, to inflict on our assailants the very evils they meditate against us, to save our own life, property and happiness by sacrificing theirs. Such is war in its best form; but, if this be not a contradiction of the gospel, we know not what is, and challenge you to conceive a principle more directly opposed to that which lies at the foundation of Christianity.

But the gospel condemns *in detail* the moral elements of war.

"Lay aside all malice; and let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger be put away.—Avenge not yourselves. Recompense to no man evil for evil. See that none render evil for evil unto any man.—Whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and division, are ye not carnal?—Now, the works of the flesh are these: hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, envyings, murders, revellings, and such like." Need any one be told, that the things here denounced, are inseparable from war, and constitute its very essence? What! war without malice or hatred, without bitterness, wrath or anger, without division or strife, without variance, emulation or murder! Nations go to war without avenging themselves, and rendering evil for evil!

The gospel, however, still more fully condemns war by *enjoining what is inconsistent with it*. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" and the parable of the Good Samaritan makes *every human being* our neighbor. "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. Charity (love) suffereth long, and is kind; seeketh not her own; is not easily provoked; thinketh no evil; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.—Do good unto *all* men. Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them.—By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another. Have peace one with another. The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness. Put on bowels of mercies, kindness, peaceableness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another, forgiving one another, even as Christ forgave you. The wisdom which is from above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated.—Blessed are the poor in spirit—the meek—the merciful—the peace-makers.—Resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. Overcome evil with good. Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you."

Now, do not such passages convey a most unequivocal condemnation of war in all its forms? *Love thy neighbor as thyself*—by shooting and stabbing him! *Love worketh no ill to his neighbor*. The soldiers *only* business in *any* war is to do his neighbor all the ill he can. *Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you*. Would you like to have them burn your dwelling over your head, butcher your whole family, and then send a bullet or a bayonet through your own heart? *Love your enemies, and do them good*. War teaches us to hate them, and do them all the evil in our power. *Forgive as Christ forgives*. Do soldiers forgive in this way? *Avenge not yourselves*. War is a system of avowed and studied vengeance. *If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink*. Is war ever waged on this principle? Can it be without ceasing to be war?

We know well the plea, that these precepts are addressed to individuals, not to governments; but we challenge the slightest proof from the New Testament, that one government, in its intercourse with another, is exempt from these obligations, or author-

ized to exempt its subjects from them.—We are also told, that many of these passages are obviously figurative. True; but they mean something. What then do they mean? *Resist not evil,—turn the other cheek to the smiter,—overcome evil with good.* Do such passages mean to allow bombardment, pillage, devastation, slaughter? If not, they do not allow war. *Love your enemies, and do them good.* Does this mean, *ruin their commerce, sink their fleets, burn their villages, plunder their cities, blow out their brains?* So of all the precepts we have quoted; no possible construction can make them allow any form of war.

War is confessedly a bad business; and, if we *must* have it, and still wish its work of blood and vengeance performed according to the gospel, its deeds of hell executed in the spirit of heaven, then must we change its agents, and, instead of such villains and desperadoes as Napoleon wanted for warriors, instead of releasing felons, as England has been wont, from the prison and the gallows, on condition of their becoming soldiers, we must select from the church her best members,—her deacons and elders, her pastors, rectors and bishops,—as the only men that can, if any body can, rob, and burn, and ravage, and murder by wholesale, all without malice, from motives of pure benevolence, in a Christian way! as Paul, or Gabriel, or Christ himself would have done it!! If unfit for such hands, then is the whole business of war unchristian. So the warrior himself confesses; for Napoleon's maxim was, 'the worse the man, the better the soldier,' and Wellington expressly says, 'a man of nice scruples about religion, has no business to be a soldier.'

Here is a fair test. If war is right for us, it must have been equally so for our Savior; but can you conceive the Prince of Peace, or one of his Apostles, leading forth an army to their work of plunder, blood and devastation? Can you point to a modern field of battle on which Christ or Paul would have been in his element amidst fire, and blood, and groans, and dying curses? Can you show us a war begun from Christian motives, conducted on Christian principles, pervaded throughout with a Christian spirit? Is there a *Christian* way of burning villages, and plundering cities, of perpetrating the wholesale butcheries of the battlefield, and hurling thousands after thousands of guilty souls into the eternal world? Does the gospel tell us *how* to do *such* things *aright*—how Apostles, how Christ himself would have done them? If not, then is war utterly incompatible with that gospel which proclaims peace on earth as one of its first and most glorious peculiarities; whose Founder was the Prince of Peace; whose promised reign on earth is to be a reign of universal peace; whose followers are all required to overcome evil with good, to love even their enemies, and imitate the blessed example of Him who reviled not his revilers, returned no curse for the many curses heaped upon him by his crucifiers, but prayed on his cross, "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do."

INSENSIBILITY TO THE EVILS OF WAR.*

BY WM. E. CHANNING, D. D.

I now proceed to point out some causes of that insensibility to the evils of war, so common in the world, and so common even among those from whom better things might be hoped; and this I do, not to gratify a love of speculation, but in the belief, that this insensibility will be resisted and overcome, in proportion as its sources shall be explained.

I. Among its chief causes, one undoubtedly is the commonness of war. This hardens us to its evils. Its horrors are too familiar to move us, unless they start up at our own door. How much more would they appal us, were they rare? If the history of the race were, with one solitary exception, a history of peace, concord, brotherly love; if but one battle had been fought in the long succession of ages; if from the bosom of profound tranquillity, two armies, on one fatal day, had sprung forth and rushed together for mutual destruction; if but one spot on earth had been drenched with human blood shed by human hands—how different would be our apprehensions of war! What a fearful interest would gather round that spot! How would it remain deserted, dreaded, abhorred! With what terrible distinctness would the leaders of those armies stand out as monsters, not men! How should we confound them with Moloch, and the fiercest fallen spirits! Should we not feel, as if, on that mysterious day, the blessed influences of Heaven had been intercepted, and a demoniacal frenzy had been let loose on the race?

And has war, in becoming common, lost its horrors? Is it less terrible because its Molochs crowd every page of history, and its woes and crimes darken all nations and all times? Do base or ferocious passions less degrade and destroy, because their victims are unnumbered? If indeed, the evils of war were only physical, and were inevitable, we should do well to resign ourselves to that kindly power of habit which takes the edge from oft-repeated pains. But moral evils, evils which may be, and ought to be shunned, which have their spring in human will, which our higher powers are given us to overcome, these it is a crime unresistingly to endure. The frequency and strength of these are more urgent reasons for abhorring and withstanding them. Reflection should be summoned to resist the paralyzing power of habit. From principle, we should cherish a deeper horror of war, because its "sword devours forever."

* This tract, so full of noble sentiments, touches some points on which there is a diversity of opinion among the friends of peace; but it will be borne in mind, that the Peace Society lends no countenance to war in any case—ED.

II. A second cause of insensibility to the evils of war, and one of immense power, is the common and almost universal belief, that the right of war belongs to civil government. Let us be just to human nature. The idea of Right has always mixed itself with war; and this has kept out of view the real character of most of the conflicts of nations. The sovereign, regarding the right of war as an essential attribute of sovereignty, has on this ground ascribed a legitimacy to all national hostilities, and has never dreamed that in most of his wars he was a murderer. So the subject has thought himself bound to obey his sovereign, and, on this ground, has acquitted himself of crime, has perhaps imputed to himself merit, in fighting and slaughtering for the defence of the most iniquitous claims. Here lies the delusion which we should be the most anxious to remove. It is the legality ascribed to war on account of its being waged by government, which produces insensibility to its horrors and crimes. When a notorious robber, seized by Alexander, asked the conqueror of the world, whether he was not a greater robber than himself, the spirit of the hero repelled the title with indignation. And why so? Had he not, without provocation or cause, spoiled cities and realms, whilst the robber had only plundered individuals and single dwellings? Had he not slaughtered ten thousand innocent fellow-creatures for one victim who had fallen under the robber's knife? And why then did the arch-robber disclaim the name, and seriously believe, that he could not justly be confounded with ruffians? Because he was a King, the head of a state, and, as such, authorized to make war. Here was the shelter for his conscience and his fame. Had the robber, after addressing his question to Alexander, turned to the Macedonian soldier, and said to him, "Are you not too, a greater robber than I? Have not your hands been busier in pillage? Are they not dyed more deeply in innocent blood?" The unconscious soldier, like his master, would have repelled the title; and why? "I am a subject," he would have replied, "and bound to obey my sovereign; and, in fulfilling a duty, I cannot be sunk to the level of the most hated criminal." Thus king and subject take refuge in the right of war which is supposed to inhere in sovereignty, and thus the most terrible crimes are perpetrated with little reproach.

I need not tell you, that there are Christians who, to strip war of this pretext or extenuation, deny that this right exists; who teach, that Jesus Christ has wrested the sword from the magistrate as truly as from the private man. On this point I shall not now enter. I believe, that more good may be done, in the present instance, by allowing to government the right of war. I still maintain, that most wars bring the guilt of murder on the government by whom they are declared, and on the soldier by whom they are carried on, so that our sensibility ought in no degree to be impaired by the supposed legitimacy of national hostilities.

I will allow, that government has the right of war. But a right has bounds; and when these are transgressed by us, it ceases to

exist; and we are as culpable, as if it had never existed. A higher authority than man's, defines this terrible prerogative. Wo! wo to him, who impatiently, selfishly, spurns the restraints of God, and winks out of sight the crime of sending forth the sword to destroy, because, as a sovereign, he has the right of war.

From its very nature, this right should be exercised above all others anxiously, deliberately, fearfully. It is the right of passing sentence of death on thousands of our fellow-creatures. If any action on earth ought to be performed with trembling, with deep prostration before God, with the most solemn inquisition into motives, with the most reverent consultation of conscience, it is a declaration of war. This stands alone among acts of legislation. It has no parallel. These few words, "Let war be," have the power of desolation which belongs to earthquakes and lightnings; they may stain the remotest seas with blood; may wake the echoes of another hemisphere with the thunders of artillery; may carry anguish into a thousand human abodes. Terrible is the responsibility, beyond that of all others, which falls on him who involves nations in war. He has no excuse for rashness, passion, or private ends. He ought at such a moment to forget, to annihilate himself. The spirit of God and justice should alone speak and act through him. To commit this act rashly, passionately, selfishly, is to bring on himself the damnation of a thousand murders. An act of legislation, commanding fifty thousand men to be assembled on yonder common, there to be shot, stabbed, trampled under horses' feet, until their shrieks and agonies should end in death, would thrill us with horror. Yet such an act is a declaration of war; and a government which can perform it, without the most solemn sense of responsibility, and the clearest admonitions of duty, deserves to endure the whole amount of torture which it has inflicted on its fellow-creatures.

I have said, a declaration of war stands alone. There is one act which approaches it, and which indeed is the very precedent on which it is founded. I refer to the signing of a death-warrant by a chief magistrate. In this case, how anxious is society that the guilty only should suffer! The offender is first tried by his peers, and allowed the benefit of skilful counsel. The laws are expounded, and the evidence weighed, by learned and upright judges; and when, after these protections of innocence, the unhappy man is convicted, he is allowed to appeal for mercy to the highest authority of the State, and to enforce his own cry by solicitations of friends and the people; and when all means of averting his doom fail, religion, through her ministers, enters his cell, to do what yet can be done for human nature in its most fallen, miserable state. Society does not cast from its bosom its most unworthy member, without reluctance, without grief, without fear of doing wrong, without care for his happiness. But wars, by which thousands of the unoffending and worthiest perish, are continually proclaimed by rulers in madness, through ambition, through infernal policy, from motives which should rank them with the captains of pirate-ships, or leaders of banditti.

It is time that the right of war should not shield governments from the infamy due to hostilities to which selfish, wicked passions give birth. Let rulers learn, that for this right, they are held to a fearful responsibility. Let a war, not founded in plain justice and necessity, never be named but as Murder. Let the Christian give articulate voice to the blood that cries from the earth against rulers by whom it has been criminally shed. Let no soft terms be used. On this subject, a new moral sense, and a new language, are needed throughout the civilized and Christian world; and just in proportion as the truth shall find a tone, war will cease.

But the right of war, which is said to belong to sovereignty, not only keeps out of sight the enormous guilt of rulers in almost all national conflicts; it also hides or extenuates the frequent guilt of subjects in taking part in the hostilities which their rulers declare. In this way, much of the prevalent insensibility to the evils of war is induced, and perhaps on no point is light more needed. The ferocity and cruelty of armies impress us little, because we look on them as doing a work of duty. The subject or citizen, as we think, is bound to obey his rulers. In his worst deeds as a soldier, he is discharging his obligations to the State; and thus murder and pillage, covered with a cloak of duty, excite no deep, unaffected reprobation and horror.

I know it will be asked, "Is not the citizen bound to fight at the call of his government? Does not his commission absolve him from the charge of murder, or enormous crime? Is not obedience to the sovereign power the very foundation on which society rests?" I answer, has the duty of obeying government no bounds? Is the human sovereign a God? Is his sovereignty absolute? If he command you to slay a parent, must you obey? If he forbid you to worship God, must you obey? Have you no right to judge his acts? Have you no self-direction? Is there no unchangeable right which the ruler cannot touch? Is there no higher standard than human law? These questions answer themselves. A declaration of war cannot sanction wrong, or turn murder into a virtuous deed. Undoubtedly, as a general rule, the citizen is bound to obey the authorities under which he lives. No difference of opinion as to the mere expediency of measures, will warrant opposition. Even in cases of doubtful right, he may submit his judgment to the law. But when called to do what his conscience clearly pronounces wrong, he must not waver. No outward law is so sacred as the voice of God in his own breast. He cannot devolve on rulers an act so solemn, as the destruction of fellow-beings convicted of no offence. For no act will more solemn inquisition be made at the bar of God.

I maintain, that the citizen, before fighting, is bound to inquire into the justice of the cause which he is called to maintain with blood, and bound to withhold his hand, if his conscience condemn the cause. On this point he is able to judge. No political question, indeed, can be determined so easily as this of war. War can be justified only by plain, palpable necessity; by unquestionable wrongs which, as patient trial has proved, can in no other

way be redressed; by the obstinate, persevering invasion of solemn and unquestionable rights. The justice of war is not a mystery for cabinets to solve. It is not a state-secret which we must take on trust. It lies within our reach. We are bound to examine it.

The presumption is always against the justice and necessity of war. This we learn from the spirit of all rulers and nations towards foreign states. It is partial, unjust. Individuals may be disinterested; but nations have no feeling of the tie of brotherhood to their race. A base selfishness is the principle on which the affairs of nations are commonly conducted. A statesman is expected to take advantage of the weaknesses and wants of other countries. How loose a morality governs the intercourse of states! What falsehoods and intrigues are licensed by diplomacy! What nation regards another with true friendship? What nation makes sacrifices to another's good? What nation is as anxious to perform its duties, as to assert its rights? What nation chooses to suffer wrong, rather than to inflict it? What nation lays down the everlasting law of right, casts itself fearlessly on its principles, and chooses to be poor, or to perish rather than to do wrong? Can communities so selfish, so unfriendly, so unprincipled, so unjust, be expected to wage righteous wars? Especially if with this selfishness are joined national prejudices, antipathies, and exasperated passions, what else can be expected in the public policy but inhumanity and crime? An individual, we know, cannot be trusted in his own cause, to measure his own claims, to avenge his own wrongs; and the civil magistrate, an impartial umpire, has been substituted as the only means of justice. But nations are even more unfit than individuals to judge in their own cause; more prone to push their rights to excess, and to trample on the rights of others; because nations are crowds, and crowds are unawed by opinion, and more easily inflamed by sympathy into madness. Is there not then always a presumption against the justice of war?

This presumption is increased, when we consider the false notions of patriotism and honor which prevail in nations. Men think it a virtuous patriotism to throw a mantle, as they call it, over their country's infirmities, to wink at her errors, to assert her most doubtful rights, to look jealously and angrily on the prosperity of rival states; and they place her honor not in unflinching adherence to the right, but in a fiery spirit, in quick resentment, in martial courage, and especially in victory. Can a good man hold himself bound to engage in war at the dictate of such a state?

The citizen or subject, you say, may innocently fight at the call of his rulers; and I ask, who are his rulers? Perhaps an absolute sovereign, looking down on his people as another race, as created to toil for his pleasure, to fight for new provinces, to bleed for his renown. There are indeed republican governments. But were not the republics of antiquity as greedy of conquest, as prodigal of human life, as steeled against the cries of humanity, as any despots who ever lived? And if we come down to modern republics, are they to be trusted with our consciences? What

does the Congress of these United States represent? Not so much the virtue of the country, as a vicious principle, the spirit of party. It acts not so much for the people as for parties; and are parties upright? Are parties merciful? Are the wars to which party commits a country, generally just?

Unhappily, public men, under all governments, are, of all moral guides, the most unsafe, the last for a Christian to follow. Public life is thought to absolve men from the strict obligations of truth and justice. To wrong an adverse party, or another country, is not reprobated, as are wrongs in private life. Thus duty is dethroned; thus the majesty of virtue is insulted in the administration of nations. Public men are expected to think more of their own elevation than of their country. Is the city of Washington the most virtuous spot in this republic? Is it the school of incorruptible men? Public bodies want conscience. Men acting in masses, shift off responsibility on one another. Multitudes never blush. If these things be true, then I maintain, that the Christian has not a right to take part in war blindly, confidently, at the call of his rulers. To shed the blood of fellow-creatures, is too solemn a work to be engaged in lightly. Let him not put himself, a tool, into wicked hands. Let him not meet on the field his brother man, his brother Christian, in a cause on which Heaven frowns. Let him bear witness against unholy wars, as his country's greatest crimes. If called to take part in them, let him deliberately refuse. If martial law seize on him, let him submit. If hurried to prison, let him submit. If brought thence to be shot, let him submit. There must be martyrs to peace as truly as to other principles of our religion. The first Christians chose to die, rather than obey the laws of the state which commanded them to renounce their Lord. "Death rather than crime!"—such is the good man's watch-word; such the Christian's vow. Let him be faithful unto death.

Undoubtedly it will be objected, that if one law of the state may in any way be resisted, then all may be, and so government must fall. This is precisely the argument on which the doctrine of passive obedience to the worst tyrannies rests. The absolutist says, "if one government may be overturned, none can stand. Your right of revolution is nothing but the right of anarchy, of universal misrule." The reply is in both instances the same. Extreme cases speak for themselves. We must put confidence in the common sense of men, and suppose them capable of distinguishing between reasonable laws, and those which require them to commit manifest crimes. The objection which we are considering, rests on the supposition, that a declaration of war is a common act of legislation, bearing no strong marks of distinction from other laws, and consequently to be obeyed as implicitly. But it is broadly distinguished. A declaration of war sends us forth to destroy our fellow-creatures, to carry fire, sword, famine, bereavement, want and woe into the fields and habitations of our brethren; whilst Christianity, conscience, and all the pure affections of our nature, call us to love our brethren, and to die, if need

be, for their good. And from whence comes this declaration of war? From men who would rather die than engage in unjust or unnecessary conflict? Too probably, from men to whom Christianity is a name, whose highest law is honor, who are used to avenge their private wrongs, and defend their reputations by shedding blood, and who, in public as in private life, defy the laws of God. Whoever, at such men's dictation, engages in war, without solemnly consulting conscience, and inquiring into the justice of the cause, contracts great guilt; nor can the "right of war" which such men claim as rulers, absolve him from the crimes and woes of the conflict in which he shares.

III. I observe, thirdly, that men's sensibility to the evil of war has been very much blunted by the deceptive show, the costume, the splendor in which war is arrayed. Its horrors are hidden under its dazzling dress. To the multitude, the senses are more convincing reasoners than the conscience. In youth, the period which so often receives impressions for life, we cannot detect, in the heart-stirring fife and drum, the true music of war, the shriek of the newly wounded, or the faint moan of the dying. Arms glittering in the sunbeam, do not remind us of bayonets dripping with blood. To one, who reflects, there is something very shocking in these decorations of war. If men must fight, let them wear the badges which become their craft. It would shock us to see a hangman dressed out in scarf and epaulette, and marching with merry music to the place of punishment. The soldier has a sadder work than the hangman. His office is not to despatch occasionally a single criminal; he goes to the slaughter of thousands as free from crime as himself. The sword is worn as an ornament; and yet its use is to pierce the heart of a fellow-creature. As well might the butcher parade before us his knife, or the executioner his axe or halter. Allow war to be necessary, still it is a horrible necessity, a work to fill a good man with anguish of spirit. Shall it be turned into an occasion of pomp and merriment? To dash out men's brains, to stab them to the heart, to cover the body with gashes, to lop off the limbs, to crush men under the hoof of the war-horse, to destroy husbands and fathers, to make widows and orphans, all this may be necessary; but to attire men for this work with fantastic trappings, to surround this fearful occupation with all the circumstances of gaiety and pomp, seems as barbarous, as it would be to deck a gallows, or to make a stage for dancing beneath the scaffold.

I conceive that the military dress was not open to as much reproach in former times as now. It was then less dazzling, and acted less on the imagination, because it formed less an exception to the habits of the times. The dress of Europe not many centuries ago, was fashioned very much after what may be called the harlequin style; that is, it affected strong colors and strong contrasts. This taste has passed away very much with the progress of civilization. The military dress alone has escaped the reform. The military man is the only harlequin left us from

ancient times. It is time that his dazzling finery were gone, that it no longer corrupted the young, no longer threw a pernicious glare over his terrible vocation.

IV. I close with assigning what appears to me to be the most powerful cause of the prevalent insensibility to war. It is our blindness to the dignity and claims of human nature. We know not the worth of a man. We know not *who* the victims are, on whom war plants its foot, whom the conqueror leaves to the vulture on the field of battle, or carries captive to grace his triumph. Oh! did we know what men are, did we see in them the spiritual immortal children of God, what a voice should we lift against war! How indignantly, how sorrowfully should we invoke Heaven and earth to right our insulted, injured brethren!

But "must the sword devour forever?" Must force, fear, pain *always* rule the world? Is the kingdom of God, the reign of truth, duty and love, never to prevail? Must the sacred name of brethren be only a name among men? Is the earth always to steam with human blood shed by man's hands, and to echo with groans wrung from hearts which violence has pierced? Can you and I, my friends, do nothing to impress a different character on the future history of our race? You say we are weak; and why weak? It is from inward defect, not from outward necessity. We are inefficient abroad, because faint within, faint in love, and trust, and holy resolution. Inward power always comes forth, and works without. Noah Worcester, enfeebled in body, was not weak. George Fox, poor and uneducated, was not weak. They had light and life within, and therefore were strong abroad. Their spirits were stirred by Christ's truth and spirit; and so moved, they spoke and were heard. We are dead, and therefore cannot act. Perhaps we speak against war; but if we speak from tradition, if we echo what we hear, if peace be a cant on our lips, our words are unmeaning air. Our own souls must bleed when our brethren are slaughtered. We must feel the infinite wrong done to man by the brute force which treads him in the dust. We must see in the authors of war, monsters in human form, incarnations of the dread enemy of the human race. Under the inspiration of such feelings, we shall speak, even the humblest of us, with something of prophetic force. This is the power which is to strike awe into the counsellors and perpetrators of now licensed murder; which is to wither the laurelled brow of now worshipped heroes. Deep moral convictions, unfeigned reverence and fervent love for man, and living faith in Christ, are mightier than armies; mighty through God to the pulling down of the strong holds of oppression and war. Go forth, then, friends of mankind, peaceful souldiers of Christ! and in your various relations, at home and abroad, in private life, and, if it may be, in more public spheres, give faithful utterance to the principles of universal justice and love, give utterance to your deep, solemn, irreconcilable hatred of the spirit of war.

CLAIMS OF PEACE ON CHRISTIANS.

THE cause of peace seeks, as its only object, the entire abolition of war. It has nothing to do with capital punishment, with the strict inviolability of human life, or with the question whether the gospel allows physical force in the government of states, schools and families. On such subjects we leave men to think as they please, and ask them merely to aid us in putting an end to that custom which lexicographers define to be "a contest by force between nations." It is not only a conflict unto death, but a conflict between *governments*; and neither a teacher punishing his pupil, nor a parent chastising his child, nor a father defending his family against a midnight assassin, nor a magistrate inflicting the penalties of law upon a criminal, can properly be termed war, because the parties are not nations or governments alone, but either individuals, or individuals *and* governments. Such questions may be important; but, associated solely for the abolition of war, we restrict ourselves to this single object.

But how is this object to be gained? Only by *God's promised blessing on a right application of his own gospel to the case*. Here we find his sovereign remedy for all the moral maladies of our race; and all we seek, or need, or can do, is such an application of its pacific principles as shall put war forever under the ban of every Christian community. If rightly applied from the first, the gospel would have caused wars to cease from every land blest with its heavenly light; and hence we urge upon all Christians the obligation of making such an application of its principles as shall insure the prevalence of peace co-extensive with Christianity itself. We ask the co-operation of all good men, and insist on *the duty of specific, associated efforts for the pacification of our world just as fast as it shall be converted to God*.

1. This duty is implied, first, in *God's promise of universal peace*. He assures us in his word of an era when men 'shall beat their swords into plough-shares, their spears into pruning-hooks, and cease from learning war any more.' Here is a promise quite as explicit as any concerning the restoration of the Jews, or the conversion of the heathen; and if bound to unite, as Christians do, in specific efforts for the fulfilment of these prophecies, why should we not do the same in reference to the prophecy of universal and permanent peace? The latter, equally with the former, is a part of God's word, and the same means are just as indispensable in one case as the other; nor do we see why, if specific, associated efforts ought to be made for the conversion of the Jews, or the spread of the gospel among the heathen, similar efforts should not be put forth to make them cease from war. The bare existence of such a prophecy imposes on

Christians the obligation of using the means necessary for its fulfilment.

2. This duty results, also, from *the very genius of Christianity*. It is emphatically a religion of peace. Peace is its motto, one of its grandest objects, a point to which its precepts, provisions and influences, all confessedly tend as their final result. Peace marks its entire history and character. The birth-song of its Founder was peace; all his instructions breathed peace, his whole life was peace; and, while pouring out his blood on the cross, he prayed for his murderers. The Bible is a great statute-book of peace; our Father in Heaven is the God of Peace; our Redeemer there is the Prince of Peace; the Spirit he promised is a Spirit of Peace; his followers are all denominated the children of peace, and bound by the very terms of their profession, to become zealous co-workers with God in the cause of universal peace.

3. The same obligation is implied, next, *in the duty of personal peace*. So frequently is this duty enjoined throughout the Bible, that the Christian must feel himself especially required to promote peace amongst individuals, in families, in neighborhoods, in Churches, in communities, wherever he comes in contact with mankind. But does not this involve the duty of seeking the peace of the whole world? Surely the principle does apply, with a force vastly augmented, to the great brotherhood of nations; for, if peace is so incumbent upon individuals, or so desirable for their happiness, is it not far more so for a kingdom, for a world? If important for one man, is it not for a million, for a thousand millions? If individuals ought to "seek peace, and ensue it," are not nations, embodying millions, under far greater obligations to do so? If required ourselves to "live peaceably with all men, and follow after the things which make for peace," are we not bound by considerations still more imperative, to use every means in our power for diffusing the virtues and blessings of peace over the whole earth?

4. The same obligation we might infer, also, *from almost every duty enjoined in the gospel*. Take, as a specimen, the duty of evangelizing the world. The substance of all the precepts on this point, is forcibly condensed into our Saviour's last command, bidding us preach his gospel, his *whole* gospel, to every creature. And what *is* that gospel? A patron, an ally, an instigator of war!—war burning with malice and revenge, reeking with pollution, and steeped in blood and tears! The bare supposition outrages common sense; for the gospel is directly, most glaringly repugnant to every shred of a custom so foul and vindictive.

We are not now discussing a disputed point. We do not here allude to the vexed question, whether a war strictly defensive, is ever justifiable on *Christian* principles; a point about which there is diversity of opinion among good men, among the sincere friends of peace, and we leave them to settle it each one for him-

self in the light of the Bible. We are assailing the custom itself; and, whatever we may think about wars strictly defensive, no man in his senses can fail to see the absolute inconsistency of such a *practice* with a religion of universal peace and good-will. Look at its details, and tell us, what part of this foul and horrid custom does the gospel sanction? Ascertain its objects, and analyze its motives; mark the spirit it cherishes, and the passions it kindles into a blaze; trace its progress in guilt, and its results in mischief and woe; go to its fleets and camps reeking with pollution, to its battle-fields raging with hellish malice and wrath, to its hospitals resounding with groans, and curses, and blasphemies; and in all these, which alone constitute war, what can you find compatible with a religion of peace, purity and love?

There is no view you can take of *such* a custom, that will not prove its direct contrariety both to the New Testament and the Old. We do not shrink from an appeal even to the Old Testament; for, if you separate its precepts from its somewhat mysterious history, you will find the former almost as much opposed as the gospel itself, to the practice of war. It enjoins piety, and love, and truth, and meekness, and a variety of other duties and graces utterly inconsistent with this trade of blood. But glance at the great moral code of Sinai. *Thou shalt have no other gods before me.* War, pagan in its origin, pagan still in its spirit, and always requiring soldiers to obey their superiors, right or wrong, rather than God himself, does virtually dethrone Jehovah from the hearts of an army, and put in his place a general or a prince, the idol of patriotism, or the phantom of military glory. War was the origin of nearly all the demigods ever worshipped; most of them were warriors deified; had Napoleon lived two thousand years earlier, he would have been the very Mars of the world; and we seriously doubt whether the sticklers for war pay half as much respect to the Almighty, as they do to this modern monster, this ravager of a continent, and murderer of millions. *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.* Every one knows war to be a nursery of irreligion, a school of profaneness and blasphemy. *Thou shalt not commit adultery.* War is a hotbed of the foulest, most brutal licentiousness. *Thou shalt not steal.* War is a system of legalized national robbery and piracy. *Thou shalt not kill.* War seeks to kill as its grand aim, and is in fact the most terrible engine ever devised for the wholesale destruction of mankind. Look through the Decalogue, through the whole of the Old Testament; and you will find war absolutely compelling soldiers to violate not a few of its plainest, most important precepts.

But the gospel, repealing the ancient law or license of retaliation, and putting in its place the principle of universal good-will, is still more repugnant, if possible, to the custom of war. *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.* Can the soldier do this, and still continue his trade of human butchery? *Love as yourself the very man on whom you are trying to inflict*

the greatest possible amount of evil for two worlds! Paul tells us, that "love is the fulfilling of the law, *because it worketh no ill to his neighbor;*" but the soldier's whole business is to do him *all* the ill he can. *Do good unto all men.* War goes upon the avowed principle of doing them *evil*, as the only means of accomplishing its objects. *Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them.* The soldier do to others what he wishes done to himself! Would *you* like to have your dwelling burnt over your head, your family butchered before your eyes, and your own body blown or hewn to pieces? Yet this alone is war; and to talk of a war that did not *aim* to perpetrate such atrocities, and inflict such miseries by wholesale, would be as plain a contradiction in terms, as to speak of living death! What! a war that sought to kill no one, to destroy no property, to do nobody any harm! You might as well call hell itself heaven! *Love your enemies.* War would fain have us *hate* them, and never did, never can exist without the deepest, bitterest malice. *Seek peace. Live in peace. Follow peace with all men. See that none render evil for evil to any man, friend or foe. Lay aside all malice, the great fountain of strife alike between individuals and nations. Mortify your members which are upon the earth, all those unholy passions from which alone, as James assures us, war can ever proceed. Avenge not yourselves; but, whoso smiteth you on one cheek, turn to him the other also. Resist not evil; but overcome evil with good.* We cannot stop to explain these passages; but there is no possible construction that would not make them condemn war as incompatible with Christianity.

Here, then, is confessedly the genuine spirit, an integral part of that gospel which our Saviour's last command bids us preach to every creature; and we insist on its being our duty, in concert with the rest of his disciples, to teach the whole human race this part, as well as every other part, of our holy religion. This *part!* and are we permitted at pleasure to embrace or to spread a mutilated gospel—a gospel without peace, any more than a gospel without repentance or faith? Are we at liberty to pluck out, or to leave out, its principles of peace? No more than we are repentance or faith; for our Saviour's last command, and all his previous instructions, rivet upon us the obligation of preaching peace, just like repentance or faith, as an integral part of the gospel, and thus rendering its pacific principles, like all its other truths, effective of their object in the spread of peace co-extensive with Christianity itself.

Here is all we ask—such an application of the gospel as shall secure the actual abolition of war in every Christian country. We dream not of extending peace a single span beyond the influences of the gospel; but we do plead earnestly for the restoration of those principles which our Saviour himself taught, his apostles everywhere preached, and his disciples, down to the war-degeneracy of the Church, continued to exemplify, like all

the other Christian graces, in their lives. We ask on this point for the very gospel that fell from the lips of him who "spake as never man spake." Only let its principles of peace once more be taught by every minister, and put in practice by every Christian, as they unquestionably were by all the first teachers and professors of Christianity; then, but never till then, will peace, as an element of the gospel itself, prevail, just like repentance and faith, wherever Christianity itself prevails, and the world thus be—what it never yet has been in the case of a single nation, though it ought to have been in every case,—converted to peace as fast as it shall be to God.

5. Such a reform is needed, moreover, *to rescue Christianity itself from perversion and reproach*. The war-degeneracy of the Church, begun early in the third century, consummated in the fourth by her union with the state under Constantine, and thenceforward extending over the whole of her subsequent history, has grossly belied the pacific character of our religion, and shorn it of no small part of its primitive beauty, loveliness and glory. When the chosen choir of heaven chanted over the manger of Bethlehem their song of peace and good-will; when our Saviour, not only through life, but even in death itself, taught and exemplified the peaceful principles of his gospel; when his Apostles in like manner carried the same principles from city to city, from kingdom to kingdom; when his disciples, without exception, followed his example of never returning curse for curse, blow for blow, but meekly bowed their heads to the axe or the gibbet of their persecutors; so long as the whole Church thus stood forth before the world in the stainless panoply of peace, just so long did Christianity commend itself to the consciences of men, and make rapid progress towards the spiritual conquest of the world. The war-degeneracy of the Church was her grand heresy, and did more than anything else to paganize her character, and pave the way for that flood of evils which overspread Christendom during the middle ages. Never was there a grosser or more fatal perversion; and ever since she has for the most part belied the peaceful principles of her gospel, and provoked the wrath or scorn of mankind.

Truth extorts this humiliating confession. The history of the nominal Church, the only one known at the time, was written for centuries in blood. How often did the professed followers of the Prince of Peace meet to slaughter one another! How many millions perished by their hands in the Crusades, in wars with the Mohammedans, in the *religious* wars consequent on the Reformation! How often did the highest dignitaries of the Church lead forth armies to battle! How common, for more than a thousand years, for Christians to pray the God of Peace to aid them in butchering one another, and then to return solemn thanks for the slaughter of thousands and scores of thousands of their own brethren! When Magdeburg was a smoking heap of ruins, and thirty thousand of her citizens, men, women, and children, lay rotting in her streets, or roasted in the ashes of their

own dwellings, the victorious general ordered a *Te Deum* to be publicly chanted in gratitude to their common God!! So has it been for some fifteen centuries; nor can the most nefarious war even now be waged, but the Church, in the Old World, if not in the New, must be made, by her prayers and praises, a party in this work of hell. The Archbishop of England still composes, for use in all her sanctuaries, a solemn form of thanksgiving to God for such savage butcheries as were perpetrated, in the middle of the nineteenth century, upon the Chinese and Afghans!

Tell us not, such cases are exceptions for which the Church has little or no responsibility. Exceptions! peace is the exception; war, the rule. The evil, too, is more or less in her own bosom. Does she not allow her members to live by this trade of blood? Has she for ages excluded the warrior from her communion? Has she once, for the last fifteen hundred years, borne her united testimony before the world against this custom as inconsistent with *her* views of the gospel? Nay, has she not fawned on the warrior, and consecrated his banners, and followed him with her prayers for success, and crowned him on his return with laurels? Are not her most venerable temples to this day filled with the trophies of war? Did not Col. Gardiner, one of her favorite sons, die on the field of battle, and Doddridge himself, one of her brightest luminaries, write his eulogy without a single rebuke upon his profession of blood? Nor is it many years since no man in the British Empire could take out a commission as an officer in the army or navy, for the wholesale butchery of his fellow-men, without a certificate of his being a member of the Church of Christ! and not a note of alarm, scarce a whisper of rebuke or displeasure, was heard from the presses or the pulpits of Christendom. Alas! do not Christians, even now join men of the world in idolizing the demi-gods of war, train some of their own children to this work of death, and teach the rest to admire war and the warrior?

No wonder, then, at the consequent reproaches upon Christianity. Mark the bitter, withering sarcasms of infidelity. "Ye bungling soul-physicians!" exclaims Voltaire, "to bellow for an hour or more against a few flea-bites, and not say a word about that horrid distemper which tears us to pieces! Burn your books, ye moralizing philosophers! Of what avail is humanity, benevolence, meekness, temperance, piety, when half a pound of lead shatters my body; when I expire, at the age of twenty, under pains unspeakable; when my eyes, at their last opening, see my native town all in a blaze, and the last sounds I hear are the shrieks and groans of women and children expiring amidst the ruins?"

Nor is Judaism less severe in her taunts. When a celebrated advocate of foreign missions was announced to preach at Falmouth, England, a Jew posted on the door of the Church this notice: "*Our* Messiah, when he comes, will establish a system of mercy, peace and kindness upon earth; while among you Christians, only disputes, animosities and cruelties mark your

passage through the world. Possibly *your* religion sanctions these things; ours does not. With us, the goodness and beneficence alone of the Mosaic laws constitute their grand authority, and proclaim aloud their emanation from a God of love. We *want* no better, we *expect* no better, till Messiah shall indeed come. Then will 'every man sit under his own vine and fig-tree; nation shall no longer lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more; the leopard shall lie down with the kid, the wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and a little child shall lead them.' Has this golden era of peace and love ever yet been witnessed? Speak, Christians, speak candidly; has it been once seen through the last eighteen hundred years?"

6. We can hardly glance at *the influence of peace on the character of the Church in preparing her for the millenium*. Such a preparation is indispensable; it is the great moral desideratum of the age; and never till she recovers her primitive spirit of peace, will she acquire the qualities requisite for reclaiming the whole world to her Saviour.

7. But mark *the necessity of such a reform to secure a sufficient blessing from heaven on the efforts now in progress for the world's conversion*. This work, begun by Apostles, has at length been renewed with a good degree of zeal and success; but why are a thousand modern missionaries, with all the resources of Christendom, accomplishing less towards the world's conversion, than did a dozen unlettered, penniless fishermen of Galilee? We rejoice in the glorious results of *modern* missions; but how slight all these results in comparison with those vouchsafed to Apostles! Whence this difference? Surely the fault is not in our missionaries, those master-spirits of the Church, but in the great body of Christians at home, who have fallen in this respect, if not in many others, so far below the high standard of primitive piety, that God cannot consistently bestow on them such success as he granted to Apostles. For results so glorious, there must be a corresponding moral preparation of the Church as a body; but will she, *can* she, make such preparation so long as the war-spirit gangrenes her vitals, or the war-system of Christendom hangs, an incubus of guilt and blood, upon her bosom?

Look at the past. David, though a man in many respects after God's own heart, was not permitted to build a 'temple for the Lord, *because he had shed much blood*.' And will not this principle apply, with still more force, to Christians in their efforts to spread a religion of peace? The Great Head of the Church is himself the Prince of Peace; he will never convert the nations at the sacrifice of a single principle of his gospel; and, though he may, doubtless will, grant his followers success enough to encourage a tenfold increase of their zeal, he will not, in all probability, give them "the heathen for their inheritance, the uttermost parts of the earth for their possession," until they shall cease from lending their countenance to the war-system, and re-incorporate in their faith and character the pacific principles of the Sermon on the Mount.

8. Such a reform would ere long *remove not a few obstacles to the spread of the gospel*. A multitude of these have been scattered, age after age, over the whole earth by the martial character of Christendom. Its wars, however unjust the charge, are actually charged by the heathen upon our religion as one of its *supposed* fruits; and thus have they reared all round the whole unevangelized world a barrier of prejudice very like the wall of China. Their ports, their ears, their hearts are closed fast against us. Christians are regarded with terror; and Christianity itself, though an angel of peace and love, has thus become, all over the earth, a hissing and a scorn.

You cannot well conceive how far the wars of Christendom have set the great mass of unevangelized minds sternly against the religion of the cross. Not only does the infidel cast them in our teeth, and the Jew insist that the Messiah, promised as the Prince of Peace, cannot have come, since nations reputedly Christian have been almost incessantly engaged in war; but even the follower of the false prophet calls us "Christian dogs," and taunts us for our glaring hypocrisy.

The result is inevitable in checking the spread of Christianity. How came the gospel to meet in the Sandwich and South Sea Islands, a reception comparatively so cordial, and a degree of success so glorious? Other causes conspired; but a principal one was found in the fact, that the wars of Christendom were little known to the natives, and they saw Christianity exhibited before them first in the lives of its humble, peaceful missionaries. On the other hand, why were the Jesuit missionaries so indignantly expelled from China? Whence such rancorous hatred of the gospel in Japan, that every man, woman and child was required to go once a year through the ceremony of publicly trampling in scorn on the cross, and no Christian even now can put his foot on the shores of that island, without first renouncing his religion? They had heard of Christian nations crimsoning their path by sea and land with blood; and they very naturally suspected those Jesuits of having come to involve them, some how or other, in the same calamities that nominal Christians had so often inflicted upon one another. The countries all round the Mediterranean, traversed by Apostles, and covered with primitive Churches, have been for ages filled, mainly in consequence of fierce, bloody wars so long waged between Mohammedans and reputed Christians, with such deep and bitter prejudices as centuries can hardly suffice to remove. Such prejudices more or less overspread the globe, and *must* be removed before its myriads can be evangelized.

9. But consider how vastly the prevalence of peace would *increase the means, both in men and money, of converting the world*. It would save enough for this purpose in a single generation; for already has the Church alone spent or lost in the wars of Christendom, a hundred times as much of treasure and of blood, as would have sufficed, centuries ago, to bring all nations under the saving power of the gospel.

Just glance at a few facts. Some three millions of standing warriors now in Christendom; 300,000 lives sacrificed in our own Revolutionary War; more than a million in the wars of the Spanish Peninsula under Napoleon; no less than nine or ten millions in the wars consequent on the French Revolution; some thirty millions in all the wars of the Reformation; while thirty thousand missionaries, it is supposed, would suffice under God for the world's immediate evangelization.

We will not here attempt to estimate or conjecture the entire loss of property by war; but its direct expenses, though a mere fraction of what it wastes, are enormous almost beyond calculation. Our war with a handful of Indians in Florida was said to cost us some forty or fifty million dollars; our Revolutionary War cost England herself nearly seven hundred millions; her wars with Napoleon absorbed more than five thousand millions; England, during twenty years, spent for war-purposes alone, an average of more than one million every day; and the wars of Christendom, from 1793 to 1815, only twenty-two years, actually wasted, barely for their support, about *fifteen thousand millions*; a sum so vast, that the mere interest, at six per cent., would be *nine hundred millions a year*; enough to evangelize two such worlds as ours, and furnish them with the most ample means of grace and salvation down to the end of time!

10. Nor is this all; for the prevalence of peace would *remove a great variety of obstructions to the efficacy of the gospel at home*. It is a pioneer or auxiliary to all our efforts for the salvation of men; because no farther than the spirit of peace prevails, can you labor with success either for the conversion of sinners, or the sanctification of Christians. Throw a fire-brand of strife into any community; and from that moment must the work of salvation cease, and never begin again, until that fire-brand is either removed or quenched.

Surely, then, war, the great fire-brand of the world, must tend in many ways to prevent the full effects of the gospel. It interposes a thousand neutralizing influences. It fosters ignorance; it encourages intemperance; it instigates to the foulest forms of licentiousness; it multiplies to a fearful extent every species of vice and crime. It prevents or neutralizes the best means of grace. It engrosses the mind, and sears the conscience, and steels the heart. It withholds the Bible itself; it shuts up the Sanctuary; it suspends the Sabbath; it suspends, for the time, all laws, nearly all influences, but its own.

Now, must not such things cripple the saving efficacy of the gospel? Take the best revival of religion; and how long could it survive a battle, or live amid the pestilential moral exhalations steaming up from a camp or a fleet? Few, if any wars can be less exceptionable than that of our own Revolution; but how deplorable was its *acknowledged* influence on the piety of our land? And let the war-mania once more pervade and madden our whole nation; let citizens be transformed by thousands into pirates or marauders, and soldiers be marched back and forth through the

country, and encamped in every section to trample on the Sabbath, and indulge in drunkenness, debauchery, and almost every species of vice and villainy; let our hills and vallies resound with the uproar of battle after battle, and every press teem, every mail be loaded, every hamlet reached, day after day, with the news of victory or defeat, to keep the public mind stretched continually to its utmost tether of anxious, agonizing interest in the progress of the war; and how long before the death-knell of every revival among us would toll out its last beat, and the Spirit of God, that peaceful dove, fly far, far from such realms of noise and strife, to return no more for years!

11. But finally; and more than all, *peace would put a stop to the ruin of immortal souls directly occasioned by war.* It is high time for the truth on this point, if on no other, to be rung aloud in the ear of every Christian community. 'Too long has the poor soldier been permitted, partly through our own connivance or neglect, to dream of wading through all the atrocities and horrors of war up to the throne of an immaculate, merciful God! Far be it from us to say, that none have ever gone even from the field of blood to the realms of glory; but if war is so notorious a hotbed of vice and irreligion; if it breathes a spirit, forms a character, and absolutely enjoins atrocities so utterly inconsistent with the gospel of Christ; if the field of battle is such a theatre for the worst passions that ever rage in the bosom of man; if fleets and camps are, the world over, such proverbial reservoirs of impiety, pollution, and crime; I dare not suppose, that *such* masses of moral putrefaction are borne up into the immediate presence of Him in whose sight the very heavens are not clean!

What a destroyer, then, of immortal souls! Scarce a war that does not slay its thousands, its scores of thousands; and how often have there fallen upon a single field of battle, ten thousand! twenty, thirty, fifty thousand! a hundred, two hundred, three hundred thousand!! No uncommon number this in ancient warfare; and, since the dawn of the present century, there perished in less than six months of the Russian campaign, half a million of the *French alone*; in the wars of Alexander and Cesar, some three millions each; in the wars of Napoleon, six millions; in the wars of Jenghis-Khan some thirty-two millions; in the wars of the Turks and Saracens, sixty millions each; and the lowest estimate I have ever seen, puts the sum total of its ravages from the first at *fourteen thousand millions*, eighteen times as many as all the present population of our globe!

Will the Church of Christ, then, never awake to a subject so immensely important? Believers in the gospel of peace, followers of the Prince of Peace, sons and daughters of the God of Peace, can you still fold your own hands in apathy or despair, and let such a fell destroyer of mankind for two worlds continue his work of death and perdition, unchecked, unresisted by any efforts or even prayers from you?

We know you would not, could not, if you only saw,—as due inquiry and reflection would certainly show you,—how efforts

made by Christians as they should be, would banish this terrible scourge ere long from Christendom, and eventually from the face of the whole earth. There is no impossibility in the case. War is just as curable as any other evil, and requires for its extinction only the means of God's appointment. There is no more *need* of this custom than there is of duelling or the Slave-trade. It exists solely because men in their folly still choose it; its continuance depends entirely on their choice; and whenever you can change that choice, and make the mass of mankind resolve that war *shall* cease, it *must* of necessity come to an end at once and forever. Such a change is clearly possible; already is it rapidly taking place under the influence of this cause; and nations will one day find it just as easy for *them* to settle their difficulties without war, as the members of a Church now do theirs without duels. A variety of substitutes *might* be adopted far more effectual than the sword for all purposes of protection and redress.

But you tell us perhaps, 'Make men Christians, and then wars will cease.' What sort of Christians? Surely not such as have for fifteen centuries been butchering one another! Convert men to the *whole* gospel, to its pacific as well as its other truths, to a kind of Christianity that shall forbid them to fight in any case; then, and only then, will the spread of our religion insure the abolition of this custom. Christianity has for ages been pretty steadily gaining ground in Christendom; and yet in the last century have her standing warriors increased not less than six hundred per cent., from half a million to more than three millions! Can *such* a Christianity put an end to war?

It is not enough, then, merely to support and to propagate *any* form of Christianity which neglects to apply the *only* part of the gospel that can ever abolish this custom. For such a result, we rely of course upon the gospel, but only on the gospel *rightly applied*. Such an application is indispensable. What *is* the gospel? Merely a collection of principles which can produce no result without an application, any more than medicine can cure a sick man who does not take it. How does the gospel convert the sinner? Only by its truths addressed to his soul. How will it ever abolish paganism? Solely by being sent and applied to paganism. How can it reclaim the blasphemer or the Sabbath-breaker? Only by a direct, specific application to their sins. In no other way can it cure *any* moral evil; and in like manner must we apply the gospel to war, before the spread of Christianity will insure a corresponding prevalence of peace.

But are you waiting for the millenium to come, and saying that, when it does come,—never before,—peace will follow as a matter of course? Very true; and so will repentance and faith follow as a matter of course; but how are you to reach the millenium? Would you first get into the millenium, and then convert the world? Is the millenium to make men Christians, or the making of all men Christians to be itself the millenium? How would you introduce a millenium of repentance? Simply by first filling the world with repentance—with men penitent for

their sins. How a millenium of faith? Solely by filling the world with faith—with believers in Jesus. How then a millenium of peace? In the same way; for peace, just like repentance and faith, must come *before* the millenium, as one of its indispensable harbingers, or along *with* the millenium, as one of its inseparable concomitants; for, unless men are converted to peace as fast as they are to God, *such* a conversion of the whole world plainly could not ensure its entire, perpetual pacification.

But come that glorious era must, for God himself hath promised it as explicitly as he has the world's conversion, or the salvation of any believer in Christ; yet it never can come, any more than either of those results, without the use of such means as he hath appointed for the purpose. These means are all included in such an application of the gospel as shall everywhere Christianize the public mind on this subject. War has, in every age and clime, resulted from a public opinion grossly perverted; that opinion must be radically, universally, permanently changed; and for the production of such a change, first in Christendom, and finally through the world, all the main-springs of influence upon the popular mind must be set and kept at work. The pulpit must speak often and aloud; the press, with her thousand tongues, must speak in the ear of all reading communities; instructors in all our seminaries of learning must speak to the young minds under their care; teachers in Sabbath-schools must speak to their pupils; every pious parent or guardian must speak to the group of interesting minds clustered around his own fireside; every Church, every Christian, every friend of God or man, high and low, old and young, male and female, should zealously cooperate in using the means which God has appointed to usher in that glorious era when nations shall beat their swords into plough-shares, their spears into pruning-hooks, and cease from learning the art of war any more.

Remember, then, the absolute necessity of means, and use all in your power. Can you write, or speak, or pray for this cause? Then do so. Have you influence? Then use it. Have you money? Be sure to give a portion of it; nor forget for how many purposes the cause needs such aid. We must support agencies, send forth lecturers, and scatter periodicals, tracts and volumes through the land. Such operations, altogether indispensable, require a large amount of funds; and Christians should at length give to this cause as liberally as they do to other causes that aim in like manner at the glory of God in the present and immortal welfare of mankind.

THE ONLY REMEDY FOR WAR.

BY W. E. CHANNING, D. D.

IF the most terrible view of war be, that it is the triumph and jubilee of selfish and malignant passions, then its true cure is to be sought in the diffusion of the principles of Universal Justice and Love, in that spirit of Jesus Christ which expels the demons of selfishness and malignity from the heart. Even supposing that war could be abolished by processes which leave the human character unchanged, that it could be terminated by the progress of a civilization which, whilst softening manners, would not diminish the selfishness, mercenariness, hard-heartedness, fraud, ambition of men, its worst evils would still remain, and society would reap in some other forms the fruits of its guilt. God has ordained, that the wickedness within us shall always find its expression and punishment in outward evil. War is the fiend within coming out. Human history is nothing more than the inward nature manifested in its native acts and issues. Let the soul continue unchanged; and, should war cease, the inward plague would still find its way to the surface. The infernal fire at the centre of our being, though it should not break forth in the wasting volcano, would not slumber, but by other eruptions, more insensible, yet not less deadly, would lay waste human happiness. I do not believe that any remedy but the Christian spirit can avail against war. The wild beast, that has gorged on millions of victims in every age, is not to be tamed by a polished or selfish civilization. Christianity is the only true remedy for war; not Christianity in name, not such Christianity as we see, not such as has grown up under arbitrary governments in church and state, not such as characterizes any Christian sect at the present day; but Christianity as it lived in the soul, and came forth in the life of its founder; a religion that reveals man as the object of God's infinite love, and which commends him to the unbounded love of his brethren; a religion, the essence of which is self-denial, self-sacrifice, in the cause of human nature; a religion, which proscribes, as among the worst sins, the passion of man for rule and dominion over his fellow-creatures; which knows nothing of rich or poor, high or low, bond or free, and casts down all the walls of partition which sever men from one another's sympathy and respect.

Christian love alone can supplant war; and this love is not a mere emotion, a tenderness awakened by human suffering, but an intelligent, moral, spiritual love, a perception and deep feeling of the sacredness of human nature, a recognition of the inalienable rights, the solemn claims of every human being. It protests fearlessly against all wrong, no matter how obscure the victim. It desires to lift up each and all, no matter how fallen. It is a sym-

pathy with the spiritual principle dwelling under every human form. This is the love which is to conquer war; but, as yet, this has been little diffused. The love which Christ breathes, which looks through man's body to the immortal spirit, which sees something divine in the rational and moral powers of the lowest human being, and which challenges for the lowest, the sympathy, respect, and fostering aid of his race; this has been rare, and yet it is only by the gradual diffusion of this, that the plague of war can be stayed. This regard for humanity, could it even prevail through a narrow sphere, could it bind together but a small body of men, would send forth a testimony against war, which would break the slumber of the Christian world, and strike awe into many a contemner of his race.

I am aware, that others are hoping for the abolition of war by other causes; and other causes, I am aware, must be brought into action. I only say, that, unless joined with the spirit of Christianity, they give no assurance of continued repose. This thought I would briefly illustrate. The present unusual cessation of arms in the Christian world (1839) is to some a promise of a happier era in human affairs. It is indeed a cheering fact, and may well surprise us, when we consider how many causes of war have been in action, how many threatening clouds have overcast the political sky, during the pause of war. But if we examine the causes of this tranquillity, we shall learn not to confide in it too strongly.

1. The first cause was the exhaustion in which Europe was left by the bloody conflicts of the French Revolution. The nations, worn out with struggles, wasted by successive invasions, and staggering under an unprecedented load of debt, yearned for repose. The strong man had bled too freely to fight more. For years poverty has kept the peace in Europe. One of the fruits of civilization is the increasing expensiveness of war, so that when the voice of humanity cannot be heard, the hollow sound of an empty treasury is a warning which cannot be slighted. This cause of peace is evidently temporary. Nations, resting from exhaustion, may be expected to renew their pernicious activity, when their strength is renewed.

2. Another cause of the continuance of peace is undoubtedly the extension of new and profitable relations through the civilized world. Since the pacification of Europe, in 1816, a new impulse has been given to industry. The discoveries of science have been applied with wonderful success to the useful arts. Nations have begun in earnest to develop their resources. Labor is discovered to be the grand conqueror, enriching and building up nations more surely than the proudest battles. As a necessary result of this new impulse, commerce has been wonderfully enlarged. Nations send the products of their soil and machinery, where once they sent armies; and such a web of common interests has been woven, that hostilities can spring up in no corner of the civilized world, without deranging in a measure the order and industry of every other state.

Undoubtedly we have here a promise of peace; but let us not be too sanguine. We have just begun this career, and we know not its end. Let wealth grow without a corresponding growth of the temperate, just and benevolent spirit of Christianity, and I see few auguries but of evil. Wealth breeds power, and power always tempts to wrong. Communities, which at once grow rich and licentious, breed desperate men, unprincipled adventurers, restless spirits, who unsettle social order at home, who make freedom a cloak and instrument of ambition, and find an interest in embroiling their country with foreign foes. Another consequence of growing prosperity, is the rapid growth of population; and this, in the absence of Christian restraints and Christian principles, tends to pauperism and crime, tends to make men cheap, and to destroy the sacredness of human life; and communities are tempted to throw off this dangerous load, this excess of numbers, in foreign war. In truth, the vices which fester in the bosom of a prosperous, licentious, over-peopled state, are hardly less fearful than those of war, and they naturally seek and find their punishment in this awful calamity. Let us not speak of industry, commerce and wealth, as ensuring peace. Is commerce never jealous and grasping? Have commercial states no collisions? Have commercial rights never drawn the sword in self-defence? Are not such states a tempting prey? And have they no desire to prey on others? Why then expect from trade alone peace among nations? Nothing, nothing can bind nations together but Christian justice and love. I insist on this the more earnestly, because it is the fashion now to trust for every good to commerce, industry, and the wonderful inventions which promise indefinite increase of wealth. With all our ingenuity, we can frame no machinery for manufacturing wisdom, virtue, peace. Rail-roads and steam-boats cannot speed the soul to its perfection. This must come, if it come at all, from each man's action on himself, from "hunger and thirst after righteousness," not after wealth; and I do fear, that without some great spiritual revolution, without some new life and love breathed into the church, without some deep social reforms, men will turn against each other their new accumulations of power; that their wealth and boasted inventions will be converted into weapons of destruction; that the growing prosperity of nations will become the nutriment of more wasteful wars, will become fuel for more devouring fires of ambition or revenge.

3. Another cause of the recent long cessation of foreign wars, has been the dread of internal convulsions, of civil wars. The spirit of revolution has, more or less, penetrated the whole civilized world. The grand idea of Human Rights has found its way even into despotisms. Kings have less confidence in their subjects and soldiers. Their thrones totter; and it is understood that the next general war will be a war not of nations, but of principles, that absolutism must measure swords with liberalism, despotism with free constitutions; and from this terrible encounter both parties recoil.

We believe that, with or without war, liberal principles and institutions are destined to advance, to make the conquest of Europe; and it is thought, that these, being recognitions of human rights, will be less prodigal of human blood than absolute power. But can we hope, that these, unsanctioned, unsustained by the Christian spirit, will ensure peace? What teaches our own experience? Because free, have *we* no wars? What indeed is the free spirit of which we so much boast? Is it not much more a jealousy of our own rights, than a reverence for the rights of all? Does it not consist with the inflictions of gross wrongs? Does it not spoil the Indian, and enslave the African? Is it not anxious to spread bondage over new regions? Who can look on this free country, distracted by parties, rent by local jealousies, in some districts administering justice by mobs, and silencing speech and the press by conflagration and bloodshed, who can see this free country, and say, that liberal opinions and institutions are of themselves to banish war? No where are the just, impartial, disinterested principles of Christianity so much needed as in a free state. No where are there more elements of strife to be composed, more passions to be curbed, more threatened wrongs to be repressed. Without Christian principle, freedom may swell the tide of tumults and war.

4. One other cause will probably be assigned by some for the long cessation of hostilities—the greater success of statesmen in securing that long sought good among nations, the balance of power. Be it so. But how soon may this balance be disturbed? How does it tremble now? Europe has long been threatened by the disproportionate growth of Russia, which, many fear, is one day to grasp at universal empire. All Europe is interested in setting bounds to this half-civilized despotism. But the great absolute powers, Prussia and Austria, dreading more the progress of liberal opinions than of Russian hordes, may rather throw themselves into her scale, and be found fighting with her the battles of legitimacy against free institutions. Many wise men dismiss these fears as vain. I presume not to read the future. My single object is, to show the uncertainty of all means of abolishing war, unless joined with, and governed by the spreading spirit of our disinterested faith. No calculations of interest, no schemes of policy, can do the work of love, of the spirit of human brotherhood. There can be no peace without, but through peace within. Society must be an expression of the souls of its members. Man's character moulds his outward lot. His destiny is woven by the good or evil principles which bear rule in his breast. I indeed attach importance to all the causes of peace which I have now stated. They are far from powerless; but their power will be spent in vain unless by a mightier and diviner energy, by the force of moral and religious principles, the strength of disinterested love, the true spirit of the gospel breathed into individuals, and through whole communities.

A SOLEMN REVIEW OF WAR.

BY NOAH WORCESTER, D. D.

WE regard with horror the custom of the ancient heathens in offering their children a sacrifice to idols. We are shocked with the customs of the Hindoos in prostrating themselves before the car of an idol to be crushed to death; in burning women alive on the funeral piles of their husbands; in casting their children, a monthly sacrifice, into the Ganges to be drowned. We read with astonishment of the sacrifices made in Papal crusades, and in Mahometan and Hindoo pilgrimages. But that which is fashionable and popular in any country, is esteemed right and honorable, whatever may be its nature in the views of men better informed.

But while we look back, with a mixture of wonder, indignation and pity, on many of the customs of former ages, are we careful to inquire, whether some customs which we deem honorable, are not the effects of popular delusion? Is it not a fact, that one of the most horrid customs of savage men is now popular in every nation in Christendom? What custom of the most barbarous nations is more repugnant to the feelings of piety, humanity and justice, than that of deciding controversies between nations by the edge of the sword, by powder and ball, or the point of the bayonet? What other savage custom has occasioned half the desolation and misery to the human race? And what, but the grossest infatuation, could render such a custom popular among rational beings?

When we consider how great a part of mankind have perished by the hands of each other, and how large a portion of human calamity has resulted from war, it surely cannot appear indifferent, whether this custom is or is not the effect of delusion. Certainly there is no custom which deserves a more thorough examination, than that which has occasioned more slaughter and misery than all the other abominable customs of the heathen world.

War has been so long fashionable amongst all nations, that its enormity is little regarded; or, when thought of at all, it is usually considered as an evil necessary and unavoidable; but cannot the state of society and the views of civilized men be so changed as to abolish so barbarous a custom, and render wars unnecessary and avoidable?

Some may be ready to exclaim, 'none but God can produce such an effect as the abolition of war; and we must wait for the millennial day.' We admit that God only can produce the necessary change in the state of society, and the views of men; but God works by human agency and human means. None but God could have produced such a change in the views of the British nation, as to abolish the slave-trade; yet the event was brought about by a long course of persevering and honorable exertions of benevo-

lent men. When the thing was first proposed, it probably appeared to the majority of the people, as an unavailing and chimerical project; but God raised up powerful advocates, gave them the spirit of perseverance, and finally crowned their efforts with glorious success. Now, it is probable, thousands of people are wondering how such an abominable traffic ever had existence in a nation which had the least pretensions to Christianity or civilization. In a similar manner God can put an end to war, and fill the world with astonishment, that rational beings ever thought of such a mode of settling national controversies.

As to waiting for the millennium to put an end to war without any exertions on our own part, it is like the sinner's waiting God's time for conversion, while he pursues his course of vice and impiety. If ever there shall be a millennium in which the sword will cease to devour, it will probably be effected by the blessing of God on the benevolent exertions of enlightened men. Perhaps no one thing is now a greater obstacle in the way of this wished for state of the church, than the spirit and custom of war which is maintained by Christians themselves. Is it not then time, that efforts should be made to enlighten the minds of Christians on a subject of such infinite importance to the happiness of the human race? That such a state of things is desirable, no enlightened Christian can deny. That it can be produced without expensive and persevering efforts, is not imagined. But are not such efforts to exclude the miseries of war from the world, as laudable as those which have for their object the support of such a malignant and desolating custom?

The whole amount of property in the United States is probably of far less value than what has been expended and destroyed within two centuries by wars in Christendom. Suppose, then, that one-fifth of this amount had been judiciously laid out by peace associations in the different states and nations, in cultivating the spirit and arts of peace, and in exciting a just abhorrence of war, would not the other four-fifths have been in a great measure saved, besides many millions of lives, and an immense portion of misery? Had the whole value of what has been expended in wars, been appropriated to the promotion of peace, how laudable would have been the appropriation, and how blessed the consequences!

Let us glance at the pleas in favor of war. 'The Israelites were permitted, and even commanded to make war on the inhabitants of Canaan.'—To this it may be answered, that the Giver and Arbiter of life had a right, if he pleased, to make use of the savage customs of the age for punishing guilty nations. If any government of the present day should receive a commission to make war as the Israelites did, let the order be obeyed; but until they have such a commission, let it not be imagined that they can innocently make war. God has, moreover, given encouragement, that under the reign of the Messiah, there shall be such a time of peace, "that nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war

any more." If this prediction shall ever be fulfilled, the present delusion in favor of war must be done away. How is it to be fulfilled? Probably not by miraculous agency, but by the blessing of God on the benevolent exertions of individuals to open the eyes of their fellow-mortals in respect to the evils and delusions of war, and the blessings of peace.

A second plea may be this, that war is an advantage to a nation, as it usually takes off many vicious and dangerous characters.—But does not war make two such characters for every one it removes? Is it not in fact the greatest school of depravity, and the greatest source of mischievous and dangerous characters that ever existed among men? Does not a state of war lower down the standard of morality in a nation, so that a vast portion of common vice is scarcely observed as evil? Besides, is it not awful to think of sending vicious men beyond the means of reformation and the hope of repentance? When they are sent into the army, what is this but consigning them to a state where they will rapidly fill up the measure of their iniquity, and become "fitted to destruction?"

It will be pleaded, thirdly, that no substitute for war can be devised, which will insure to a nation a redress of wrongs.—But is it common for a nation to obtain a redress of wrongs by war? As to redress, do not the wars of nations resemble boxing at a tavern, when both the combatants receive a terrible bruising, then drink together, and make peace, each, however, bearing for a long time the marks of his folly and madness? A redress of wrongs by war is so uncommon, that unless revenge is redress, and multiplied injuries satisfaction, we should suppose that none but madmen would run the hazard.

But if the eyes of people could be opened in regard to the evils and delusions of war, would it not be easy to form a confederacy of nations, and organize a high court of equity to decide national controversies? Why might not such a court be composed of some of the most eminent characters from each nation, and a compliance with its decisions be made a point of national honor, to prevent the effusion of blood, and to preserve the blessings of peace? Can any considerate person say, that the probability of obtaining right in such a court, would be less than by an appeal to arms? When an individual appeals to a court of justice for the redress of wrongs, it is not always the case that he obtains his right. Still such an appeal is more honorable, more safe, and more certain, as well as more benevolent, than for the individual to attempt to obtain redress by his pistol, or his sword. And are not the reasons for avoiding an appeal to the sword for the redress of wrongs, always great in proportion to the calamities which such an appeal must naturally involve? If this be a fact, then there is infinitely greater reason, why two nations should avoid an appeal to arms, than usually exists against a bloody combat between two contending individuals.

It may be urged, also, that a spirit of forbearance on the part of a national government, would operate as an invitation to repeated

insult and aggression.—But is this plea founded on facts and experience? Does it accord with what is well known of human nature? Who are the persons in society that most frequently receive insult and abuse? Are they the meek, the benevolent, and the forbearing? Do these more commonly have reason to complain, than persons of quick resentment, who are ready to fight on the least provocation? There are two sects of professed Christians in this country, peculiar in their opinions respecting the lawfulness of war, and the right of repelling injury by violence,—the Quakers and the Shakers. Now, does it appear from experience, that their forbearing spirit brings on them a greater portion of injury and insult than is experienced by people of other sects? Is not the reverse of this true in fact? There may indeed be some instances of such gross depravity, as a person's taking advantage of their pacific character to do them injury with the hope of impunity; but in general, their pacific principles and spirit command the esteem even of the vicious, and operate as a shield from insult and abuse. How seldom, too, do children of a mild, forbearing temper experience insult or injury, compared with the waspish who will sting if touched? The same inquiry may be made in respect to persons of these opposite descriptions of every age, and in every situation of life; and the result will be favorable to the point in question.

Should any deny the applicability of these examples to national rulers, we will produce one example undeniably applicable. When William Penn took the government of Pennsylvania, he distinctly avowed to the Indians his forbearing and pacific principles, and his benevolent wishes for uninterrupted peace with them. On these principles the government was administered, while it remained in the hands of the Quakers. What then was the effect? Did this pacific character in government invite aggression and insult? Let the answer be given in the language of the Edinburgh Review of the Life of William Penn. Speaking of the treaty made by Penn with the Indians, the Reviewer says:—"Such indeed was the spirit in which the negotiation was entered into, and the corresponding settlement conducted, that for the space of more than seventy years, so long indeed as the Quakers retained the chief power in the government, the peace and amity which had been thus solemnly promised and concluded, never was violated; and a large though solitary example afforded, of the facility with which they who are really sincere and friendly in their views, may live in harmony with those who are supposed to be peculiarly fierce and faithless."

Some of the evils of wars have already been mentioned; but the field is almost boundless. The demoralizing and depraving effects of war cannot be too seriously considered. We have heard much of the corrupting tendency of some of the rites and customs of the heathen; but what custom of the heathen nations had a greater effect in depraving the human character, than the custom

of war? What is that feeling usually called a war-spirit, but a deleterious compound of enthusiastic ardor, ambition, malignity and revenge, a compound which as really endangers the soul of the possessor, as the life of his enemy! Who, but a person deranged or deluded, would think it safe to rush into the presence of his Judge with his heart boiling with enmity, and his brother's blood dripping from his hands! Yet in time of war, how much pains is taken to excite and maintain this blood-thirsty disposition as essential to success!

The profession of a soldier exposes him to sudden and untimely death, and at the same time hardens his heart, and renders him regardless of his final account. When a person goes into the army, it is expected of him that he will rise above the fear of death. In doing this, he too commonly rises above the fear of God, and all serious concern for his soul. It is not denied that some men sustain virtuous characters amidst the contaminating vapors of a camp, and some may be reformed by a sense of the dangers to which they are exposed; but these are uncommon occurrences.

The depravity occasioned by war, is not confined to the army. Every species of vice gains ground in a nation during war. And when a war is brought to a close, seldom, perhaps, does a community return to its former standard of morals. In time of peace, vice and irreligion generally retain the ground they acquired by a war. As every war augments the amount of national depravity, so it proportionably increases the dangers and miseries of society.

Among the evils of war, a wanton undervaluing of human life ought to be mentioned. This effect may appear in various forms. When a war is declared for the redress of some wrong in regard to property, if nothing but property be taken into consideration, the result is not commonly better than spending five hundred dollars in a law-suit to recover a debt of ten. But when we come to estimate human lives against dollars and cents, how are we confounded! "All that a man hath will he give for his life."

If by the custom of war rulers learn to undervalue the lives of their own subjects, how much more do they undervalue the lives of their enemies! As they learn to hear of the loss of five hundred or a thousand of their own men with perhaps less feeling than they would hear of the death of a favorite horse or dog; so they learn to hear of the death of thousands after thousands on the side of the enemy, with joy and exultation. If their own men have succeeded in taking an unimportant fortress, or a frigate, with the loss of fifty lives on their own side, and fifty-one on the other, this is a matter of joy and triumph. This time they have got the game. But, alas! at what expense to others! This expense, however, does not interrupt the joy of war-makers. They leave it to the wounded, and the friends of the dead, to feel and to mourn.

This dreadful depravity of feeling is not confined to rulers in time of war. The army becomes abandoned to such depravity.

They learn to undervalue not only the lives of their enemies, but even their own, and will often wantonly rush into the arms of death, for the sake of military glory. And more or less of the same want of feeling, and the same undervaluing of human life, extend through the nation in proportion to the frequency of battles, and the duration of war.

If any thing be done by the army of one nation, which is deemed by the other as contrary to the modern usages in war, how soon do we hear the exclamation of Goths and Vandals! Yet what are Christians at war, better than those barbarous tribes? And what is the war-spirit in them, better than the spirit of Goths and Vandals? When the war-spirit is excited, it is not always to be circumscribed in its operations by the refinements of civilization. It is at best a bloody and desolating spirit. What is our boast of civilization, or Christianization, while we tolerate, as popular and justifiable, the most horrid custom which ever resulted from human wickedness? Should a period arrive when the nations "shall learn war no more," what will posterity think of our claims, as Christians and civilized men? The custom of sacrificing men by war, may appear to them as the blackest of all heathen superstitions. Its present popularity may appear as wonderful to ages to come, as the past popularity of any ancient custom now does to us. What! they may exclaim, could those be Christians, who could sacrifice men by thousands to a point of honor, falsely so called, or to obtain a redress of a trifling wrong in regard to property? If such were the customs of Christians, what were they better than the heathens of their own time?

Perhaps some apologist may rise up in that day, and plead, that it appears from the history of our times, that it was supposed necessary to the safety of a nation, that its government should be quick to assume a warlike tone and attitude, upon every infringement of their rights; that magnanimous forbearance was considered as pusillanimity, and that Christian meekness was thought intolerable in the character of a ruler.

To this others may reply—Could these professed Christians imagine, that their safety depended on displaying a spirit the reverse of their Master's? Could they suppose such a temper best calculated to insure the protection of Him who held their destiny in his hands? Did they not know, that wars were of a demoralizing tendency, and that the greatest danger of a nation resulted from its corruption and depravity? Did they not also know, that a haughty spirit of resentment in one government, was very sure to provoke a similar spirit in another? That one war usually paved the way for a repetition of similar calamities, by depraving each of the contending parties, and by fixing enmities and jealousies which would be ready to break forth on the most frivolous occasions?

That we may obtain a still clearer view of the delusions of war, let us look back to the origin of society. Suppose a family, like that of Noah, to commence the settlement of a country. They multiply into a number of distinct families. Then in the

course of years, they become so numerous as to form distinct governments. In any stage of their progress, unfortunate disputes might arise by the imprudence, the avarice, or the ambition of individuals.

Now, at what period would it be proper to introduce the custom of deciding controversies by the edge of the sword, or an appeal to arms? Might this be done when the families had increased to ten? Who would not be shocked at the madness of introducing such a custom under such circumstances? Might it then with more propriety be done when the families had multiplied to fifty, or to a hundred, or a thousand, or ten thousand? The greater the number, the greater the danger, the carnage and calamity. Besides, what reason can be given, why this mode of deciding controversies would not be as proper when there were but ten families, as when there were ten thousand? And why might not two individuals thus decide disputes, as well as two nations?

Perhaps all will admit that the custom could not be honorably introduced, until they separated, and formed two or more distinct governments. But would this change of circumstances dissolve their ties as brethren, and their obligations as accountable beings? Would the organization of distinct governments confer a right on rulers to appeal to arms for the settlement of controversies? Is it not manifest, that no period can be assigned, at which the introduction of such a custom would not be absolute murder? And shall a custom which must have been murderous at its commencement, be now upheld as necessary and honorable?

‘But, we must consider what mankind are, and not what they would have been, had wars never been introduced.’—True, we should consider both; and by what ought to have been the state of society, we may discover the present delusion. If it would have been to the honor of the human race, had the custom of war never commenced, it must be desirable to dispel the present darkness, and exterminate the desolating scourge. The same objection might have been made to the proposition in the British Parliament for the abolition of the slave-trade; the same may now be made against any attempt to abolish the custom of human sacrifices among the Hindoos; yea, the same may be urged against every attempt to root out pernicious and immoral customs of long standing.

Let it then be seriously considered, how abominably murderous the custom must have been in its origin; how precarious the mode of obtaining redress; how often the aggressor is successful; how small a part even of the successful nation is ever benefited by the war; how a nation is almost uniformly impoverished by the contest; how many individuals are absolutely ruined as to property, or morals, or both; and what a multitude of fellow-creatures are hurried into eternity in an untimely manner, and an unprepared state; and who can hesitate a moment to denounce war as the effect of popular delusion?

Let every Christian seriously consider the malignant nature of that spirit which war-makers evidently wish to excite, and compare it with the temper of Jesus; and where is the Christian who would not shudder at the thought of dying in the exercise of the common war-spirit, and also at the thought of being the instrument of exciting such a spirit in his fellow-men? Any custom which cannot be supported but by exciting in men the very temper of the devil, ought surely to be banished from the Christian world.

The impression that aggressive war is murderous, is general among Christians, if not universal. The justness of the impression seems to be admitted by almost every government in going to war. For this reason, each of two governments endeavors to fix on the other the charge of aggression, and to assume to itself the ground of defending some right, or avenging some wrong. Thus each excuses itself, and charges the other with all the blood and misery which result from the contest. But these facts, so far from affording a plea in favor of war, afford a weighty reason for its abolition. If the aggressor is a murderer, and answerable for the blood shed in war; if one or the other must be viewed by God as the aggressor; and if such is the delusion attending war, that each party is liable to consider the other as the aggressor; surely there must be serious danger of a nation's being involved in the guilt of murder, while they imagine they have a cause which may be justified.

So prone are men to be blinded by their passions, their prejudices, and their interests, that in most private quarrels, each of two individuals persuades himself that he is in the right, and his neighbor in the wrong. Hence the propriety of arbitrations, references, and appeals to courts of justice, that persons more disinterested may judge, and prevent that injustice and desolation which would result from deciding private disputes by single combats, or acts of violence.

But rulers of nations are as liable to be misled by their passions and interests as other men; and, when misled, they are very sure to mislead those of their subjects who have confidence in their wisdom and integrity. Hence it is highly important that the custom of war should be abolished, and some other mode adopted to settle disputes between nations. In private disputes there may be cause of complaint on each side, while neither has reason to shed the blood of the other, much less to shed the blood of innocent family connections, neighbors and friends. So of two nations, each may have cause of complaint, while neither can be justified in making war, and much less in shedding the blood of innocent people who have had no hand in giving the offence.

It is an awful feature in the character of war, and a strong reason why it should not be countenanced, that it involves the innocent with the guilty in the calamities it inflicts, and often falls with the greatest vengeance on those who have had no concern in the management of national affairs. It surely is not a crime to be born in a country which is afterwards invaded; yet in how

many instances do war-makers punish, or destroy, for no other crime than being a native or resident of an invaded territory! A mode of revenge or redress which makes no distinction between the innocent and the guilty, ought to be discountenanced by every friend to justice and humanity. Besides, as the rulers of a nation are as liable as other people to be governed by passion and prejudice, there is as little prospect of justice in permitting war for the decision of national disputes, as there would be in permitting an incensed individual to be, in his own cause, complainant, witness, judge, jury and executioner. In what point of view then is war not to be regarded with horror?

That wars have been so overruled by God as to be the occasion of some benefits to mankind, will not be denied; for the same may be said of every custom that ever was popular among men. War may have been the occasion of advancing useful arts and sciences, and even of spreading the gospel; but we are not to do evil that good may come, nor to countenance evil because God may overrule it for good.

‘But war gives opportunity for the display of extraordinary talents—of daring enterprise and intrepidity.’—True; but let robbery and piracy become as popular as war has been; and will not these customs give as great opportunity for the display of the same talents and qualities of mind? Shall we therefore encourage robbery and piracy? Indeed it may be asked, do we *not* encourage these crimes? For what is modern warfare but a popular, refined and legalized mode of robbery, piracy and murder, preceded by a proclamation giving notice of the purpose of the war-maker? The answer of a pirate to Alexander the Great, was as just as it was severe:—“By what right,” said the king, “do you infest the seas?” The pirate replied, “By the same that you infest the universe. But because I do it in a small ship, I am called a robber; and because you do the same acts with a great fleet, you are called a conqueror!” Equally just was the language of the Scythian ambassadors to the same deluded monarch, “Thou boastest, that the only design of thy marches is to extirpate robbers. Thou thyself art the greatest robber in the world.”

Is it not, then, time for Christians to learn not to attach glory to guilt, or to praise actions which God will condemn? That Alexander possessed talents worthy of admiration, will be admitted; but when such talents are prostituted to the vile purposes of military fame by spreading destruction and misery through the world, a character is formed which should be branded with everlasting infamy. And nothing, perhaps, short of the commission of such atrocious deeds, can more endanger the welfare of a community, than the applause given to successful military desperadoes. Murder and robbery are not the less criminal for being perpetrated by a king, or a mighty warrior.

Shall the Christian world, then, remain silent in regard to the enormity of this custom, and even applaud the deeds of men who were a curse to the age in which they lived? On the same prin-

ciple we may applaud the chief of a band of robbers and pirates in proportion to his ingenuity, intrepidity and address in doing mischief. But if we attach glory to such exploits, do we not encourage others to adopt the same road to fame? Besides, would not such applause betray a most depraved taste; a taste which makes no proper distinction between virtue and vice, or doing good, and doing mischief; a taste to be captivated with the glare of bold exploits, but regardless of their end, or the means by which they were accomplished, of the misery they occasion to others, or the light in which they must be viewed by a benevolent God?

An important question now occurs. Is it not possible to produce such a change in the state of society, and the views of Christian nations, that every ruler shall feel his honor, safety and happiness, to depend on his displaying a pacific spirit, and forbearing to engage in war? Cannot peace societies be extended through Christendom, to support its government, and secure the nation from war? In these societies we may hope to engage every true minister of the Prince of Peace, and every Christian who possesses his temper. Let the contributions be liberal, corresponding in some measure with the importance of the object, and be judiciously appropriated in diffusing light on the subject in every direction, and exciting a just abhorrence of war in every breast. Let every land be filled with newspapers, tracts and periodical works, adapted to the same purpose. The object so perfectly harmonious with the gospel, might be frequently the subject of discussion in the pulpit, of Sabbath and every day conversation, and of our daily prayers to God.

Especially should early education in families, common schools, academies and universities, be made every where subservient to this object. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." The power of education has been tried to make children of a ferocious, blood-thirsty character; let it now have a fair chance to see what it will do towards making mild, friendly and peaceful citizens.

As there is an aversion to war in a large majority of every civilized people, and as its evils have been felt in every Christian nation, will it not be as easy to excite a disposition for peace, as for war? If then such means should be put in operation, as have been suggested, would not the most beneficial effects result? Would they not gradually produce an important change in the views of society, and give a new character to Christian nations? What institution or project would more naturally unite all pious and virtuous men? On what effort could we more reasonably hope for the blessing of the God of Peace?

Bible Societies in various parts of the world, must naturally and even necessarily aid our object. Indeed the two objects are so congenial, that whatever promotes the one, will aid the other. The same may be said of all Societies for Propagating the Gospel; and, should these all cordially co-operate, they must form a most powerful association. The societies of Friends and Shakers will

also come in of course, and cordially contribute to the glorious object. May we not also expect a ready acquiescence and co-operation from the particular churches of every denomination in the land?

True; there are obstacles, but none insurmountable, because God will aid, and the time is at hand when his promise of universal peace shall be fulfilled. Nor is the object of a party nature. The delusion in respect to war, is confined to no nation, sect or party; and our remarks are designed not to cast reproach on any class, but to benefit all who have not examined the subject, and arouse Christians to united and vigorous efforts for the peace of the world.

Here Christians of every sect may find an object worthy of their attention, in which they may cordially unite. For this object they may with propriety leave behind all party zeal and party distinctions, and bury their animosities in one united effort to give peace to the world. Let lawyers, politicians and divines, men of every class who can write or speak, consecrate their talents to the diffusion of light, and love, and peace. Should there be an effort, such as the object demands, God will grant his blessing, posterity will be grateful, heaven will be filled with joy and praise, and "the sword shall not devour forever."

If war is ever to be set aside, an effort must some time be made; and why not now, as well as at any future day? What objection can now be stated, which may not be brought forward at any after period? If men must have objects for the display of heroism, let their intrepidity be shown in firmly meeting the formidable prejudices of a world in favor of war. Here is an opportunity for the display of such heroism as will occasion no remorse on a dying bed, such as God will approve at the final reckoning. In this cause, ardent zeal, genuine patriotism, undaunted fortitude, the spirit of enterprise, and every quality of mind worthy of a hero, may be gloriously displayed.

There is nothing in the nature of mankind, which renders war necessary and unavoidable. The Quakers, Shakers and Moravians are of the same nature with other people. All the difference between them and others results from education and habit. The principles of their teachers are impressed on the minds of old and young; and an aversion to war and violence is excited, which becomes habitual, and has a governing influence over their hearts, their passions and their lives. If then it has been found possible, by the force of education, to produce such an aversion to war, that people will not even defend their own lives by acts of violence, shall it be thought impossible to destroy the popularity of war, and exclude this deadly custom from the abodes of men?

It will be generally admitted, that the Christian religion has abolished the practice of enslaving captives, and mitigated the evils of war; that, if the temper of our Savior should universally prevail, wars must cease; and that the Scriptures give reason to hope for such a time of peace as the result of our religion. If so, does it not follow, that the custom of war is directly opposed to the

gospel; that in proportion as the gospel has its proper effect, an aversion to war must be excited; and that every Christian should do all in his power to bring the custom into disrepute, and effect its abolition?

Can Christians hold their peace, while this custom is sweeping off myriads of their brethren into eternity by violence and murder? Can they forbear to exert themselves to put an end to this voluntary plague? If war is opposed to our religion, and God designs to put an end to this scourge by the influence of the gospel, can we still sleep on without an effort to secure this promised and expected result? It can come only from the efforts of Christians; and so long as they acquiesce in the custom, this desirable event will be delayed. Christianity itself is not an intelligent agent; neither a God, an angel, nor a man. It is only a system of divine instructions, to be used by men for their own benefit, the benefit of each other, and the honor of its Author. Like all other instructions, they are of no use any further than they are reduced to practice.

In what way, then, can Christianity ever put an end to war, but by enlightening the minds of men on the subject? Can war cease while Christians themselves are its advocates? If men are to be saved by the preaching of the gospel, the gospel must be preached; and so, if this world is to be delivered from war by the gospel, it must be applied for the purpose. Its pacific tendencies must be illustrated, its opposition to war displayed in the lives of Christians, and men influenced by its motives to cease from destroying one another. We expect the abolition of idolatry, and human sacrifices; but how? Will our Bibles spread their covers for wings, fly through the world, and convert the nations without the agency of Christians? Would the gospel ever convert the heathen from their idolatry, if Christians should themselves encourage idolaters by a compliance with their customs? But as little may we expect the gospel will make wars cease without the exertions of Christians, and while they countenance the custom by their own example.

Is it pleaded, that men are not sufficiently enlightened, but we must wait for a more improved state of society? Improved in what? In the science of blood? Are *such* improvements to prepare the way for peace? Why not wait a few centuries until the heathen become more improved in their idolatrous customs, before we attempt to convert them to Christianity? Do we expect that continuance in idolatry will prepare them to receive the gospel? If not, let us be consistent, and, while using means for the conversion of heathens, let us also use them for the conversion of Christians; for war is, in fact, a heathenish and savage custom, most malignant, most desolating, and most horrible, and the grossest delusion, the greatest curse, that ever afflicted a guilty world.

SIEGES,

A MIRROR OF WAR.

A SIEGE is war in miniature. History is full of them; but we can here quote only a few specimens to illustrate in part the atrocities and horrors inseparable from this custom.

Glance at the sufferings of its own agents in this work of blood and fire. Take the case of Ciudad Rodrigo. 'The toll of the cathedral bell for seven gave the signal; a low, murmuring whisper ran along the advanced files of the forlorn hope; stocks were loosened, and each man pressed his cap more firmly down upon his brow, and, with lip compressed, waited for the word to move. Anon it passed in whispers from rank to rank, and the dark mass moved on towards the foot of the breach. What a moment! How many thoughts of home, of years long past, of last adieu to all we loved! Each heart was too full for words; and we marched noiselessly along to the ditch. All was still and silent as the grave. "Quietly, my men, quietly," said our leader; "don't press." Scarcely had he spoken, when a musket accidentally went off, and suddenly a bright flame burst forth from the ramparts, and, shooting up toward the sky, made the whole scene before us clear as noonday, disclosing on one side the dark ranks and glistening bayonets of the enemy, and on the other the red uniform of the British columns compressed like a solid wall, and stretched along the plain.

'There was no time to lose; and the loud cry of our leader, as he sprang into the trench, summoned us to the charge. Those in the van, without waiting for the leaders, jumped after him, and others pressed rapidly behind them, when a loud rumbling thunder, a hissing, crackling noise followed, and from the dark ditch there burst forth a forked, livid lightning, like the flame from a volcano, and a mine exploded! Hundreds of shells and grenades, scattered along the ground, were ignited at the same moment; the air sparkled with the whizzing fuses; the musketry plied incessantly from the walls, and every man of the leading company of stormers was blown to pieces. At the same time, assaults were made on all sides; the whole fortress seemed girt around with fire; and from every part arose the shouts of assailants, and the yells of triumph. As for ourselves, we stood on the verge of the ditch breathless, hesitating and horror-struck. A sudden darkness had succeeded to the bright glare; but from the midst of the gloom the agonizing cries of our wounded and dying comrades rent our very hearts.

"Make way there! make way! here comes Mackie's party," cried their leader; and, as he spoke, another forlorn hope came

forward at a run, leaped recklessly into the ditch, and made toward the breach. The supporting division of stormers gave a loud cheer, and sprang after them. The rush was tremendous; for scarcely had we reached the crumbling ruins of the rampart, when the vast column, pressing on like a mighty torrent, bore down upon our rear. And now commenced a scene no pen can describe! The whole ground, covered with the most deadly and destructive combustibles, was rent open with a crash; the huge masses of masonry bounded into the air like things of no weight; and the ringing clangor of the iron howitzers, the crackling of the fusees, the blazing splinters, the shouts of defiance, and the more than savage yells of those in whose ranks alone the dead and the dying were numbered, all made up a mass of sights and sounds almost maddening with their excitement. Yet on we struggled over the mutilated bodies of the leading files which almost filled the way.

‘By this time the third division had joined us; and the crush of our thickening ranks was dreadful. Every moment some well known leader fell dead or mortally wounded, and his place was supplied by some bold fellow that would spring from the leading files, and scarcely utter his cheer before he himself was laid low. Many a voice familiar to me, would break upon my ear in tones of reckless daring, and the next moment burst forth in a death-cry. For more than an hour the frightful carnage continued, fresh troops constantly advancing, but scarce a foot of ground gained; the earth belched forth its volcanic fires, and that terrible barrier no man passed. The boldest would in turn leap into the whizzing flame; and the taunting cheers of the enemy triumphed in derision at the effort.

‘“Stormers, to the front! Only the bayonet! trust to nothing but the bayonet,” cried a voice; and the leader of another forlorn hope bounded into the chasm. All the officers sprang simultaneously after them; the men pressed madly on; a roll of murderous musketry crashed upon them, and was answered by a furious shout. The British, springing over the dead and the dying, bounded like blood-hounds on their prey. Meanwhile the ramparts trembled beneath the tramp of the light division who had forced the lesser breach, and were now coming upon the flank of the French. Still the garrison thickened their numbers, and bravely held their ground. Man to man was now the combat. No cry for quarter; no supplicating look for mercy; it was the death-struggle of vengeance and despair! At this instant, an explosion louder than the loudest thunder, shook the air; the rent and torn-up ramparts flew into the sky; the conquered and the conquering were alike the victims. One of the great magazines had been ignited by a shell; and the black smoke, streaked with a lurid flame, hung above the dead and the dying. The artillery and the musketry were stilled, paralyzed, as it were, by the ruin and devastation before them. Both sides stood leaning on their arms for a moment; it was only a moment; for the British, roused by the cries of their wounded comrades, uttered a fierce cry for

vengeance, then closed upon the foe, and soon their bayonets gleamed in triumph on the ramparts of Ciudad Rodrigo.'

So of other cities in Spain. 'Thousands,' says an English reviewer, 'rushed through the breaches, and trampled one another to death at the very mouth of the French guns, which cut them down by regiments; while the shrieks and cries of the wounded, the howls of the maddened, the roar of ordnance, the shouts of an army, the bewilderment of midnight, and the horrible stench of burnt human flesh, lit up by the flash of unnumbered guns and musketry, seemed like the wild burning waves of the bottomless pit rolling over the souls of the shrieking lost. Still on, on they rush. There is no madness like a maddened mob. Hundreds were impaled upon the sharp sword-blades fastened in rows across the breaches; yet hundreds more pressed on, and fell upon other tiers of the same horrible instruments. Over these, as they writhed and shrieked, mounted others, and trod and crushed them down, till an army passed over unharmed by the pointed steel beneath; and even horsemen rushed upon this causeway of living beings, and trampled and crushed it into a reeking jelly of human flesh and blood, and still plunged onward through the crimson river which flowed beyond!

'Thus was the city won; and then did the British soldiers who had crossed the seas to rescue Spaniards from French thralldom, rush upon the city, and slaughter, and pillage, and violate every house. There was no order, no restraint; officers were shot in the streets by drunken soldiers; old men and children they slaughtered promiscuously; there was scarce a woman whose person they did not violate; whole families were burnt up in their own houses; and thus reigned horror and dreadful carnage for several days in succession. The after-scene was indeed "hell broke loose." We cannot read it without a shudder; and yet no effort was made to restrain the fierce and brutal licentiousness of the soldiers!'

Let us now turn to the sufferings of the besieged. We can give only a few brief specimens. 'At the siege of Saragossa, in Spain, by the French, a convent and the general hospital were stormed and set on fire. The sick and wounded threw themselves from the windows to escape the flames; and the horror of the scene was aggravated by the maniacs, whose voices, raving or singing in paroxysms of increased madness, were heard amidst the confusion of dreadful sounds. After forcing their way into the city, the French occupied one side of the street, and the Spaniards the other; and the intervening space was presently heaped with the dead, either slain upon the spot, or thrown from the windows. It was almost death to appear by day-light within reach of such houses as were occupied by the other party; but, under cover of the night, the combatants frequently dashed across the street to attack each other's batteries; and the battles begun there, were often carried into the houses beyond, where they fought from room to room, and floor to floor.'

Ucles, a decayed town in Spain, was taken by the French in

1809. Plunder was their first object ; and, in order to make the people discover where their valuables were secreted, they put them to the torture. Having obtained all the portable wealth of the place, they yoked the inhabitants like beasts, especially the clergy, loaded them with their own furniture, and made them carry it to the castle hill, and pile it in heaps, when they set fire to it, and consumed the whole. They then proceeded, in mere wantonness, to murder above threescore persons, dragging them to the shambles, that this butchery might be committed in its proper place. Among these sufferers were several women ; and they might be regarded as happy in being delivered from the worse horrors that ensued ; for the French laid hands on all the surviving women of the place for the gratification of their brutal lusts. They tore the nun from the altar, the widow from her husband's corpse, the virgin from her mother's arms ; and these victims of the foulest brutality they abused till many of them actually expired on the spot !! Nor was even this all ; but the *further* abominations, adds the historian, perpetrated by those monsters in open day, without the slightest attempt of their officers to restrain them, cannot even be hinted at without violating the decencies of language, and the reverence due to humanity.

But take a recent specimen from the British, the bombardment of St. Jean d'Acre, in Syria. English newspapers of the day called it "a most brilliant exploit ;" but let us see what it was. 'At half past four in the morning,' says an eye-witness, 'all firing ceased, as if by one consent, when—heavens ! what a sight !—the whole town seemed to be thrown into the air ! We saw nothing but one dense cloud extending thousands of yards into the air on all sides ; and then we felt an awful shock, which gave the line-of-battle ships a keel of two degrees. It was the explosion caused by one of our shells bursting in their main magazine of powder, by which, to speak within bounds, two thousand souls, besides beasts of burden of every description, were blown to atoms ! The entire loss of the Egyptians is computed at three thousand. At daylight, what a sight was exposed to our view ! The stupendous fortification, that only twelve hours before was among the strongest in the world, was so riddled that we could not find a square foot which had not a shot. I went ashore to witness the devastation ; the sight beggared all description ! The bastions were strewed with the dead, the guns dismantled, and all sorts of havoc. The spot of the explosion was far worse—a space of two acres laid quite bare, and hollowed out as if a quarry had been worked there for years ! Heavens ! what a sight was there before me ! Mangled human bodies, of both sexes, strewed in all directions, women searching for their husbands and other relatives, tearing their hair, beating their breasts, and howling and crying most piteously !' All this by England herself in 1840 !!

In 1800, Genoa, occupied by 24,000 French troops, was besieged at once by a British fleet, and a powerful Austrian army. We will not detail the horrors attendant on the sallies and assaults ; but let us look at the condition of the soldiers and citizens

within. The former, worn down by fatigue, and wasted by famine, had consumed all the horses in the city, and were at length reduced to the necessity of feeding on dogs, cats and vermin which were eagerly hunted out in the cellars and common sewers. Soon, however, even these wretched resources failed; and they were brought to the pittance of four or five ounces a day of black bread made of cocoa, rye, and other substances ransacked from the shops of the city.

The inhabitants, also, were a prey to the most unparalleled sufferings. The price of provisions had from the first been extravagantly high, and at length no kind of grain could be had at any cost. Even before the city was reduced to the last extremities, a pound of rice was sold for more than a dollar, and a pound of flour for nearly two dollars. Afterwards beans were sold for two cents each, and a biscuit of three ounces weight, when procurable at all, for upwards of two dollars. A little cheese, and a few vegetables, were the only nourishment given even to the sick and wounded in the hospitals.

The horrors of this prolonged famine in a city containing above 100,000 souls, cannot be adequately described. All day the cries of the miserable victims were heard in the streets, while the neighboring rocks within the walls were covered with a famished crowd seeking in the vilest animals, and the smallest traces of vegetation, the means of assuaging the intolerable pangs of hunger. Men and women, in the last agonies of despair, filled the air with their groans and shrieks; and sometimes, while uttering these dreadful cries, they strove with furious hands to tear out their ravening entrails, and fell dead in the streets! At night the lamentations of the people were still more dreadful; too agitated to sleep, and unable to endure the agonies around them, they prayed aloud for death to relieve them from their sufferings.

Dreadful was the effect of these protracted calamities in hardening the heart, and rendering men insensible to any thing but their own disasters. Children, left by the death of their parents in utter destitution, implored in vain the passing stranger with tears, with mournful gestures, and heart-broken accents, to give them succor and relief. Infants, deserted in the streets by their own parents, and women who had sunk down from exhaustion on the public thoroughfares, were abandoned to their fate; and, crawling to the sewers, and other receptacles of filth, they sought there, with dying hands, for the means of prolonging their miserable existence for a few hours. In the desperation produced by such long continued torments, the more ardent and impetuous rushed out of the gates, and threw themselves into the harbor, where they perished without assistance or commiseration. To such straits were they reduced, that not only leather and skins of every kind were devoured, but the horror at human flesh was so much abated, that numbers were supported on the dead bodies of their fellow-citizens!

Still more cruel, horrible beyond all description, was the spectacle presented by the Austrian prisoners of war confined on board

certain old vessels in the port ; for such was the dire necessity at last, that they were left for some days without nutriment of any kind ! They ate their shoes, they devoured the leather of their pouches, and, scowling darkly at each other, their sinister glances betrayed the horrid fear of their being driven to prey upon one another. Their French guards were at length removed, under the apprehension that they might be made a sacrifice to ravening hunger ; and so great did their desperation finally become, that they endeavored to scuttle their floating prisons in order to sink them, preferring to perish thus rather than endure any longer the tortures of famine.

Pestilence, as usual, came in the rear of such calamities ; and contagious fevers swept off multitudes whom the strength of the survivors was unable to inter. Death in every form awaited the crowds whom common suffering had blended together in the hospitals ; and the multitude of unburied corpses which encumbered the streets, threatened the city with depopulation almost as certainly as the grim hand of famine under which they were melting away. When the evacuation took place, the extent of the suffering which the besieged had undergone, appeared painfully conspicuous. ‘ On entering the town,’ says Thiebault, ‘ all the figures we met, bore the appearance of profound grief, or sombre despair ; the streets resounded with the most heart-rending cries ; on all sides death was reaping its harvest of victims, and the rival furies of famine and pestilence were multiplying their devastations. In a word, both the army and the inhabitants seemed fast approaching their dissolution.’

We will give only one specimen more in the closing scenes of the siege of Magdeburg, in 1836. The resistance was long and obstinate ; but at length two gates were forced open by the besiegers, and Tilly, marching a part of his infantry into the town, immediately occupied the principal streets, and with pointed cannon drove the citizens into their dwellings, there to await their destiny. Nor were they held long in suspense ; a word from Tilly decided the fate of Magdeburg. Even a more humane general would have attempted in vain to restrain such soldiers ; but Tilly never once made the attempt. The silence of their general left the soldiers masters of the citizens ; and they broke without restraint into the houses to gratify every brutal appetite. The prayers of innocence excited some compassion in the hearts of the Germans, but none in the rude breasts of Pappenheim’s Walloons. Scarcely had the massacre commenced, when the other gates were thrown open, and the cavalry, with the fearful hordes of Croats, poured in upon the devoted town.

Now began a scene of massacre and outrage which history has no language, poetry no pencil to portray. Neither the innocence of childhood, nor the helplessness of old age, neither youth nor sex, neither rank nor beauty, could disarm the fury of the conquerors. Wives were dishonored in the very arms of their husbands, daughters at the feet of their parents, and the defenceless sex exposed to the double loss of virtue and life. No condition,

however obscure, or however sacred, could afford protection against the cruelty or rapacity of the enemy. Fifty-three women were found in a single church with their heads cut off! The Croats *amused* themselves with throwing children into the flames, and Pappenheim's Walloons with stabbing infants at their mothers' breasts! Some officers of the League, horror-struck at scenes so dreadful, ventured to remind Tilly, that he had it in his power to stop the carnage. "Return in an hour," was his answer, "and I will see what is to be done; the soldier must have some recompense for his dangers and toils!"

No orders came from the general to check these horrors, which continued without abatement till the smoke and flames at last stopped the course of the plunderers. To increase the confusion, and break the resistance of the inhabitants, the invaders had, in the commencement of the assault, fired the town in several places; and a tempest now arose, and spread the flames with frightful rapidity, till the blaze became universal, and forced the victors to pause awhile in their work of rapine and carnage. The confusion was deepened by the clouds of smoke, the clash of swords, the heaps of dead bodies strewing the ground, the crash of falling ruins, and the streams of blood which ran along the streets. The atmosphere glowed; and the intolerable heat finally compelled even the murderers to take refuge in their camp. In less than twelve hours, this strong, populous and flourishing city, one of the finest in all Germany, was a heap of ashes, with the exception of only two churches, and a few houses.

Scarcely had the flames abated, when the soldiers returned to satiate anew their rage for plunder amid the ruins and ashes of the town. Multitudes were suffocated by the smoke; but many found rich booty in the cellars where the citizens had concealed their most valuable effects. At length Tilly himself appeared in the town after the streets had been cleared of ashes and corpses. Horrible and revolting to humanity was the scene that presented itself! the few survivors crawling from under the dead; little children wandering about, with heart-rending cries, in quest of their parents now no more; and infants still sucking the dead bodies of their mothers! More than five thousand bodies were thrown into the Elbe just to clear the streets; a far greater number had been consumed by the flames; the entire amount of the slaughter was estimated at thirty thousand; and in gratitude to the God of peace for such horrid success in the butchery of his children, for this triumph of Christian over Christian in blood, and fire, and rapine, and brutal lust, a solemn mass was performed, and *Te Deum* sung amid the discharge of artillery!!

We have no room for any more specimens; but, if you will just think of the siege of Ismail with its 70,000 victims, of Ostend with its 120,000, of Mexico with its 150,000, of Carthage with its 700,000, of Jerusalem with more than a million, of Troy with nearly two millions, you may form some faint conception of the atrocities and woes with which this single department of warfare has covered the earth.

Such, then, is war—even among nominal Christians in the seven-teenth and nineteenth centuries! Nor are these terrible evils merely accidental, undesigned, such as warriors would fain prevent if they could. No; they are the very results at which war aims; over which it exults in wild out-bursts of joy; for which even Christian ministers return solemn thanks to a God of purity and love; in commemoration of which history writes her eulogies, and poetry chants her peans, and sculpture chisels her marble and her granite.

Such is the very nature of war, a tissue of guilt and suffering. Then tell us, lovers of your country, does patriotism want such a compound of cruelty and crime, such an engine of blood, rapine and lust, for the accomplishment of its just and generous purposes? Say, friends of universal man, does humanity prompt or sanction the atrocities and horrors of such a custom? Speak, disciples of the Prince of Peace, and tell us, does your religion lend its countenance to such a mass of abominations and woes? Can it cherish in its pure and loving bosom, such a reptile of lust, such a scorpion of revenge, such a blood-leech of the world, a fiend so fierce for carnage and devastation?

Then rally, one and all, for the extinction of a custom so foul and baleful. Come up to the work in earnest, and vow upon the altar of God and humanity, never to cease from your efforts so long as a single foot-print of the monster remains on the face of the earth. Pray against it; talk against it; preach against it; write against it; circulate tracts and books against it; give your money to sustain the operations now in progress for its abolition; hold it up in all its pollution and blood before the mass of every community; infuse into your children, your pupils, your congregation, into all within the reach of your influence, a deep, undying abhorrence of it, and thus help to form such a public sentiment as shall ere long banish war, with all its crimes and woes, from Christendom forever.

We appeal especially to the gentler sex. And will not women, cultivated, Christian women, join us, with all their hearts, in such a work of peace and love? Sisters of humanity, you were made to weep for the woes of human kind; and will you not strive with us to avert from ourselves, as well as from others, evils like those we have so faintly sketched in these pages? You see what your own sex have suffered from war; and in the name of the wives it has widowed, of the mothers it has made childless, of the daughters it has doomed to orphanage and want, of the sisters it has bereft of brothers beloved, of the plighted ones whose fondest hopes it has crushed in an hour, of all the thousands and millions it has subjected to indignities worse than death itself, we beseech, we conjure you to lend your aid in putting an end forever to this foul and terrible scourge.

A GLIMPSE OF WAR.

BY WM. E. CHANNING, D. D.*

I HAVE chosen for our consideration the subject of WAR; a subject which has strong and peculiar claims on Christian ministers. Their past neglect of it is their reproach; and it is time that this reproach were wiped away, and our influence combined in illustrating and enforcing the slighted and almost forgotten precepts of Christianity on the subject of war. I wish to awaken in your breasts a firm and holy purpose to toil and suffer in the great work of abolishing this worst vestige of barbarism, this grossest outrage on the principles of Christianity. The day, I trust, is coming, when Christians will look back with gratitude and affection on those men who, in ages of conflict and bloodshed, enlisted under the banner of philanthropy and peace, cherished generous hopes of human improvement, withstood the violence of corrupt opinion, held forth amidst general darkness the pure and mild light of Christianity, and thus ushered in a new and peaceful era in the history of mankind.

In detailing the miseries and crimes of war, there is no temptation to recur to unreal or exaggerated horrors. No strength, no depth of coloring can approach the reality. It is lamentable, that we need a delineation of its calamities to rouse us to exertion. The mere idea of human beings employing every power and faculty in the work of mutual destruction, ought at once to strike a horror into our minds. But on this subject, our sensibilities are dreadfully sluggish and dead. Our ordinary sympathies seem to forsake us, when war is named. The sufferings and death of a single fellow being often excite a tender and active compassion; but we hear without emotion of thousands enduring every variety of wo in war. A single murder in peace thrills through our frames; the countless murders of war are heard as an amusing tale. The execution of a criminal depresses the mind, and philanthropy is laboring to substitute milder punishments for death; but benevolence has hardly made an effort to snatch from sudden and untimely death, the innumerable victims immolated on the altar of war. This insensibility demands, that the miseries and crimes of war should be often placed before us with minuteness, with energy, with strong and indignant emotion.

The miseries of war may be easily conceived from its very nature. By war, we understand the resort of nations to the most dreaded methods of destruction and devastation. In war, the strength, skill, courage, energy, and resources of a whole people

* From his Discourse in 1816 before the Convention of Congregational Ministers in Massachusetts.

are concentrated for the infliction of pain and death. The bowels of the earth are explored, the most active elements combined, the resources of art and nature exhausted, to increase the power of man in destroying his fellow-creatures.

Would you learn what destruction man, when thus aided, can spread around him? Look at that extensive region, desolate and overspread with ruins; its forests rent and leafless, as if blasted by lightning; its villages prostrated, as by an earthquake; its fields barren, as if swept by storms. Not long ago, the sweet influences of heaven descended on no happier or more fruitful region than this. But ravaging armies prowled over it; war frowned on it; and its fruitfulness and happiness are fled. Here were gathered thousands and ten thousands from distant provinces, not to embrace as brethren, but to renounce the tie of brotherhood; and thousands, in the vigor of life, when least prepared for death, were hewn down, and scattered like chaff before the whirlwind.

Repair, in thought, to a field of recent battle. Here are heaps of slain weltering in their own blood, their bodies mangled, their limbs shattered, and in many a form and countenance not a vestige left of their former selves. Here are multitudes trodden under foot, and the war-horse has left the trace of his hoof in many a crushed and mutilated frame. Here are severer sufferers; they live, but live without hope or consolation. Justice despatches the criminal with a single stroke; but the victims of war, falling by casual, undirected blows, often expire in lingering agony, their deep groans appealing in vain to compassion, their limbs writhing with pain on the earth, their lips parched with a burning thirst, their wounds open to the chilling air, the memory of tender relations rushing on their minds, but not an accent of friendship or comfort reaching their ears. Amid this scene of horrors, you see the bird and beast of prey drinking the blood of the dead, and with a merciful cruelty ending the struggles of the dying; and, still more melancholy! you see human plunderers bereft of all human sympathy, turning a deaf ear on the wounded, and rifling the warm and almost palpitating remains of the slain.—If you extend your eye beyond the immediate field of battle, and follow the track of the pursuing and victorious army, you see the roads strewed with the dead; you see scattered flocks, and harvests trampled under foot, the smoking ruins of cottages, and the miserable inhabitants flying in want and despair! Nor even yet are the horrors of a single battle exhausted. Some of the deepest pangs which it inflicts, are silent, retired, enduring, to be read in the countenance of the widow, in the unprotected orphan, in the aged parent, in affection cherishing the memory of the slain, and weeping that it could not minister to their last pangs.

I have asked you to traverse in thought a field of battle. There is another scene often presented in war, perhaps more terrible—I refer to a besieged city. The most horrible pages in history are those which record the reduction of strongly fortified places. In a besieged city are collected all descriptions and ages of mankind,

women, children, the old, the infirm. Day and night the weapons of death and conflagration fly around them. They see the approaches of the foe, the trembling bulwark, and the fainting strength of their defenders. They are worn with famine, and on famine presses pestilence. At length the assault is made; every barrier is broken down, and a lawless soldiery, exasperated by resistance, and burning with lust and cruelty, are scattered through the streets. The domestic retreat, even the house of God, is no longer a sanctuary. Venerable age is no protection; female purity no defence. In presence of the dying husband, and the murdered child, the wife is spared, not from mercy, but to gratify the basest passion. These are heart-rending scenes, but history abounds with them; and what better fruits can you expect from war?

But the horrors of war are not yet exhausted. Consider the condition of those who are immediately engaged in war. The sufferings of soldiers from battle we have seen; but their sufferings are not limited to the period of conflict. The whole of war is a succession of exposures too severe for human nature. Death employs other weapons than the sword. It is computed, that in ordinary wars, greater numbers perish by sickness than in battle. Exhausted by long and rapid marches, by unwholesome food, by exposure to storms, by excessive labor under a burning sky through the day, and by interrupted and restless sleep on the damp ground, and under the chilling atmosphere of night, thousands after thousands of the young pine away and die. They anticipated that they should fall, if to fall should be their lot, on what they called the field of honor; but they perish in the inglorious and crowded hospital, surrounded with sights and sounds of wo, far from home and every friend, and denied those tender offices which sickness and expiring nature require.

But do not stop here; consider the influence of war on the *character* of these unhappy men. Their trade is butchery—their business destruction. They hire themselves for slaughter, place themselves, servile instruments, passive machines, in the hands of unprincipled rulers, to execute the bloodiest mandates, without reflection, without mercy, without a thought on the justice of the cause in which they are engaged. What a school is this for the human character? From men trained in battle to ferocity and carnage, accustomed to the perpetration of cruel deeds, accustomed to take human life without sorrow or remorse, habituated to esteem an unthinking courage a substitute for every virtue, encouraged by plunder to prodigality, taught improvidence, by perpetual hazard and exposure, restrained only by an iron discipline which is withdrawn in peace, and unfitted by the restless and irregular career of war for the calm and uniform pursuits of ordinary life; from such men, what can be expected but hardness of heart, profligacy of life, contempt of the restraints of society, and of the authority of God?

The influence of war on the community at large, on its pros-

perity, its morals, and its political institutions, though less striking than on the soldiery, is yet most baleful. How often is a community impoverished to sustain a war in which it has no interest. Public burdens are aggravated, whilst the means of sustaining them are reduced. Internal improvements are neglected. The revenue of the state is exhausted in military establishments, or flows through secret channels into the coffers of corrupt men whom war exalts to power and office. The regular employments of peace are disturbed. Industry in many of its branches is suspended. The laborer, ground with want, and driven to despair by the clamor of his suffering family, becomes a soldier in a cause which he condemns, and thus the country is drained of its most effective population. The people are stripped and reduced, whilst the authors of war retrench not a comfort, and often fatten on the spoils and woes of their country.

But the influence of war on the morals of society is still more fatal. The suspension of industry, and the pressure of want multiply vice. Criminal modes of subsistence are the resource of the suffering. Public and private credit are shaken. Distrust and fear take the place of mutual confidence. Commerce becomes a system of stratagem and collusion; and the principles of justice receive a shock which many years of peace are not able to repair.

In war, the moral sentiments of a community are perverted by their admiration of military exploits. Every eye is fixed on the conqueror, and every tongue busy with his deeds. The milder virtues of Christianity are eclipsed by the baleful lustre thrown round a ferocious courage. The disinterested, the benignant, the merciful, the forgiving, those whom Jesus has pronounced blest and honorable, must give place to the hero whose character is stained not only with blood, but sometimes with the foulest vices, all whose stains are washed away by victory.

War also diffuses through a community malignant passions. Nations, exasperated by mutual injuries, burn for each other's humiliation and ruin. They delight to hear that the most dreadful scourges are desolating a hostile community. The slaughter of thousands of fellow-beings, instead of awaking pity, flushes them with delirious joy, illuminates the city, and dissolves the whole country in revelry and riot. Thus the heart of man is hardened. His worst passions are nourished. Were the prayers, or rather the curses of warring nations prevalent in heaven, the whole earth would long since have become a desert.

But war not only assails the prosperity and morals of a community; its influence on the political condition is alarming. It arms government with a dangerous patronage, multiplies dependants and instruments of oppression, and generates a power which, in the hands of the energetic and aspiring, can hardly fail to prostrate a free constitution. War organizes a body of men who lose the feelings of the citizen in the soldier; whose habits detach them from the community; whose ruling passion is devotion to a chief; who are inured in the camp to despotic sway; who are

accustomed to accomplish their ends by force, and to sport with the rights and happiness of their fellow-beings; who delight in tumult, adventure and peril, and turn with disgust and scorn from the quiet labors of peace. Is it wonderful, that such protectors of a state should look with contempt on the weakness of the protected, and should lend themselves base instruments to the subversion of that freedom which they do not themselves enjoy? In a community, where precedence is given to the military profession, freedom cannot long endure.

Thus war is to be ranked among the most dreadful calamities which fall on a guilty world; and, what deserves consideration, and gives to war a dreadful pre-eminence among the sources of human misery, it tends to multiply and perpetuate itself without end. It feeds and grows on the blood which it sheds. The passions, from which it springs, gain strength and fury from indulgence. The successful nation, flushed by victory, pants for new laurels; whilst the humbled nation, irritated by defeat, is impatient to redeem its honor and repair its losses. Peace becomes a truce, a feverish repose, a respite to sharpen anew the sword, and to prepare for future struggles. Under professions of friendship, lurk hatred and distrust; and a spark suffices to renew the mighty conflagration. When from these causes, large military establishments are formed, and a military spirit kindled, war becomes a necessary part of policy. A foreign field must be found for the energies and passions of a martial people. To disband a numerous and veteran soldiery, would be to let loose a dangerous horde on society. The blood-hounds must be sent forth on other communities, lest they rend the bosom of their own country. Thus war extends and multiplies itself. No sooner is one storm scattered, than the sky is darkened with the gathering horrors of another. Accordingly, war has been the mournful legacy of every generation to that which succeeds it. Every age has had its conflicts. Every country has in turn been the seat of devastation and slaughter. The dearest interests and rights of every nation have been again and again committed to the hazards of a game, of all others the most uncertain, and in which, from its very nature, success too often attends on the fiercest courage and the basest fraud.

But how, it will be asked, can we contribute to the abolition of war? Has not war its origin in the ambition of princes? And how shall we obtain an influence over courts and cabinets, and sway the minds of those whose power and station almost place them beyond the reach of instruction?—It is indeed true, that the ambition of rulers is a frequent cause of war. The desire of building up their power at home, or of extending their empire abroad, of surpassing other sovereigns, their natural and only rivals, of signalizing their administration by brilliant deeds, and of attracting louder applause than ordinarily attends on pacific virtues; this aspiring principle has in all ages thrown the world into tumult. But the ambition of rulers does not lie at the foot of war. We

must remember, that ambition is directed and inflamed by public opinion. Were there not a propensity in the mass of men to give honor to warlike triumphs, rulers would never seek distinction in this bloody career. The deepest and most operative causes of war are to be found in the universal principles of human nature, in passions which sway all classes of men; and therefore, religious instructors, whose office it is to operate on the human heart, and to purify its principles, may do more than any other men to counteract the causes of war.

To assist us in this work, let us inquire into the passions and principles which generate war. And here, I doubt not, many will imagine that the first place ought to be given to malignity and hatred; but justice to human nature requires, that we ascribe to national animosities a more limited operation, than is usually ascribed to them, in the production of this calamity. It is indeed true, that ambitious men, who have an interest in war, too often accomplish their views by appealing to the malignant feelings of a community, by exaggerating its wrongs, ridiculing its forbearance, and reviving ancient jealousies and resentments; but, were not malignity and revenge aided by the concurrence of higher principles, the false splendor of this barbarous custom might easily be obscured, and its ravages stayed.

One of the great springs of war may be found in a very strong and general propensity of human nature—the love of excitement, of emotion, of strong interest. No state of mind, not even positive suffering, is more painful than the want of interesting objects. The vacant heart preys on itself, and often rushes with impatience from the security which demands no effort, to the brink of peril. Why has the first rank among sports been given to the chase? Because its difficulties, hardships, hazards, tumults, awaken the mind, and give to it a new consciousness of existence, and a deep feeling of its powers. What is the charm which attaches the statesman to an office which almost weighs him down with labor, and an appalling responsibility? He finds much of his compensation in the powerful emotion and interest, awakened by the very hardships of his lot, by conflict with vigorous minds, by the opposition of rivals, and by the alternations of success and defeat. What hurries to the gaming-table the man of prosperous fortune and ample resources? The dread of apathy, the love of strong feeling and of mental agitation. We have here one spring of war. War is of all games the deepest, awakening most powerfully the soul, and of course presenting powerful attraction to those restless and adventurous minds which pant for scenes of greater experiment and exposure than peace affords. The savage, the sovereign, the whole mass of a community find a pleasure in war as an excitement of the mind. They follow, with an eager concern, the movements of armies, and wait the issue of battles with a deep suspense, an alternation of hope and fear, inconceivably more interesting than the unvaried uniformity of peaceful pursuits.

Another powerful spring of war is the passion for superiority for triumph, for power. The human mind is strongly marked by

this feature. It is aspiring, impatient of inferiority, and eager of pre-eminence and control. I need not enlarge on the predominance of this passion in rulers, whose love of power is influenced by the possession, and who are ever restless to extend their sway. It is more important to observe that, were this desire restrained to the breasts of rulers, war would move with a sluggish pace. But the passion for power and superiority is universal; and as every individual, from his intimate union with the community, is accustomed to appropriate its triumphs to himself, there is a general promptness to engage in any contest by which the community may obtain an ascendancy over other nations.

Another powerful spring of war, is the admiration of the brilliant qualities which it often displays. These qualities, more than all things, have prevented an impression of the crimes and miseries of this savage custom. Many delight in war, not for its carnage and woes, but for its valor and apparent magnanimity, for the self-command of the hero, the fortitude which despises suffering, the resolution which courts danger, the superiority of the mind to the body, to sensation, to fear. Men seldom delight in war considered merely as a source of misery. When they hear of battles, the picture which rises to their view, is not what it should be, a picture of extreme wretchedness, of the wounded, the mangled, the slain. These horrors are hidden under the splendor of those mighty energies which break forth amidst the perils of conflict, and which human nature contemplates with an intense and heart-thrilling delight. Attention hurries from the heaps of the slaughtered to the victorious chief whose single mind pervades and animates a host, and directs with stern composure the storm of battle; and the ruin which he spreads, is forgotten in admiration of his power. This admiration has, in all ages, been expressed by the most unequivocal signs. Why that garland woven, that arch erected, that festive board spread? These are tributes to the warrior. Whilst the peaceful sovereign, who scatters blessings with the silence and constancy of Providence, is received with a faint applause, men assemble in crowds to hail the conqueror, perhaps a monster in human form, whose private life is blackened with lust and crime, and whose greatness is built on perfidy and usurpation. Thus war is the surest and speediest road to renown; and war will never cease, while the field of battle is the field of glory.

Another cause of war is a false patriotism. It is a natural and a generous impulse of nature to love the country which gave us birth; but this sentiment often degenerates into a narrow, partial, exclusive attachment, alienating us from other branches of the human family, and instigating to aggression on other states. In ancient times, this principle was developed with wonderful energy, and sometimes absorbed every other sentiment. To the Roman, Rome was the universe. Other nations were of no value but to grace her triumphs, and illustrate her power; and he who in private life would have disdained injustice and oppression, exulted in the successful violence by which other nations were bound to the chariot wheels of this mistress of the world. This spirit still

exists. The tie of country is thought to absolve men from the obligations of universal justice and humanity. Statesmen and rulers are expected to build up their own country at the expense of others; and in the false patriotism of the citizen, they have a security for any outrages which are sanctioned by success.

Let me mention one other spring of war—the impressions we receive in early life. In our early years, we know war only as it offers itself to us at a review; not arrayed in horror, not scattering wo, not stalking over fields of the slain, and desolated regions, its eye flashing with fury, and its sword reeking with blood. No; war, as we first see it, is decked with gay and splendid trappings, and wears a countenance of joy. It moves, with a measured and graceful step, to the sound of the heart-stirring fife and drum. Such is war; the youthful eye is dazzled with its ornaments; the youthful heart dances to its animated sounds. It seems a pastime full of spirit and activity, the very sport in which youth delights. These false views of war are confirmed by our earliest reading. We are intoxicated with the exploits of the conqueror, as recorded in real history, or in glowing fiction. We follow, with a sympathetic ardor, his rapid and triumphant career in battle; and, unused as we are to suffering and death, we forget the fallen and miserable who are crushed under his victorious car. Even where these impressions in favor of war are not received in youth, we yet learn, from our early familiarity with it, to consider it as a necessary evil, an essential part of our condition. We become reconciled to it as to a fixed law of our nature, and consider the thought of its abolition as extravagant as an attempt to chain the winds, or arrest the lightning.

But is there no possibility of abolishing this custom? Yes, by the use of right means; and among these should we place the inculcation of just and elevated sentiments relative to the honor of rulers, and the glory of nations, as not consisting in war. We should turn men's admiration from military courage to qualities of real nobleness and dignity. It is time that the childish admiration of courage should give place to more manly sentiments; and in proportion as we effect this change, we shall shake the main pillar of war. Courage is a very doubtful quality. It sometimes results from mental weakness. Peril is confronted, because the mind wants comprehension to discern its extent. This is often the courage of youth, the courage of unreflecting ignorance, a contempt of peril because peril is but dimly seen. Courage still more frequently springs from physical temperament, from a rigid fibre and iron nerves, and deserves as little praise as the proportion of the form, or the beauty of the countenance. Every passion, which is strong enough to overcome the passion of fear, and to exclude by its vehemence the idea of danger, communicates at least a temporary courage. Thus revenge, when it burns with great fury, gives a terrible energy to the mind, and has sometimes impelled men to meet certain death, that they might inflict the same fate on an enemy. You see the doubtful nature of courage. It is often associated with the worst vices. The most wonderful

examples of it may be found in the history of pirates and robbers, whose fearlessness is generally proportioned to the insensibility of their consciences, and to the enormity of their crimes. The common courage of armies is equally worthless. A considerable part of almost every army, so far from deriving their resolution from love of country, and a sense of justice, can hardly be said to have a country, and have been driven into the ranks by necessities which were generated by vice. These are the *brave soldiers*, whose praises we hear; brave from the absence of all reflection; prodigal of life, because their vices have robbed life of its blessings; brave from sympathy; brave from the thirst of plunder; and especially brave, because the sword of martial law is hanging over their heads. Military courage is easily attained by the most debased; and the common drunkard, enlisted in a fit of intoxication, becomes as brave as his officer, whose courage may often be traced to the same dread of punishment, and to fear of severer infamy than attends on the cowardice of the common soldier. Let us then labor to direct the admiration and love of mankind to another and infinitely higher kind of greatness, to that true magnanimity which is prodigal of ease and life in the service of God and mankind. Let the records of past ages be explored, to rescue from oblivion, not the wasteful conqueror, but the benefactors of the human race, martyrs to freedom and religion, men who have broken the chain of the slave, who have traversed the earth to shed consolation into the cell of the prisoner, or whose sublime faculties have explored and revealed useful and ennobling truths. Can nothing be done to hasten the time, when to such men eloquence and poetry shall offer their glowing homage; when for these the statue and monument shall be erected, the canvass be animated, and the laurel entwined; and when to these the admiration of the young shall be directed, as their guides and forerunners to glory and immortality?

I proceed to another method of promoting the cause of peace. Let Christian ministers exhibit with greater clearness and distinctness, than ever they have done, the pacific and benevolent spirit of Christianity. My brethren, this spirit ought to hold the same place in our preaching, which it holds in the gospel of our Lord. Instead of being crowded and lost among other subjects, it should stand in the front of Christian graces; it should be inculcated as the life and essence of our religion. We should teach men, that charity is greater than faith and hope; that God is love or benevolence; and that love is the brightest communication of divinity to the human soul. We should exhibit Jesus in all the amiableness of his character, now shedding tears over Jerusalem, and now his blood on Calvary, and in his last hours recommending his own sublime love as the badge and distinction of his followers. We should teach men, that it is the property of the benevolence of Christianity to diffuse itself like the light and rain of heaven, to disdain the limits of rivers, mountains, or oceans, by which nations are divided, and to embrace every human being as a brother. Let us never forget, that our preaching is evangelical just in pro-

portion as it inculcates this disinterested and unbounded charity; and that our hearers are Christians just as far, and no farther than they delight in peace and beneficence.

In our preaching, then, and in our lives, let us bear perpetual testimony to this great characteristic of the gospel. Were the true spirit of Christianity to be inculcated with but half the zeal which has been wasted on doubtful and disputed doctrines, a sympathy, a co-operation might in a very short time be produced among Christians of every nation, most propitious to the pacification of the world. In consequence of the progress of knowledge, and the extension of commerce, Christians of both hemispheres are at this moment brought nearer to one another than at any former period; and an intercourse, founded on religious sympathies, is gradually connecting the most distant regions. Christians of different tongues are beginning to unite their efforts in support of that cause which, by its sublimity and purity, obscures and almost annihilates those perishable interests about which states are divided. What a powerful weapon is furnished by this new bond of union to the ministers and friends of peace! Should not the auspicious moment be seized to inculcate on all Christians in all regions, that they owe their first allegiance to their common Lord in heaven, whose first, and last, and great command is love? Should they not be taught to look with a shuddering abhorrence on war, which continually summons to the field of battle, under opposing standards, the followers of the same Savior, and commands them to imbrue their hands in each other's blood? Has not the time arrived, when the dreadful insensibility of Christians on this subject may be removed; when the repugnance of the gospel to this inhuman custom may be carried with power to every pious heart; and when all who love the Lord Jesus, the Prince of peace, may be brought to feel, and with one solemn voice to pronounce, that of all men *he* is most stained with murder, and most obnoxious to the wrath of God, who, entrusted with power to bless, becomes the scourge, and curse, and ravager of the creation; scatters slaughter, famine, devastation and bereavement through the earth; arms man against his brother; multiplies widows and fatherless children; and sends thousands of unprepared souls to be his accusers at the judgment seat of God? Once let Christians of every nation be brought to espouse the cause of peace with one heart and one voice, and their labor will not be in vain in the Lord. The predicted ages of peace will dawn on the world. Public opinion will be purified. The false lustre of the hero will grow dim; a nobler order of character will be admired and diffused; the kingdoms of the world will gradually become the kingdom of God and of his Christ.

I might suggest other methods; but I will only add, let this subject recur more frequently in our preaching. Let us exhibit to the hearts and consciences of men the woes and guilt of war, with all the energy of deep conviction, and strong emotion. Let us labor to associate images of horror and infamy with this unchristian custom in the minds of the young, and awaken at once their sym-

pathy towards its victims, and their indignation against its imposing and dazzling crimes. The doctrines of Christianity have had many martyrs. Let us be willing, if God shall require it, to be martyrs to its spirit—the neglected, insulted spirit of peace and love. In a better service we cannot live—in a nobler cause we cannot die. It is the cause of Jesus Christ, supported by almighty goodness, and appointed to triumph over the passions and delusions of men, the customs of ages, and the fallen monuments of the forgotten conqueror.

CERTAIN PLEAS FOR WAR ANSWERED BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1. War, it is said, kindles patriotism. But the patriotism which is cherished by war, is ordinarily false and spurious, a vice and not a virtue, a scourge to the world, a narrow, unjust passion, which aims to exalt a particular state on the humiliation and destruction of other nations. A genuine, enlightened patriot discerns, that the welfare of his own country is involved in the general progress of society; and, in the character of a patriot, as well as of a Christian, he rejoices in the liberty and prosperity of other communities, and is anxious to maintain with them the relations of peace and amity.

2. It is said, that a military spirit is the defence of a country. But it more frequently endangers the vital interests of a nation by embroiling it with other states. This spirit, like every other passion, is impatient for gratification, and often precipitates a country into war.

3. War is recommended as a method of redressing national grievances. But unhappily the weapons of war, from their very nature, are often wielded most successfully by the unprincipled. Justice and force have little congeniality. Should not Christians strive to promote the reference of national as well as of individual disputes to an impartial umpire? Is a project of this nature more extravagant than the idea of reducing savage hordes to a state of regular society? The last has been accomplished. Is the first to be abandoned in despair?

4. It is said, that war sweeps off the idle, dissolute and vicious members of the community. Monstrous argument! If a government may for this end plunge a nation into war, it may with equal justice consign to the executioner any number of its subjects whom it may deem a burden on the state. The fact is, that war commonly generates as many profligates as it destroys. A disbanded army fills the community with at least as many abandoned members as at first it absorbed.

5. It is sometimes said, that a military spirit favors liberty. But how is it, that nations, after fighting for ages, are so generally enslaved? The truth is, that liberty has no foundation but in private and public virtue; and virtue, as we have seen, is not the common growth of war.

6. But the great argument is, that without war to excite and invigorate the human mind, some of its noblest energies will

slumber, and its highest qualities,—courage, magnanimity, fortitude,—will perish. To this I answer, that if war is to be encouraged among nations, because it nourishes energy and heroism, on the same principle, war in our families and between villages ought to be encouraged; for such contests would equally tend to promote heroic daring and contempt of death. Why shall not different provinces of the same empire annually meet with the weapons of death, to keep alive their courage? We shrink at this suggestion with horror; but why shall contests of nations, rather than of provinces or families, find shelter under this barbarous argument? If war be a blessing, because it awakens energy and courage, then the savage state is peculiarly privileged; for every savage is a soldier, and all his modes of life tend to form him to invincible resolution. On the same principle, those early periods of society were happy, when men were called to contend, not only with one another, but with beasts of prey; for to these excitements we owe the heroism of Hercules and Theseus. On the same principle, the feudal ages were more favored than the present; for then every baron was a military chief, every castle frowned defiance, and every vassal was trained to arms.

I repeat, then, we need not war to awaken human energy. There is at least equal scope for courage and magnanimity in blessing as in destroying mankind. The condition of the human race offers inexhaustible objects for enterprize, and fortitude, and magnanimity. In relieving the countless wants and sorrows of the world, in exploring unknown regions, in carrying the arts and virtues of civilization to unimproved communities, in extending the bounds of knowledge, in diffusing the spirit of freedom, and especially in spreading the light and influence of Christianity, how much may be dared, how much endured! Philanthropy invites us to services which demand the most intense, and elevated, and resolute, and adventurous activity. Let it not be imagined, that were nations imbued with the spirit of Christianity, they would slumber in ignoble ease; that instead of the high minded murderers who are formed on the present system of war, we should have effeminate and timid slaves. Christian benevolence is as active as it is forbearing. Let it once form the character of a people, and it will attach them to every important interest of society. It will call forth sympathy in behalf of the suffering in every region under heaven. It will give a new extension to the heart, open a wider sphere to enterprize, inspire a courage of exhaustless resource, and prompt to every sacrifice and exposure for the improvement and happiness of the human race. The energy of this principle has been tried and displayed in the fortitude of the martyr, and in the patient labors of those who have carried the gospel into the dreary abodes of idolatry. Away then with the argument, that war is needed as a nursery of heroism. The school of the peaceful Redeemer is infinitely more adapted to teach the nobler, as well as the milder virtues which adorn humanity.

MILITARY HOSPITALS,

OR

TREATMENT OF THE SICK, WOUNDED AND PRISONERS IN WAR.

WAR is a tissue of woes ; and its real nature, its inevitable effects, we may see in its treatment not only of its victims, but of its own agents when disqualified by fatigue, disease or wounds for continuing their work of death and devastation.

It is hardly possible, during the progress of a war, to make comfortable provisions for the diseased ; and even in a time of peace, the condition of a sick soldier would be regarded by most persons as quite beyond endurance. A surgeon perhaps may come to his barrack with occasional prescriptions, and a messmate administer the medicine ; but no wife, no mother, no sister is there to watch by his rude hammock, or his pallet of straw, nor a well-trained, sympathizing nurse to soothe his pains, and cheer his drooping, anguished spirits.

But look at the treatment of such sufferers in a time of war. 'There was nothing,' says an English soldier in Spain, 'to sustain our famished bodies, or to shelter us, when fatigued or sick, from the rain and snow. The road was one line of bloody foot-marks from the sore feet of the men ; and along its sides lay the dead and the dying. Too weak to drag the sick and wounded any farther in the wagons, we now left them to perish in the snow. Even Donald, the hardy Highlander, who had long been bare-footed and lame like myself, at length lay down to die. For two days he had been almost blind, and unable, from a severe cold, to hold up his head. We sat down together ; not a word escaped our lips. We looked around, then at each other, and closed our eyes. We felt there was no hope. We would have given in charge a farewell to our friends ; but who was to carry it ? Not far from us, there were, here and there, above thirty in the same situation with ourselves ; and nothing but groans mingled with execrations, was to be heard between the pauses of the wind.'

'I was sent,' says the same sufferer in another place, 'to Brae-burnlees, where I remained eight weeks very ill indeed. All the time I was in the hospital, my soul was oppressed with the distresses of my fellow-sufferers, and shocked at the conduct of the hospital men. Often have I seen them *fighting* over the expiring bodies of the patients, their eyes not yet closed in death, for articles of apparel that two had seized at once ; mingling their curses and oaths with the dying groans and prayers of the poor sufferers. How dreadful the thought that my turn might come next ! There was none to comfort, none to give even a drink of water with a

pleasant countenance.—At length I recovered sufficiently to write, and longed to tell my mother where I was, that I might hear from her. I crawled along the wall of the hospital towards the door to see if I could find one more convalescent than myself, to bring me paper and pen; I could not trust the hospital men with the money. One great inducement to this difficult exertion, was to see the face of heaven, and breathe the pure air once more. Feebly, and with anxious joy, I pushed open the door. Dreadful sight! There lay Donald, my only, my long-tried friend, upon a barrow, to be carried into the dead-room, his face uncovered, and part of his body naked. The light forsook my eyes, I became dreadfully sick, and fell senseless upon the body; and after my recovery from the swoon, my mind was for some time either vacant or confused, and it was long before I could open a door without an involuntary shudder.'

Take from the same writer a specimen of the treatment that war gives its wounded servants. 'We then marched off, leaving our wounded, whose cries were piercing; but we could not help them. Numbers followed us, crawling on their hands and knees, and filling the air with their groans. Many who could not even crawl after us, held out their hands, supplicating to be taken with us. We tore ourselves from them, and hurried away; for we could not bear the sight. On we struggled through a dark and stormy night, carrying the wounded officers in blankets on our shoulders; but such of the wounded soldiers as had been able still to keep up with us, made the heart bleed at their cries.'

Nor is this a solitary case, or one unusually severe. In the late wars of Europe, multitudes of the sick were abandoned to their fate in camps suddenly forced by the enemy; in their rapid marches, vast numbers, enfeebled by disease, or exhausted with fatigue, sank down by the road-side to perish without succor or sympathy; and sometimes thousands were left on the battle-field, day after day, amid the stench of putrefying carcasses, without food or drink, with no shelter from the weather, and no protection against the voracity of ravening wolves and vultures. During the far-famed campaign of Napoleon in Russia, little attention was paid to the sick, the wounded, or those who became from any other cause unable to take care of themselves. The eighty thousand victims on the fatal field of Borodino, were for the most part left where they fell; and Labaume, glancing at that scene on his return with the French from Moscow, says, "the carcasses of men and horses still covered the plain, intermingled with garments stained with blood, and bones gnawed by the dogs, and birds of prey." While marching over the field of battle, they found one poor fellow stretched upon the ground, with both his legs broken, yet still alive! Wounded on the day of the great battle, he had remained in that condition nearly two months, living on bits of bread found among the dead bodies, on grass and roots, lying by night in the carcasses of dead horses, and dressing his wounds with their flesh!

Let us now quote a case less startling, but more common, and sufficiently painful. 'I was taken ill,' says a British officer, 'in the beginning of August, 1813, but continued with the regiment, in the hope of getting better, until we arrived near Madrid. I was then very ill, and had become so weak, that I frequently fainted when endeavoring to mount my horse. The surgeon at last ordered me into the rear; and with much difficulty I reached Salamanca in a cart, almost breathing my last. Here I lay, and grew worse, till I was reduced to a mere skeleton, and had been given over more than once, when our army arrived with the French at their heels, and every preparation was made to evacuate Salamanca, and remove the sick further to the rear. Unfortunately I was too ill to be removed, and my surgeon recommended me by all means to make up my mind to be taken prisoner; for, said he, you have no other alternative but to be taken by the enemy, or run the risk of losing your life by being removed; adding coolly, that I should surely die before they could get me over the bridge on the outside of the town. I might have died inside the town for him, as I saw him no more. The cannonading had already commenced; the French cavalry had forded the river, and got round our flanks; and I, the only officer in the place, was left to get away as I could.

'I now thought it time to take the miserable alternative proposed by the surgeon; for the place was already given up to plunder. Unable to stir, I was lying in the most dreadful state of suspense, expecting every moment to see a Frenchman pounce in upon me, when an officer of my own regiment, to my great surprise, rushed into my room, determined to rescue me. He hurried me away, wrapped in a blanket, upon the back of a rifleman, and got me put into a cart, and conveyed over the bridge. On we travelled through the night, the army in full retreat, and the French in close pursuit, the weather miserably wet and cold, and the roads so drenched that it was up to the middle in mud. The effort, however, was fruitless to me; for the animals were killed, and I fell into the hands of the enemy, who knocked the cart from under me, sabred the men, and dragged me into the middle of the road, stripped me of my clothes, which they tore into shreds, and, turning me over with their sabres, plundered me of what little I had left, tearing a gold ring from my finger, and leaving me naked to perish with cold and hunger.

'In this miserable state I lay two days and nights, with no mortal near me except the dead, one of whom lay with his head upon my legs, having died in that position during the night, and I was too weak to remove his body, or even to raise myself up. Still I continued to exist, which I attribute to some rum which a humane Frenchman allowed me to drink from his canteen. The whole of the next day, I saw no living soul; and there I still lay on the road half-famished. The day following, an escort of French dragoons came up with some prisoners, among whom was a soldier of my own company. He recognized me, and so earnestly

begged the Frenchmen to let him and three others remove me to a village three or four leagues distant, that they finally consented. Wrapt in a blanket, I was conveyed on their shoulders almost in a state of insensibility, except when roused by the inhumanity of the three soldiers, who several times tumbled me into the mud in the most unfeeling manner, swearing I was dead, and they would carry me no farther; but, my rifle comrade threatening them if they dared to leave me, they carried me to a village which had been plundered by the troops, and deserted by the inhabitants. Starvation now stared me in the face; for the escort, having laid me inside a hut, proceeded with their prisoners to Salamanca, whither I begged in vain they would take me to save me from dying with hunger. They refused to let any of their prisoners stay with me, or even carry me farther, as I was a mere skeleton; and they left me in this deserted village, destitute of both food and covering.

‘Still I survived; but my sufferings from hunger were indescribable, having only a pittance of horse-flesh and acorns to subsist on for nearly a month in the depth of winter; and during all this time, I lay in an old, half-unroofed barn, to which the Spaniards, on their return to the village, had carried me, without giving me a morsel of food, but telling me I might lie there and die. So I certainly should, had I not been found by an English soldier who had escaped from the hands of the enemy, and accidentally took shelter in my quarters. The poor fellow found me in a state of starvation, and, taking me on his back to the village, craved food for me from door to door; but the inhuman Spaniards shut their doors in our face, and refused me both shelter and food. However, my fellow-sufferer found a dead horse, and supplied me with that food and acorns, which I then thought very dainty, and devoured them with greediness.’

We will now turn the tables by showing how French prisoners in Spain were treated by their captors. ‘On our road to Cordova,’ says one of these victims, ‘we met some of our comrades who had just been taken prisoners by the Spaniards. What a sight! Their eyes were put out, their tongues cut off, their fingers split up, and sundry parts of their bodies stabbed!—We took the city, but were afterwards obliged to capitulate; and no sooner had we grounded our arms, than the Spaniards broke in upon us, and murdered our defenceless people in cold blood. The victims of this treachery met death under every variety of torture; some were pierced with numberless stabs, and others taken and burnt alive; in short, all the horrors of Cordova were revived, and put in execution against us.’

‘Nor was the fate of the survivors much preferable; for famine soon stared us in the face, and we thought starvation inevitable. The pangs of hunger so overcame even the horror of our brutal oppressors, that we implored them in piteous accents to give us food. Our petitions only awakened their derision; and, when several men fell down from mere exhaustion, they were instantly

despatched by a dreadful blow from the butt-end of a musket. When we reached Cordova again, the infuriated populace rushed like tigers upon us, plucked individuals here and there from the ranks, and literally cut them to pieces, and then gazed with savage exultation on their convulsive, agonizing throes!

'We were next marched toward the coast; but our numbers thinned rapidly. Fatigue and insufficient provision rendered many incapable of renewing their march after a night's halt; and dawn exhibited to us the stiffened limbs of such as death had released from their sufferings. The survivors were gaunt and emaciated; and frequently would a poor fellow drop down in the extremity of weariness and despair. No effort was made to relieve these sufferers; but they were either left behind to perish, or bayoneted on the spot.

'At length we arrived at St. Lucar, and were thrown, some of us into prison-ships, and others into stinking casements. The extremity of our anguish now exceeded all powers of description. With scarce strength to crawl to our detestable dungeons, many reached them only to lie down, and die broken-hearted. Unwholesome and distasteful bread, about four ounces of horse-beans, and a little rancid oil, formed the materials of our wretched fare,—so wretched as to be refused in many cases by men fainting with weariness and famished with hunger.

'From St. Lucar we were sent to Cadiz, some on foot, and others by water. I was among the latter; and, as soon as we had got on board the vessels, we were counted like so many cattle driven into their stables. Each place of rest was made to contain six men; and, when once laid upon our backs, we had no room to change our position right or left, and the pestilential effluvia, arising from so many bodies thus huddled together, was extremely offensive, and rendered the atmosphere of the ship quite putrid. Vermin were generated by thousands; and such was the climax of my wretchedness and disgust, that I earnestly implored the intervention of the destroying angel; and a great many of my companions, harassed by the unrelenting severity of our masters, sought refuge from their misery by plunging into the sea.

'Nor did our changes stop here. From Cadiz we were sent to Majorca, and thence to the desolate island of Cabrera, where we were reduced for a time to the necessity of feeding on grass, and even on the dust of the earth. A great many died; and we immediately buried them in the sea, under the horrible apprehension, that the presence of their bodies would rouse within us the savage longings of the cannibal. A cuirassier was actually killed for this purpose by a Pole, who confessed he had done the same to two others of his comrades.'

No kindness or skill can avert suffering from the victims of war. 'For ten days after the sea-fight of Trafalgar, men were employed in bringing the wounded ashore; and spectacles were hourly exhibited at the wharves, and through the streets, sufficient to shock every heart not yet hardened to scenes of blood and

human suffering. When by the carelessness of the boatmen, or the surging of the sea, the boats struck against the stone piers, a horrid cry, piercing the very soul, arose from the mangled wretches on board. Nor was the scene less affecting on the tops of the pier, where the wounded were being carried away to the hospitals in every shape of misery, whilst crowds of Spaniards either assisted, or looked on with signs of horror. Meanwhile their companions who had escaped unhurt, walked up and down with folded arms and down-cast eyes, whilst women sat on heaps of arms, broken furniture and baggage, with their heads bent between their knees. I had no inclination to follow the litters of the wounded; yet I learned that every hospital in Cadiz was already full, and the convents and churches were appropriated to the remainder.'

Sir Charles Bell, the eminent surgeon who was present in the hospitals after the battle of Waterloo, says 'the wounded French continued to be brought in for several days; and the British soldiers who had in the morning been moved by the piteous cries of those they carried, I saw in the evening so hardened by the repetition of the scene, and by fatigue, as to become indifferent to the sufferings they occasioned.

'It was now the *thirteenth* day after the battle. It is impossible to conceive the sufferings of men rudely carried at such a period of their wounds. When I first entered the hospital, these Frenchmen had been roused and excited in a degree quite extraordinary; and in the glance of their eyes there was a character of fierceness which I never expected to witness in the human countenance. On the second day, the temporary excitement had subsided; and, turn which way I might, I encountered every form of entreaty from those whose condition left no need of words to stir compassion. "Surgeon Major, oh, how I suffer! Dress my wounds—do dress my wounds!—Doctor, cut off my leg! Oh! I suffer too much!" And when these entreaties were unavailing, you might hear in a weak, inward voice of despair, "I shall die—I am a dead man!"'

The following sketch from a British officer in Portugal will help us still further to conceive the horrors of a hospital. 'I entered the town of Mirando Cerro about dusk. It had been a black, grim, gloomy sort of day. Huge masses of clouds lay motionless on the sky; and then they would break up suddenly as with a whirlwind, and roll off in the red and bloody distance. I felt myself in a strange sort of excitement; my imagination got the better of all my other faculties; and, while walking out in the principal street, I met a woman, an old haggard-looking wretch, who had in her hollow eyes an unaccountable expression of cruelty, a glance like that of madness; but her deportment was quiet and rational, and, though clad in squallidness, she was evidently of the middle rank in society. Without being questioned, she told me in broken English, I should find comfortable accommodations in an old convent at some distance in a grove of cork-trees, pointing to them with her long, shrivelled hand and arm, and giving a sort of hysterical laugh.

‘I followed her advice, anticipating no danger or adventure; yet the wild eyes, and the still wilder voice of the old crone so powerfully affected me, that I walked, in a sort of muse, up a pretty long flight of steps, and found myself standing at the entrance to the cloisters of the convent. A strange sight now burst upon my view! Before me lay and sat more than a hundred dead bodies, all of them apparently in the very attitude or posture in which they had died. I gazed at them a minute or more before I knew that they were all corpses; and a desperate courage then enabled me to look steadfastly at the scene before me. The bodies were mostly clothed in mats, and rags, and tattered great coats; some of them were merely wrapt round about with girdles composed of straw; and two or three were perfectly naked. Every face had a different expression, but all painful, horrid, agonized, bloodless. Many glazed eyes were wide open; and perhaps this was the most shocking thing in the whole spectacle—so many eyes that saw not, all seemingly fixed upon different objects; some cast up to heaven, some looking straight forward, and others with the white orbs turned round, and deep sunk in their sockets. It was a sort of hospital; and these wretched beings, nearly all desperately wounded, had been stripped by their comrades, and left there either dead, or to die.

‘This ghastly sight I had begun to view with some composure, when I saw, at the remotest part of the hospital, a gigantic figure sitting, all covered with blood, and almost naked, upon a rude bedstead, with his back leaning against the wall, and his eyes fixed directly on mine. I first thought him alive, and shuddered; but he was stone dead! In his last agonies he had bitten his under lip almost entirely off, and his long black beard was drenched in clotted gore, that likewise lay in large blots upon his shaggy bosom. One of his hands had convulsively grasped the woodwork of the bedstead, and crushed it in the grasp. I recognized the corpse. He was a sergeant in a grenadier regiment, and had, during the retreat, been distinguished for acts of savage valor. One day he killed with his own hand Harry Warburton, the right-hand man of my own company, perhaps the most powerful man in the British army. There sat the giant frozen to death. I went up to him, and, raising his brawny arm, it fell down again with a hollow sound against the bloody side of the corpse.

‘My eyes unconsciously wandered along the walls. They were covered with grotesque figures and caricatures of the English, absolutely drawn in blood! Horrid blasphemies, and the most shocking obscenities in the shape of songs, were in like manner written there. I observed two books lying on the floor, and picked them up. One was full of the most hideous obscenity; the other was the Bible! It is impossible to tell the horror produced in me by this circumstance. The books dropt from my hand, and fell on the breast of one of the bodies—it was a woman’s breast! Yes, a *woman* had lived and died in such a place as this! What had been in that now still, death-cold heart, perhaps only a few hours

before, I knew not—possibly love strong as death; love, guilty, abandoned, linked by vice unto misery, but still love that perished only with the last throb, and yearned in its last convulsion towards some one of these grim dead bodies.

‘Near this corpse lay that of a perfect boy not more than seventeen years of age. Round his neck was suspended, by a chain of hair, a little copper figure of the Virgin Mary, and in his hand was a letter in French. I glanced at it, and read enough to know it was from a mother—*My dear Son, &c.* It was a terrible place to think of mother—of home—of any social, any human ties. What! have these ghastly things parents, brothers, sisters, lovers? Were they once all happy in peaceful homes? Did these convulsed, bloody, mangled bodies ever lie in undisturbed beds? Did these clutched hands once press in infancy a mother’s breast? Now, alas, how loathsome, terrible, ghostlike! Will such creatures, thought I, ever live again? Robbers, ravishers, incendiaries, murderers, suicides—a dragoon there had obviously blown out his own brains—here is a very pandemonium of guilt and horror!’

Such are the illustrations of war in the heart of Christendom itself at the dawn of the nineteenth century! Are they like the gospel—like its spirit, its principles, its promised results? Are such woes, such atrocities and horrors necessary, inevitable? Must they continue even in Christendom forever? Need they ever be repeated again under the blessed light of revelation? Is there not power in the gospel, God’s own panacea for all human ills, to prevent it? Most certainly; and all we need is a *right application of its pacific principles*. Here is a sovereign remedy for war; but, like every other remedy, it must be applied before it can cure, and it is the business of Christians to apply it wherever the evil is found. Who else will make the application? Has not the Prince of Peace devolved this duty upon them as peculiarly, emphatically their own? Will they not then array themselves as one man against a sin so foul, a scourge so terrible? Are you willing that such evils should ever befall your country, and your own father or brothers, your own husband or sons, should be doomed to similar cruelties and sufferings? If not, gird yourself in earnest for the work of putting an end to war first in Christendom, and finally through the world. Means are just as indispensable in this cause as in any other; but, if used aright, the God of Peace is pledged to crown them in due time with complete success.

SAFETY OF PACIFIC PRINCIPLES.

THERE are two ways to keep men from injuring us—by compulsion, or persuasion ; by brute force, or kind moral influence ; by appeals to their fears alone, or addresses to their conscience and better feelings. We may resort to the law of violence, or the law of love ; we may rely on the principle of war, or the principle of peace. One threatens, the other persuades ; one hates and curses, the other loves and blesses ; the former gives back insult and injury with interest, while the latter meekly turns the other cheek to the smiter, forgives even its bitterest enemies, and strives to overcome evil only with good.

No man, at all acquainted with the gospel, needs to be told which of these methods is most accordant with its principles. The bare statement must suffice for any one who has read either the New Testament or the Old ; who has traced the example of Christ and his Apostles, or caught from their lips such instructions as these,—*lay aside all malice ; do good unto all men ; love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and do good to them that despitefully use you ; resist not evil, but whoso smiteth you on one cheek, turn to him the other also ; recompense to no man evil for evil, but overcome evil with good.*

Here is the Christian mode of preventing or curing evils ; but most persons deem it unsafe, and resort to some form of violence. They have little confidence in the power of reason or truth, of justice or kindness, to hold in check the bad passions of mankind ; but employ for this purpose threats of evil, and engines of vengeance and death. Fear they seem to regard as the only effectual restraint upon mischief or guilt ; and hence they arm themselves with pistols and daggers against their personal foes, and think it madness for nations to rely for protection, one against another, on any thing but fleets and armies, a soldiery well trained, and fortifications well manned. Milder means, appeals to the better feelings of our nature, they would not entirely discard ; but the former they make their last resort, their sole reliance, and honestly believe that war is the only sure way to peace ; that there is no real security but in bloodshed ; that we must either fight, or become the prey of malice or ambition, of rapacity or revenge. Nor can we deny that the history of our world, written mainly in blood, and detailing a series of almost incessant jealousies and conflicts between nations, would seem to justify such an opinion ; and yet we verily believe that pacific principles are the surest safeguard, and would, if rightly used, suffice, far better than any war-methods, to avert or mitigate the evils incident from bad passions to individual or national intercourse.

Let us first ascertain the precise point in dispute. The question is not whether the principles of peace, any measures of forbearance, kindness and conciliation will, in *every case*, avert *all* evil. The depravity of mankind forbids the hope. It is morally impossible; and no means devised by the policy of man, or the wisdom of God, have hitherto succeeded in securing such a result. The war-principle has been tried all over the earth for nearly six thousand years; but has it kept man from preying upon his brother, or nation from rising against nation? Has it prevented bloodshed, violence, rapine, injustice, oppression, despotism, the countless wrongs and evils that form nearly the sum total of history? Surely then war is no security against the bad passions of men; it would seem hardly possible for any system to produce *worse* results; and hence we are forced to the inquiry, as the only point at issue, whether a policy strictly pacific will prevent more evil, and secure more good, than war-methods actually have.

The advocates of war seem even now to concede the very point in debate; for they all admit, that we ought to use pacific expedients as long as we can, and to draw the sword only as a last and inevitable resort. This admission recognizes the superiority of pacific over warlike measures; and we should, if consistent, abandon the latter, and adopt the former as our uniform and permanent policy.

History too, though extremely barren of examples to illustrate the efficacy of pacific principles, does nevertheless furnish some strong presumptions in their favor. War, as an engine of mere force and vengeance, belongs to a state entirely savage; and communities, like individuals, abandon or relax the war-principle just as fast as they rise in the scale of general cultivation, and come under the sway of moral influences. Nations, even while retaining the war-system in the back-ground as their ultimate reliance, have already reached the wisdom of employing for the most part pacific expedients for the prevention or adjustment of difficulties with each other. They retain the sword, but keep it in the scabbard, and are fast superceding its use by the substitution of pacific methods. They continue the war-system either by the force of habit, or as a sort of scare-crow; it looms up before the world very like an old, useless hulk afloat on the ocean as a memento of the past, and a warning to the future; while they sedulously use in its stead the policy of peace in more than nine cases out of ten, and thus bear an unconscious but decisive testimony to the vast superiority of the former.

We can find in history no considerable nation acting on the strictest principles of peace; but those which approach the nearest to these principles, uniformly enjoy the highest degree of safety and prosperity. Take China, Switzerland, or the United States; and you will see in their case a striking confirmation of this truth, and a strong presumptive argument for the *strictest* principles of peace. None of them have given up the system of armed self-defence; but they have for the most part adopted a

policy unusually pacific. They have professedly acted only on the defensive; they have betrayed few, if any wishes for aggression or conquest; they have kept up no fleets or armies sufficient to intimidate or provoke their neighbors; they have been respectful, courteous and conciliatory in their intercourse with other nations, and relied mainly on their own character, and the force of reason and justice, for the vindication of their rights, and the redress of their wrongs. What is the result? No nations on earth have ever been so exempt from aggression, injury and insult; and, if the partial adoption of our principles has been so successful, would not their full application be still more so?

Let us dwell a little on cases like these. Rome, while under her warlike kings, kept a great part of Italy in arms against her; but Numa, changing this policy, turned his people from the pursuits of war to the arts of peace, quelled the dissensions among themselves, and cultivated a friendly intercourse with the nations around them. Their neighbors, astonished at the change, threw aside their arms, hailed the Romans as friends, and lived in peace with them so long as they continued this new policy.—So of the Chinese. Disinclined to war, and nearly destitute of military resources, still what nation has suffered fewer invasions of its soil or its rights?—Look at Switzerland. For more than five centuries has she, with very few and brief exceptions, been at peace with her neighbors. While the flames of war have raged all around her, she has remained quiet upon her mountains, tilled her rugged soil, and reaped the fruits of her industry and pacific policy in the enjoyment of health, competence and domestic happiness. Nor is this owing to her Alpine position, to the bravery of her sons, or the peculiar form of her government; for there is nothing in all these to shield her against the assaults of any power disposed to invade her territory. It would have been very easy for neighboring states to conquer Switzerland; and yet she remains unmolested, a republic free and flourishing in the midst of surrounding despotisms. Why? Not because she has any formidable power, but because she pursues a pacific policy. She betrays no ambition to enlarge her territory, seeks only security within her own limits, and is scrupulously upright, honorable and conciliatory in her intercourse with other nations. She aims to give no just ground for offence; and, when complaints arise, she holds herself ready to meet every fair and equitable claim for redress. Her policy and her character are the bulwarks of her defence, almost the only pledges of her safety.—Here, too, is the secret of our own security. More than sixty years have elapsed since our independence was acknowledged by Great Britain; and during all this time no invader, except when provoked by the hostilities we had ourselves begun, has set foot upon our soil; nor has there been any real need of drawing the sword to secure from other nations a proper respect for our rights, or an equitable redress for our wrongs. Yet has our policy ever been essentially and eminently pacific. We have had the merest handful of men

for a standing army ; our navy too, though in high repute for its skill and bravery, has always been comparatively small ; and in all our intercourse with other nations, we have relied almost entirely on the excellence of our principles, and the justice of our cause. We have doubtless experienced occasional injury, and some delays of justice ; but we have suffered as little as any other people in the same time, and far less than we should from an opposite policy.

An example still more striking is found in the commonwealth of San Marino. This little republic in Italy, the smallest independent state in Europe, covers, on a single mountain and two adjoining hills, some thirty square miles, and contains in its capital, and four villages, only 7000 inhabitants. Yet has this petty republic existed, very much in its present form, more than thirteen centuries. The thunderbolts of war have fallen thick but harmless around it ; other republics, proud of their military strength, have been swept from the earth ; Italy has repeatedly been covered with armies, and drenched in blood ; thrones have crumbled, and dynasties perished, and all Europe been shaken to its centre by political convulsions ; yet San Marino, strong in its very weakness, and safe mainly by its reliance on a pacific policy, has remained without harm or assault. It claims the right of violent defence, but provides few means for the purpose, and none sufficient to deter or provoke its neighbors. How shall we account for its long and perfect safety ? No state is too poor for the clutches of avarice, none too small for the grasp of ambition ; and but for its pacific policy, and the indelible disgrace of assailing a community so defenceless, San Marino would long since have been merged in some neighboring nation.

Such are the results of peace principles partially applied ; and would not their full application be still more successful ? Such a conclusion, indeed, might well seem almost self-evident ; but let us proceed to prove it, first from *the promised protection of heaven*, next from *the natural tendency of such principles*, and finally from *the history of their actual influence*.

God, then, has promised protection to those who act on the pacific principles of his gospel. Here is security enough. It is always safe to do right ; and no man, or body of men, ever did their duty, and trusted God in vain. It may have *seemed* otherwise for a time ; but it was *not* in vain, nor ever can be. History is full of proofs on this point ; and if God has made it the duty of nations in their intercourse to put in practice the principles of peace, then may they do so in full confidence of his protection. His promises insure their safety. "If thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him drink ; for in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good ? When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." Both the New Testament and the Old are replete with promises of divine protection to those who obey and trust God ; and ever will the

path of obedience to him be found a path of safety both for individuals and for nations.

This point needs little proof; but take an illustration from the Old Testament. God bade the Israelites, "thrice in a year shall all your man-children appear before the Lord;" and he added the promise, "neither shall any man desire thy land when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice in the year." So the result proved; for a learned author assures us, "that the Hebrew territories remained free from invasions, while all the adult males three times every year went to the Tabernacle or the Temple, without leaving in their cities and villages any guard to protect them from foreign incursions; and in no instance does there appear to have been any hostile attack made upon them at such times."

The Bible is full of instances very like this; the history of God's ancient people exhibits a series of similar interpositions; nor should we, from the nature of the case, expect any other result. If he *knows* what is best for us, can we suppose that a God of infinite love would enjoin upon us a course of conduct fatal to our welfare? The supposition would impeach every attribute of his character. If he hath the hearts of all entirely in his hand; if he doeth his pleasure in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of earth; if he controls every event from the falling of a sparrow to the revolutions of an empire and a world; if all his attributes are pledged for the protection of such as obey his will, and trust his promises for safety; can we doubt that he will fulfil those promises in their actual preservation from danger?

To this question, the history not only of the Israelites, but of Christian missionaries in every age, gives a most triumphant answer. They have gone forth to combat the errors and sins of a world lying in wickedness; and while assailing time-hallowed prejudices, and thus provoking both anger and revenge, they have for the most part been safe under the invisible but omnipotent and almighty protection of Him who called them to such perilous, godlike services. Look at the herald of the cross. He is far away from his native land, with no promise or hope of safety from its power; he takes up his abode in Greenland or Caffraria, among savages and cannibals; he has no means whatever of defence, but, like a lamb among wolves, is entirely at the mercy of men inured to blood, and steeled to compassion. Yet is the missionary safe even there. Trusting in his character, in his work, in his God, he walks unharmed, and sleeps without fear, in the midst of those whose chief business is the butchery of mankind. The warrior just returned from battle, the savage holding still in his hand the green scalps of his victims, the cannibal fresh from the taste of human flesh, all unite in spontaneous deference to the man of peace, the messenger of love from the Great Spirit to his wild, wandering children. There is no weapon of death in his hand, no word of menace on his lips, no scowl of defiance or malice on his brow; and the rude, untutored sons of nature welcome

him to their homes and their hearts, as one whom none must harm. Even in their bosoms we find a principle which reveres his character and mission of peace, and renders him far safer than he would be with all the bayonets of Christendom to guard him. We grant that missionaries have sometimes been persecuted, and have occasionally fallen victims; but we believe this has always resulted from some misapprehension of their real character and intentions. When these have been fully understood, the heralds of the cross, in the simple panoply of the gospel, have been safe, like those saints of old who passed unharmed through the fiery furnace. God has been their protector; and even in the lion's den have his Egedes and Eliots, his Brainerds and Martyns, walked fearless and secure, not merely because his providence guarded them, but because his hand had planted in men a principle which makes them spontaneously yield to the charms of goodness, to the welcome power of peace and love.

Let us look at some instances of providential protection. The natives of the South Sea Islands once came down upon the missionaries, with the intention of killing them, for the sole purpose of seizing their property which they coveted. The missionaries expostulated with them in vain; they still persisted in their bloody design, and seemed on the point of carrying it into effect. God was the only resort; and the missionaries, turning towards each other, knelt in prayer, and expected every moment the war-club to dash out their brains. They rose at length from their knees; and the natives were gone! They feared an ambush, or some other stratagem, and searched for them with care, but could discover no traces of their assailants. They went to the seashore; but the natives were not there. At length they met a little boy, of whom they inquired, 'where are all the people?' "Why," said he, "don't you know? They are gone to the other side of the island to hide themselves in the wood." "And how came they to do that?" "When they saw you praying," replied the boy, "and heard you call on your God, and knew that he is a great and mighty God, they were afraid he would come down, and kill them all, and so they all ran away to hide themselves."

A case still more remarkable occurred at the siege of Copenhagen under Lord Nelson. An officer in the fleet says, "I was particularly impressed with an object which I saw three or four days after the terrific bombardment of that place. For several nights before the surrender, the darkness was ushered in with a tremendous roar of guns and mortars, accompanied by the whizzing of those destructive and burning engines of warfare, Congreve's rockets. The dreadful effects were soon visible in the brilliant lights through the city. The blazing houses of the rich, and the burning cottages of the poor, illuminated the heavens; and the wide-spreading flames, reflecting on the water, showed a forest of ships assembled round the city for its destruction. This work of conflagration went on for several nights; but the Danes at length surrendered; and on walking some days after among

the ruins, consisting of the cottages of the poor, houses of the rich, manufactories, lofty steeples, and humble meeting-houses, I desecrated, amid this barren field of desolation, a solitary house unharmed; all around it a burnt mass, this alone untouched by the fire, a monument of mercy. Whose house is that? I asked. 'That,' said the interpreter, 'belongs to a Quaker. He would neither fight, nor leave his house, but remained in prayer with his family during the whole bombardment.' Surely, thought I, it is well with the righteous. God *has* been a shield to thee in battle, a wall of fire round about thee, a very present help in time of need."

II. Such is God's care of the peace-maker; but let us glance at *the natural tendency of his principles*. Their power is peculiar and universal. They address some of the deepest, strongest elements in the nature of man. There is in innocence and love, in meekness, forbearance and forgiveness, in the spirit of self-sacrifice for others, in the principle of returning only good for evil, a charm which few can resist. Even the maniac, the beast of the forest, the very reptile at our feet, all feel its power. It allays passion; it disarms hatred; it checks revenge; it subdues the felon and the savage. From every heart does it call back echoes of its own sweet and soothing voice. Like begets like; and whatever spirit we breathe in our intercourse with others, we may expect them to manifest more or less of the same spirit towards ourselves. Hate them, and they will hate you; love them, and you will ere long kindle in their bosoms an affection responsive to your own; curse them, and they will fling back your curses; menace them, and you will rouse a spirit of stern defiance; assail them, and they will turn upon you in wrath; do them either good or evil, and you may expect a return of your own treatment. You must first give to others what you wish from them. It is a law of our moral nature. Speak in harsh, angry tones to any man, and his first impulse will be to answer you in the same tones. Address words of respect and kindness to the veriest churl or brawler in the streets, and he will make an honest effort to treat you as well as you have treated him.

But weakness and innocence are their own protection, better far than lead and steel. Throw an infant on the mercy of any man, civilized or savage; and, so far from killing it, he will instinctively respond to its claims upon his kindness and care. If that infant belongs to his enemy, he may wreak his vengeance on the latter by murdering the former; but the child, left to itself, he would spontaneously protect and cherish. No man assails, or challenges to mortal combat, a woman, a feeble old man, or a minister of the gospel. Whence their security? They carry no weapons; they utter no threats; they have little or no power to defend themselves by force; they look for protection, nor look in vain, to the great principles of our nature. In these there is far more power for such a purpose, than there is in any weapons of violence that a Hercules ever wielded; and the feeblest, most de-

fenceless, will generally be found to enjoy the greatest degree of safety. Even the iron tempest of war sweeps over them comparatively harmless. At the close of a battle, a soldier of the victorious army, more ferocious and reckless from the bloody work of the day, chanced to find a small boy on the field, and, very much from the habit of assailing whatever came in his way, lifted his sword to cleave him down, when the little fellow, looking up in his face, exclaimed, "*O sir, don't kill ME, I'm so little.*" That simple appeal went to the warrior's heart; and returning his sword into its scabbard, he galloped away without harming the child. Some men there possibly may be who would have killed him; but scarce one man in a million would so outrage his own nature.

Men generally rely upon force; but there is, in truth, far more efficacy in persuasion. Æsop, in one of his fables, relates a contest between the sun and the north wind to see which should first disarm a certain traveller of his cloak. The wind blew, and the traveller wrapped his cloak more tightly about him; it blew still more loudly, but he only held his cloak with a firmer grasp than ever; the fiercer the assault, the more vigorous and determined the resistance. The sun took an opposite course; he betrayed no purpose of violence, no symptoms of wrath, but spread over hill and valley the warmth of his purest, gentlest radiance; the traveller smiled, and at once yielded to persuasion what he had denied to force. Such is human nature; and a counterpart to this beautiful picture may be found all over the earth.

Universal experience proves the truth of this principle. You will find it at work every where; and a man, *known* to be unarmed, would be safer even among robbers and assassins, pirates and savages, than he would with the most formidable weapons. Let us hear the deliberate judgment of one taught by long and familiar acquaintance with the worst specimens of humanity. "Spanish smugglers," says Raymond, "are as adroit as they are determined, are familiarized at all times with peril, and march in the very face of death. Their first movement is a never-failing shot, and certainly would be a subject of dread to most travellers; for where are they to be dreaded more than in deserts where crime has nothing to witness it, and the feeble no assistance? As for myself, alone and unarmed, I have met them without anxiety, and accompanied them without fear. We have little to apprehend from men whom we inspire with no distrust or envy, and every thing to expect in those from whom we claim only what is due from man to man. The laws of nature still exist for those who have long shaken off the laws of civil government. At war with society, they are sometimes at peace with their fellows. The assassin has been my guide in the defiles of Italy, and the smuggler of the Pyrenees has welcomed me to his secret paths. Armed, I should have been the enemy of both; unarmed, they have alike respected me. In such expectation, I have long since laid aside all menacing apparatus whatever. Arms may indeed

be employed against wild beasts; but no one should forget that they are no defence against the traitor; that they irritate the wicked, and intimidate the simple; lastly, that the man of peace among mankind has a much more sacred defence—his character."

III. But let us inquire more fully into *the actual results of the peace principle*. We shall find it has power over the young and the old, over the refined and the rude, over the bad as well as the good, over savages, maniacs, and even brutes. Nor can we wonder when we look at its nature. A slave in one of the West Indies, originally from Africa, became, after his conversion, singularly valuable on account of his integrity and general good conduct. His master at length raised him to a situation of some consequence, and used to employ him in the purchase of new slaves. On one occasion he was sent with instructions to select twenty of the strongest, most able-bodied he could find in the market; but he had not long surveyed the multitude offered for sale, before he fixed his eye intently on a feeble, decrepit old man, and told his master he must be one of the twenty. His master in surprise remonstrated against so strange a choice; but the poor fellow begged so hard to be indulged, that the dealer said if they took twenty, he would give them the old man in the bargain. The purchase was accordingly made, and the slaves conducted to the plantation; but upon none did the negro bestow half the attention and care he did upon the old African. He took him to his own habitation, and laid him on his own bed; he fed him at his own table, and gave him drink out of his own cup; when he was cold, he carried him into the sun-shine, and when hot, he placed him under the shade of the cocoa-nut trees. Astonished at such attentions, his master interrogated him on the subject. 'Why do you take such interest in that worthless old man? There must be some special reason; he is a relative of yours, perhaps your father?' "No, massa," answered the poor fellow, "he no my fader!" 'An elder brother then!' "No, massa, he no my broder!" 'Then he is an uncle, or some other relation.' "No, massa, he no be of my kindred at all, nor even my friend!" 'Then,' asked the master in astonishment, 'why do you take so much interest in the old fellow?' "He my enemy, massa," replied the slave; "he sold me to the slave-dealer; and my Bible tell me when my enemy hunger, feed him, and when he thirst, give him drink."

Such a principle touches a responsive cord even in brutes. I once read of a lion so pained by a thorn in his paw which he could not himself extract, that he prevailed by some means upon a passing boy to pull it out; and that act of kindness attached the king of the forest to the lad, and drew forth a flood of the fondest caresses. Martin tells a similar story of a lion on board a British war-ship. Prince had a keeper to whom he was much attached. The keeper got drunk one day; and, as the captain never forgave the crime, the keeper was ordered to be flogged. The grating

was rigged on the main deck opposite Prince's den, a large barred up place, the pillars large, and cased with iron. When the keeper began to strip, Prince rose gloomily from his couch, and got as near to his friend as possible. On beholding his bare back, he walked hastily round the den; and when he saw the boatswain inflict the first lash, his eyes sparkled with fire, and his sides resounded with the strong and quick beatings of his tail. At last, when the blood began to flow from the unfortunate man's back, and the 'clotted cats' jerked their gory knots close to the lion's den, his fury became tremendous. He roared with a voice of thunder, shook the strong bars of his prison as if they had been osiers, and finding his efforts to break loose unavailing, he rolled and shrieked in a manner the most terrific it is possible to conceive. The captain, fearing he might break loose, ordered the marines to load, and present at Prince. This threat, however, only redoubled his rage; and at last the captain desired the keeper to be cast off, and go to his friend. It is impossible to describe the joy evinced by the lion. He licked with care the mangled and bleeding back of the cruelly treated seaman, caressed him with his paws, which he folded round the keeper as if to defy any one renewing a similar treatment; and it was only after several hours that Prince would allow the keeper to quit his protection, and return among those who had so ill used him.

Let us see the effects of this principle upon the most unmanageable of human beings, men who have lost their reason. It used to be supposed, that force alone would suffice for the control of maniacs, and they were treated entirely on the war-principle; but the whole mode of treatment has been changed, and kindness now takes the place of violence. The results are well known; but this new system had at its outset to encounter what may now seem a strange skepticism. Its introduction into this country is comparatively recent; and we will take the story of its first trial in France.

In 1792, Pinel, who had been for some time chief physician to the Bicetre, or mad-house of Paris, begged repeatedly of the public authorities, to let him remove the chains from the furious. His applications having been unsuccessful, he presented himself before the commune of Paris, and repeating his objections with increased warmth, urged a reform of such monstrous treatment. "Citizen," said one of the members to him, "I will to-morrow go to visit the Bicetre; but wo betide thee, if thou deceivest us, and concealst any of the enemies of the people amongst thy insane."

This member of the commune was Couthon. The next day he went to the Bicetre. Couthon was himself as strange a spectacle as any whom he visited. Deprived of the use of his lower extremities, and compelled to be borne on the arms of others, he appeared, says Pinel, a fraction of humanity implanted on another's body; and from out of this deformity, pronounced in a feeble and feminine voice, merciless sentences proceeded, sentences of death; for death was the only logic that then prevailed. Couthon visited the insane in succession, and questioned them himself; but he received

only imprecations amidst the clanking of chains on floors disgustingly filthy from the evacuations of the miserable occupants. Fatigued with the monotony and revolting character of this spectacle, Couthon returned to Pinel. "Citizen," said he, "art thou thyself mad to desire to unchain such animals?" "Citizen," replied Pinel, "I am convinced that these lunatics are intractable only from being deprived of air and liberty, and I expect much from a different course." "Well," said Couthon, "do as thou likest; I leave them to thee; but I am afraid thou wilt fall a victim to thy presumption."

Master of his own actions, Pinel immediately commenced his undertaking, fully aware of its real difficulties; for he was going to set at liberty about fifty furious maniacs, without injurious or dangerous consequences, as he hoped, to the other peaceable inmates of the establishment. He determined to unchain no more than twelve at the first trial; and the only precaution he took, was to have an equal number of strait jackets prepared, made of strong linen with long sleeves, which could be tied behind the back of the maniac, should it become necessary to restrict him from committing acts of violence.

The first person to whom Pinel addressed himself, had been a resident for the longest period in this abode of misery. He was an English captain, whose history was unknown, but who had been chained there for forty years. He was looked upon as the most terrible of all the insane. His attendants always approached him with circumspection; for in a paroxysm of fury, he had struck one of the servants on the head with his manacles, and killed him on the spot. He was confined with more rigor than many of the others, which circumstance, combined with almost total neglect on the part of the keepers, had exasperated a disposition naturally furious. Pinel entered his cell alone, and approached him calmly. "Captain," said he, "if I were to remove your chains, and to give you liberty to walk in the court, would you promise me to be rational, and do harm to no one?" "I promise thee. But thou mockest me; they, as well as thyself, are too much afraid of me." "Assuredly not. I have no fear; for I have six men at hand to make me respected, should it be necessary. But believe my word; be confiding and docile. I will give you liberty, if you will allow me to substitute this strait waistcoat for your ponderous chains."

The captain yielded with a good grace to every thing required of him, shrugging his shoulders, but without uttering a word. In a few minutes his irons were completely removed, and Pinel withdrew, leaving the door of the cell open. Several times the maniac raised himself from his seat, but fell back again; he had kept the sitting posture so long that he had lost the use of his legs. At length, in about a quarter of an hour, and after repeated attempts, he succeeded in retaining his equilibrium, and from the depth of his dark cell advanced staggering towards the door. His first action was to look at the sky, and exclaim in ecstasy, "How beautiful!" Through the whole day he ran about, ascending and descending the stairs, and constantly repeating the excla-

mation, "How beautiful! how good!" In the evening he returned to his cell, slept tranquilly on a better bed, which had been provided for him; and during the two additional years which he passed in the Bicetre, he had no paroxysm of fury. He rendered himself, indeed, useful in the establishment, by exerting a certain degree of authority over the patients, whom he governed after his own fashion, and over whom he elected himself a kind of superintendent.

But the case of Chevinge, a soldier of the French guards, is looked upon as one of the most memorable feats of that interesting and eventful day. While in the army, he had but one fault—drunkenness; and when in this state he became turbulent, violent, and the more dangerous from his strength being prodigious. Owing to his repeated excesses, he was dismissed from his regiment, and soon dissipated his limited resources. Shame and misery subsequently plunged him into such a state of depression, that his intellect became disordered. In his delirium he thought he had been made a general, and beat those who did not admit his rank and quality; and, in consequence of a violent disturbance thus originating, he was taken to the Bicetre, laboring under the most furious excitement. He had been confined in chains for ten years, and with more severity than most of his fellow sufferers, as he had frequently broken asunder his irons by the sole strength of his hands. On one occasion, when he obtained momentary liberty in this manner, he set at defiance the united efforts of all his keepers to make him re-enter his cell. His strength had, indeed, become proverbial at the Bicetre.

Pinel, on several visits, had discovered in Chevinge an excellent disposition, masked under the excitement incessantly occasioned by cruel treatment. He promised the lunatic to ameliorate his condition, and this promise itself rendered him more tranquil. Pinel at length told him he should be no longer chained; 'and to prove the confidence I have in thee,' said he, 'and that I regard thee as a man adapted for doing good, thou shalt aid me in freeing those unfortunates who have not their reason like thee; and if thou conductest thyself as I have reason to hope, I will take thee into my service, and thou shalt never quit me. Never,' adds Pinel, 'was there a more sudden and complete revolution. The keepers themselves were impressed with respect and astonishment at the spectacle which Chevinge afforded.' Scarcely was he liberated when he was seen anticipating and following with his eye, every motion of Pinel, executing his orders with skill and promptitude, and addressing words of reason and kindness to the insane, on the level with whom he had been but a short time before. This man whom chains had kept degraded during the best years of his life, and who would doubtless have spent the remainder of his existence in the same wretched condition, became afterwards a model of good conduct and gratitude. Often, in the difficult times of the revolution, he saved the life of Pinel, and on one occasion rescued him from a band of miscreants who were conducting him to the "Lanterne," owing to his having been an elector in

1789. During the time of famine, he left the Bicetre every morning, and returned with supplies of provisions which gold could not at that time procure. His whole life was one of perpetual devotion to his liberator.

In the course of a few days, the shackles were removed from fifty-five lunatics. An unexpected improvement followed from a course previously regarded impracticable and even fatal. The furious mad-men, who monthly destroyed hundreds of utensils, renounced their habits of violence; others, who tore their clothes, and rioted in filth and nudity, became clean and decent; tranquillity and harmony succeeded to tumult and disorder; and over the whole establishment order and good feeling reigned.

Mark, also, the power of this principle over criminals. Mr. Pillsbury, warden of the state prison in Connecticut, once received into the prison a man of gigantic stature, whose crimes had for seventeen years made him the terror of the country. He told the criminal when he came, he hoped he would not repeat the attempts to escape which he had made elsewhere. "It will be best," said he, "that you and I should treat each other as well as we can. I will make you as comfortable as I possibly can, and I shall be anxious to be your friend; and I hope you will not get me into difficulty on your account. There is a cell intended for solitary confinement; but we have never used it, and I should be sorry ever to have to turn the key upon any body in it. You may range the place as freely as I do; if you trust me, I shall trust you." The man was sulky, and for weeks showed only gradual symptoms of softening under the operation of Mr. Pillsbury's cheerful confidence. At length information was brought of the man's intention to break prison. The warden called him, and taxed him with it; the man preserved a gloomy silence. He was told it was now necessary for him to be locked in the solitary cell, and desired to follow the warden, who went first, carrying a lamp in one hand, and a key in the other. In the narrowest part of the passage, Mr. Pillsbury, a small, light man, turned round, and looked in the face of the stout criminal. "Now," said he, "I ask whether you have treated me as I deserve? I have done every thing I could to make you happy; I have trusted you; but you have never given me the least confidence in return, and have even planned to get me into difficulty. Is this kind? And yet I cannot bear to lock you up. If I had the least sign that you cared for me"—The man burst into tears. 'Sir,' said he, 'I have been a very devil these seventeen years; but you treat me like a man.' "Come, let us go back," said the warden. The convict had free range of the prison as before; and from this hour he began to open his heart to the warden, and cheerfully fulfilled his whole term of imprisonment.

The labors of Elizabeth Fry in Newgate, and their signal success, are well known; but let us quote the case of Haynes, executed in 1799 at Bristol, Eng. He was heavily ironed, yet so extremely turbulent and outrageous, that the other prisoners stood

in fear of him, and were obliged to be constantly on their guard. It became necessary even to call out the military; but this only irritated him, and made him worse. He would expose his naked breast to the soldiers' bayonets, dare them to run him through, and say he would rather be shot dead than surrender himself to them. Yet, when force failed, remonstrance succeeded; for he actually delivered up to the persuasions of a gentleman, a weapon which a file of soldiers were unable to take from him. A pious minister by the name of Bundy, used to visit him, and at length told the keeper he wished to spend the night with the felon. He was warned of his danger; but, moved with compassion, he persisted, and entered the prisoner's cell. Finding him prostrate on the floor under the weight of his irons, he persuaded the keeper to let him have one hand and foot at liberty. The keeper retired late at night, locking after him three massive doors; and Haynes, immediately lifting up his liberated hand, and reaching a clasped knife he had concealed, rushed fiercely towards him, exclaiming with the voice and looks of a demon, 'now thou art in my power, I will kill thee.' The man of God thought his end had come; but suddenly recalling the passage, "thou canst have no power over me unless it be given thee from above," was instantly raised above all fear, and calmly met the enraged culprit, to whom he kindly said, "now, my friend, what harm have I done you, or of what service would my death be to you?" He then spoke of the love of Christ, and assured the felon, that he was ready to receive all, even the most wicked, who came to him. These words of kindness softened the culprit's heart; he threw down the knife, acknowledging his guilt, and burst into tears. Deeply convicted at length of sin, he asked if it was possible for such a sinner as himself ever to be saved? The anguish of his mind was extreme; he would often weep bitterly in view of his sins; and there is reason to hope that he died a sincere penitent.

A case still stronger occurred in France early in the same century. A pious man by the name of Claude, was confined in the Bastille, and along with him a felon so ferocious and brutal, that no one durst approach him. In vain had every possible means been used to humanize him; and when all expedients had failed, the governor urged Claude to undertake the work. His humility at first declined the proposal; but the entreaties of the governor prevailed on him at length to attempt the difficult and perilous service, and he was shut up with the human brute. He received the saint with the greatest rudeness, and exhausted his ferocity in revilings, in blows, and still more savage tokens of his disposition. To this treatment, continued till the mad-man was completely exhausted, the man of God opposed only silence, patience and meekness. His prayers achieved the rest. The monster, after absolutely wearying himself out with abuse and violence, looked at length into the face of Claude, and seeing the love and patient benignity of its expression, suddenly threw himself at his feet in a flood of tears. On recovering his voice enough to speak, he expressed the utmost abhorrence of himself, as well as

veneration for Claude, and, humbly beseeching his forgiveness, implored to be taught a religion which could do such great things. Claude, raising the penitent, and embracing him with tears, showed him the necessity of an entire and thorough change. Nor were his instructions in vain; they effected a complete alteration in the man, and he became pious, gentle and resigned, a tiger transformed into a lamb.

Take also the case of Archbishop Sharpe and the footpad. His lordship, when riding alone, was met by a well-looking young man, who presented a pistol to his breast, and demanded his money. The archbishop, with great composure, turned about, and, looking steadfastly at him, desired he would remove that dangerous weapon, and tell him fairly his condition. "Sir! Sir!" with great agitation, cried the youth, "no words, 'tis not a time—your money instantly."—"Hear me, young man," said the archbishop; "you see I am an old man, and my life is of very little consequence; yours seems far otherwise. I am named Sharpe, and am archbishop of York; my carriage and servants are behind. Tell me what money you want, and who you are; and I will not injure you, but prove a friend. Here, take this," giving him his purse; "and now ingenuously tell me how much you want to make you independent of so destructive a business as you are now engaged in." "Oh, Sir," replied the man, "I detest the business as much as you. I am—but—but at home there are creditors who will not stay; fifty pounds, my lord, indeed would do what no tongue besides my own can tell." "Well, Sir, I take it on your word; and, upon my honor, if you will, in a day or two, call on me, what I have now given shall be made up that sum." The highwayman went off, and at the time appointed, actually waited on the archbishop, and assured him his words had left impressions which nothing could ever destroy.

Nothing more transpired for nearly two years, when a person knocked at his grace's gate, and with a peculiar earnestness desired to see him. The archbishop ordered the stranger to be brought in. He entered the room where his lordship was, but had scarce advanced a few steps before his countenance changed, his knees tottered, and he sank almost breathless on the floor. On recovering, he requested an audience in private. The apartment being cleared, "My Lord," said he, "you cannot have forgotten the circumstances at such a time and place; gratitude will never suffer them to be obliterated from my mind. In me, my lord, you behold that once most wretched of mankind, but now, by your inexpressible humanity, rendered equal, perhaps superior, in happiness to millions. Oh, my lord," (tears for awhile preventing his utterance,) "'tis you, 'tis you, that have saved me, body and soul; 'tis you that have saved a dear and much-loved wife, and a little brood of children, whom I loved dearer than my life. Here are the fifty pounds; but never shall I find language to testify what I feel. I was the younger son of a wealthy man; your lordship knows him, his name was ———. My marriage alienated his affection, and my brother withdrew his love, and left

me to sorrow and penury. A month since, my brother died a bachelor, and intestate. What was his, is become mine; and, by your astonishing goodness, I am at once the most penitent, most grateful, and happiest of my species."

Washington, far more a man of peace than of war, once gave a fine and impressive illustration of the peace principle. When stationed in early life at Alexandria, with a regiment under his command, he grew warm at an election, and said something offensive to a Mr. Payne who, with one blow of his cane, brought him to the ground. On hearing of the insult, the regiment, burning for revenge, started for the city; but Washington met them, and begged them, by their regard for him, to return peaceably to their barracks. Finding himself in the wrong, he nobly resolved to make an honorable reparation, and next morning sent a polite note requesting Payne to meet him at the tavern. Payne took it for a challenge, and went in expectation of a duel; but what was his surprise to find instead of pistols, a decanter of wine on the table. Washington rose to meet him, and said with a smile, "Mr. Payne, to err is human; but to correct our errors is always honorable. I believe I was wrong yesterday; you have had, I think, some satisfaction; and if you deem that sufficient, here is my hand—let us be friends." Such an act few could resist; and Payne became from that moment through life, an enthusiastic friend and admirer of Washington.

This principle has a peculiar charm for the young. 'One day,' says a city missionary in Boston, 'I visited one of the primary schools. Some fifty children, from four to eight years old, were present. A boy about seven years old, and his sister about five, sat near me; and while I was talking to the school, George doubled up his fist, and struck his sister on the head. She was angry in a moment, and raised her hand to strike him back. The teacher, happening to see her at the instant, promptly said, "Mary, you had better kiss your brother." The girl dropped her hand, and looked up at her teacher as if she did not understand her. She had never been taught to return good for evil, but thought, if her brother struck her, she must strike him back. The teacher, looking very kindly both at her and at George, said again, "My dear Mary, you had better kiss your brother. See how angry and unhappy he looks!" Mary looked at her brother, who seemed very sullen and wretched; but soon forgetting her resentment, she threw both her arms round his neck, and kissed him. The poor boy, wholly unprepared for such a return, burst into a flood of tears. The gentle sister, taking the corner of her apron, and wiping away his tears, sought to comfort him by saying, "don't cry, George, you did n't hurt me much;" but he only cried the harder.'

Of the same tenor is the story of William Ladd and his neighbor. "I had," said he, "a fine field of grain growing upon an out-farm at some distance from the homestead. Whenever I rode by, I saw my neighbor Pulsifer's sheep in the lot, destroying my hopes of a harvest. These sheep were of the gaunt, long-legged kind, active as spaniels; they could spring over the highest fence,

and no partition-wall could keep them out. I complained to neighbor Pulsifer about them, and sent frequent messages, but all without avail. Perhaps they would be kept out for a day or two; but the legs of his sheep were long, and my grain rather more tempting than the adjoining pasture. I became angry, and told my men to set the dogs on them; and if that would not do, I would pay them if they would shoot the sheep.

"I rode away much agitated, for I was not so much of a peace man then as I am now, and I felt literally full of fight. All at once a light flashed in upon me. I asked myself, would it not be well for you to try in your own conduct the peace principle you are preaching to others? I thought it all over, and settled down my mind as to the best course to be pursued.

"The next day I rode over to see neighbor Pulsifer. I found him chopping wood at his door. 'Good morning, neighbor.' No answer. 'Good morning,' I repeated. He gave a kind of grunt like a hog, without looking up. 'I came,' continued I, 'to see about the sheep.' At this he threw down his axe, and exclaimed, in a most angry manner, 'now aren't you a pretty neighbor, to tell your men to kill my sheep? I heard of it—a rich man like you to shoot a poor man's sheep!'

"'I was wrong, neighbor,' said I; 'but it wont do to let your sheep eat up all that grain; so I came over to say that I would take your sheep to my homestead pasture, and put them in with mine, and in the fall you may take them back, and if any one is missing, you may take your pick out of my whole flock.'

"Pulsifer looked confounded—he did not know how to take me. At last he stammered out, 'now, Squire, are you in earnest?' 'Certainly I am,' I answered; 'it is better for me to feed your sheep in my pasture on grass, than to feed them here on grain; and I see the fence can't keep them out.'

"After a moment's silence—'the sheep shan't trouble you any more,' exclaimed Pulsifer. 'I will fetter them all. But I'll let you know that when any man talks of shooting, I can shoot too, and when they are kind and neighborly, I can be kind too.' The sheep never again trespassed on my lot. And my friends," he would continue, addressing the audience, "remember that when you talk of injuring your neighbors, they will talk of injuring you. When nations threaten to fight, other nations will be ready too. Love will beget love; a wish to be at peace, will keep you in peace. You can overcome evil only with good."

Even savages feel the charm of this principle. About the year 1812, Indiana was the scene of Indian hostilities; but the Shakers, though without forts or arms, lived in perfect safety while the work of blood and fire was going on all around them. 'Why,' said the whites afterwards to one of the Indian chiefs, 'why did you not attack the Shakers as well as others?' "What!" exclaimed the savage, "we warriors attack a peaceable people! We fight those who wont fight us! Never; it would be a disgrace to hurt *such* a people."

A family of Quakers from Pennsylvania settled at the west in a remote place, then exposed to savage incursions. They had not been there long before a party of Indians, panting for blood, started on one of their terrible excursions against the whites, and passed in the direction of the Quaker's abode; but, though disposed at first to assail him and his family as enemies, they were received with such open-hearted confidence, and treated with such cordiality and kindness, as completely disarmed them of their purpose. They came forth, not against such persons, but against their enemies. They thirsted for the blood of those who had injured them; but these children of peace, unarmed and entirely defenceless, met them only with accents of love, and deeds of kindness. It was not in the heart even of a savage to harm them; and, on leaving the Quaker's house, the Indians took a white feather, and stuck it over the door, to designate the place as a sanctuary not to be harmed by their brethren in arms. Nor *was* it harmed. The war raged all around it; the forest echoed often to the Indian's yell, and many a white man's hearth was drenched in his own blood; but over the Quaker's humble abode gently waved the white feather of peace, and beneath it his family slept without harm or fear.

The early history of America is replete with such instances of personal preservation. Most horrible was the Indian's mode of wreaking vengeance on his foes. By day he lurked in ambush along their path, and shot them down without warning; at night he prowled around their pillow of repose, kindled the flames over their heads, and made their own dwelling their funeral pile. From such dangers most of the inhabitants sought safety by retiring to fortified places; and persons, when compelled to pass beyond the range of such protection, provided themselves with arms for their defence. Such was the general policy; but the Quakers, true to their pacific principles, would neither arm themselves, nor retire to garrisons. While their neighbors were flying to forts for safety, they remained openly in the country, and pursued their ordinary occupations at home, or in the field, without a weapon for annoyance or defence. Were they butchered in cold blood? No; they *all* escaped unhurt except three. And how came these to fall victims? They abandoned their pacific principles, and then were killed, not as men of peace, but solely as men of blood. Two were men who had been wont to pursue their labors in the open field without weapons, in simple reliance on God; but, being seized with fear, they took weapons for their defence, and the Indians who had hitherto spared them as peace-men, now regarded them as enemies, and shot them. The third victim was a widow who refused for a time the proffered shelter of a garrison, and continued with her children safe in her defenceless habitation; but, impelled at length by "a slavish fear," she took refuge by night in a fort not far from her dwelling, and soon after the Indians waylaid and killed her.

The efficacy of peace principles, however, is not restricted to Quakers, but extends to all of like faith and practice. A multi-

tude of proofs might be gathered from Indian history ; but we will content ourselves with a single one from the banks of the Piscataqua. Several villages early began to rise there as far up as what is now Dover, N. H. Their intercourse with the tawny sons of the forest was not always that of enemies ; the latter often came forth to visit their white brethren on terms of friendship ; and, on one of those occasions, a squaw, with her infant suddenly taken ill, sought a place for shelter and repose. A widow, alone with her family on the outskirts of the settlement, kindly welcomed them to her humble abode, nursed the sick babe as her own, and, when it was restored to health, sent them on their way with her blessing. That deed of kindness was not lost. Years rolled on ; but the Indian did not forget his humble benefactor. Strife arose between the two races ; and the Indians prepared to empty upon the place the vials of their wrath. They surrounded it at dead of night ; but, before striking a single blow, they sought the poor widow's house, and placed there a guard, lest some of their warriors should, in their ignorance or heedless rage, wreak upon their friend a vengeance aimed only at their foes. This done, they went to their work of fire and blood ; nor did they stay their hand until the settlement was in flames, and most of its inhabitants, save the widow and her children, were butchered, or made captives.

Such is the power of peace over savages ; can it be less influential over civilized men ? To this we might quote many an answer from the ferocious and terrible rebellion of 1798 in Ireland. Seldom has there been warfare more savage, passions more fierce, or the spirit of revenge more blood-thirsty and remorseless. It was a fiendish conflict, the death-struggle of neighbor against neighbor, of brother against brother. The gangrene pervaded the whole community ; every body was required to take sides, and none allowed in safety to remain neutral. Yet the Quakers, firm in their faith, did continue neutral and pacific, friends to all, enemies to none. Anticipating the storm, they had prepared to meet it by girding themselves anew with their principles, by destroying whatever weapons they chanced to have in their possession, and by exhorting each other to stand fast in their peaceful faith. The storm came, and Ireland was drenched in fraternal blood. The Quakers, in going to their places of worship, were sometimes obliged to pass over fields of dead bodies ; and repeatedly did each party in turn threaten to burn their meeting-houses over their heads, or butcher them in their own homes. The bloody strife raged week after week all around them, and up to their very doors ; their own domestics were instigated to destroy them ; their houses were entered by exasperated soldiers on purpose to kill them ; and often did it seem well nigh impossible for them to escape a general massacre. Still the Quakers trusted in God, and were safe. Persisting in their ordinary attendance on his worship, in their refusal to take any part in the contest, and in their habits of equal kindness to sufferers from both factions, they came ere long to be respected, trusted and loved by all, and their houses became places of refuge to fugitives from each party. Their faith made them at length the

mediators, the guardian angels of a warring community; and the badge of a Quaker, regarded at first as a sure precursor of death or violence, came in the end to be a sort of talisman, a passport to safety and universal confidence. Their principles proved, under God, a far better protection than the sword; for they lost only one of their number, and that one a victim, not to his principles of peace, but to his own folly in renouncing them. Losing his confidence in their power to protect, he dressed himself in regimentals for safety; and then he was shot, not as a peace-man, but as a man of blood. How strongly does such an exception confirm the general rule!

The same principles insured equal protection to others during the Irish Rebellion. The rebels, who had long meditated an attack upon the Moravian settlement at Grace Hill, marched at length a large body of men into the town; but the Moravians, true to their principles, offered no resistance, and no means of violent defence. God was their trust. Assembled in their chapel, they besought him to be their shield in that hour of their danger; and he gave at once a most signal answer to their prayers. The infuriated soldiers were astonished at a sight so contrary to their expectations; they paused, and listened to the devotions of their intended victims; they heard the Moravians imploring mercy for their expected murderers; such an exhibition of the Christian spirit, of the peace principle, disarmed their rage; and, after lingering in the streets a day and a night, they turned and marched off without killing or injuring a single individual.

The principle, too, is just as safe for communities as for individuals. "I have read," says Mrs. L. M. Child, "of a certain regiment ordered to march into a small town, (in the Tyrol, I think,) and take it. It chanced that the place was settled by a colony who believed the gospel of Christ, and proved their faith by works. A courier from a neighboring village informed them that troops were advancing to take the town. They quietly answered, 'if they will take it, they must.' Soldiers soon came, riding in with colors flying, and fifes piping their shrill defiance. They looked round for an enemy, and saw the farmer at his plough, the blacksmith at his anvil, and the women at their churns and spinning-wheels. Babies crowed to hear the music, and boys ran out to see the pretty trainers, with feathers and bright buttons, 'the harlequins of the nineteenth century.' Of course none of these were in a proper position to be shot at. 'Where are your soldiers?' they asked. 'We have none,' was the brief reply. 'But we have come to take the town.' 'Well, friends, it lies before you.' 'But is there nobody here to fight?' 'No, we are all Christians.' Here was an emergency altogether unprovided for by the military schools. This was a sort of resistance which no bullet could hit; a fortress perfectly bomb-proof. The commander was perplexed. 'If there is nobody to fight with, of course we can't fight,' said he. 'It is impossible to take such a town as this.' So he ordered the horses' heads to be turned about, and they carried the human animals out of the village, as guiltless as they entered, and perchance

somewhat wiser. This experiment on a small scale indicates how easy it would be to dispense with armies and navies, if men only had faith in the religion they profess to believe."

Even paganism has exemplified, in some degree, the beauty and power of this principle. The island of Loo-Choo in the Chinese sea, was visited in 1816 by the two war-ships which took Lord Amherst to China as ambassador from England. In order to procure supplies, and make some repairs, they anchored in a harbor of the island; and many of the natives immediately came on board, to whom the Captain, through an interpreter, stated whence the ships came, on what embassy sent, and why they had anchored there. Learning what things were wanted, they began forthwith to furnish them in great abundance, which they continued for six weeks, and then refused the slightest compensation.

Some of the crew being sick, were taken ashore to a temple as a temporary hospital, and there treated with the utmost tenderness. 'Nothing,' says Capt. Hall, 'could be more interesting than to observe the care which the natives took of our sick men. They crowded round to assist them out of the boats, carried those confined to their beds, all the way from the beach to the hospital, and gently supported those who had strength barely to walk; and when safely lodged, they were immediately supplied with eggs, milk, fowls and vegetables already cooked.

'I was absent awhile on a survey of the coast; and on my return I was glad to find the sick men much recovered, and very grateful for the kindness of the natives. The best provisions had been brought to them every day; and when disposed to take exercise, they were sure to be accompanied by some of the natives, who helped them up the steep side of the hill behind the hospital, to a grassy spot on the summit, and having lighted pipes for them, remained patiently till the invalids wished to return. Never were sailors so caressed; and it was pleasing to observe our hardy seamen so much softened, that they laid aside for the time all the habitual roughness of their manners, and without any interference of the officers, treated the natives with the greatest consideration. Indeed, from the first hour of our visit, their amiable disposition and gentle manners won the good will of all; and, by a sort of tacit, spontaneous understanding, every one of our men treated them not only with kindness, but with entire confidence. The proud, haughty feeling of national superiority, so common among British seamen, was here completely subdued by the kind and gentle manners of this pacific people. Though continually intermingled, no quarrel or complaint occurred during all our stay; but each succeeding day seemed to increase our mutual cordiality and friendship.

'We also inquired into their government; and while partaking of the general mildness, we deemed it highly efficient from the great order always maintained. The chiefs, though quite decided in giving their commands, were mild in manner and expression; and the people always obeyed them with the greatest alacrity and cheerfulness. Crimes were said to be very unfrequent; the peo-

ple went entirely unarmed; and they always declared that they had no military weapons. We looked sharply for them, but could find none. Their behavior on seeing a musket fired, showed their ignorance of fire arms; and they invariably denied having any knowledge of war by experience or tradition.'

The case of William Penn, however, is perhaps the fullest and fairest illustration of pacific principles in their bearing on the intercourse of nations. His colony, though an appendage to England, was to the Indians an independent State. They knew no power above or beyond that of Penn himself; and they treated his colony as another tribe or nation. Their king had himself expressly abandoned these Quakers entirely to their own resources. "What!" said Charles II. to Penn on the eve of his departure, "venture yourself among the savages of North America! Why man, what security have you, that you will not be in their war-kettle within two hours after setting your foot on their shores?" 'The best security in the world,' replied the man of peace. "I doubt that, friend William; I have no idea of any security against those cannibals, but a regiment of good soldiers with their muskets and bayonets; and I tell you before hand, that, with all my good will for you and your family, to whom I am under obligations, I will not send a single soldier with you." 'I want none of thy soldiers; I depend on something better.' "Better! on what?" 'On the Indians themselves, on their moral sense, and the promised protection of God.'

Such was the reliance of Penn; and a single fact will show his mode of dealing with the Indians. Learning that there was some very choice land not included in his first purchase, he sent to inquire of the Indians if they would sell it. They replied they did not wish to part with the land where their fathers were sleeping, but to please him, they would sell him a part of it. Accordingly, they agreed, for a certain quantity of English goods, to sell as much land as one of his young men could walk round in a day; but this mode of measurement, though their own choice, did not in the end satisfy the Indians, since the young Englishman, chosen to walk off the tract, walked much faster and farther than they expected. Penn observed their dissatisfaction, and inquired the cause. "The walker cheat us." 'Ah! how can that be? Did you not yourselves choose to have the land measured in this way?' "Yes," said the Indians, "but white brother make too big walk." Some of Penn's commissioners, waxing warm, said the bargain was a fair one, and insisted that the Indians ought to abide by it, and, if they would not, should be compelled to do so. 'Compelled!' exclaimed Penn, 'how can you compel them without bloodshed? Don't you see this looks to murder?' Then turning with a benignant smile to the Indians, he said, 'well, brothers, if you have given us too much land for the goods first agreed on, how much more will satisfy you?' This proposal gratified them much; and they mentioned the quantity of cloth, and number of fish-hooks, with which they would be satisfied. These were cheer-

fully given; and the Indians shaking hands with Penn, went away smiling. After they were gone, the governor, looking round on his friends, exclaimed, 'Oh, how sweet a thing is charity! Some of you just now spoke of *compelling* these poor creatures to stick to their bargain, that is, in plain English, to fight and kill them, and all about a little piece of land!'

Such was the policy of Penn. He resolved to treat the Indians as the gospel requires, and then rely for safety on the better principles of their nature, and the promises of God. He brought no cannon; he built no forts; nor was there at his command a single musket or sword to assail or repulse an enemy. He treated none as enemies, but all as friends, and threw himself, with open-hearted confidence, upon the red man's generosity and justice. He met the rude sons of the forest as brethren; his kindness disarmed their enmity, and lulled their suspicions and fears asleep; he won their perfect confidence in his friendship; and, sitting down with them on the banks of the Delaware, they smoked together the calumet of peace and love.

Such was the course of William Penn; and what was the result? In the midst of the most warlike tribes on this continent, the Quakers lived in safety, while all the other colonies, acting on the war-policy of armed defence, were involved almost incessantly in bloody conflicts with the Indians. Shall we ascribe this to the personal tact of William Penn? Shrewd he doubtless was; but the success of his policy was owing mainly, if not entirely, to its pacific character. Penn was only an embodiment of his principles, and the efficacy of these is strikingly exhibited in the fact that Pennsylvania, during all the seventy years of her peace policy, remained without harm from the Indians, but suffered, as soon as she changed that policy, the same calamities with the other colonies.

Such, then, is the efficacy of pacific principles. Not that they, or any thing else, can prevent *all* evil in a world like ours; but, when *rightly* applied, they are a far surer protection than the sword. We doubt whether they have ever been put to a fair test without proving successful; and any people who shall dare to trust these principles, will find them safe. Who seemed less likely than American Indians to feel their power? Yet how readily did they lay their tomahawks and scalping-knives at the feet of Penn, and humbly apologize for killing the only Quakers they ever attacked. 'The men carried arms,' said they; 'we supposed them to be fighters, and thought they pretended to be Quakers, merely because they were cowards.' So said the murderers of Lyman and Munson. 'They came with arms in their hands, and we took them for enemies. Had we *known* they were men of God, come to do us good, we would have done them no harm.' There is no policy so safe as that of peace. Let any people abjure all war, and proclaim to the world that they will never fight under any provocation, but will be ready to settle all difficulties with other nations by umpires mutually chosen; and would any nation attack

such a people? No sooner than a duellist will now fight a woman or a child. Would not any nation be ashamed of an act so mean, and the whole world cry shame upon them, and brand them as the basest of poltroons and assassins?

‘But experience pleads for the war-principle; all nations have hitherto acted upon it; and does not this prove its necessity?’—No more than the extent and long continuance of paganism prove that to be necessary. Men have tried war more than five thousand years; and what is the result? A world covered with crime, and drenched in blood and tears. Could any policy of peace have led to worse results?

‘But would you have *no* means of defence?’—Yes, the best in the world; such as God himself has prescribed; such as Penn used with perfect, glorious success; such as every fair trial has shown to be far more effectual than any weapons of war. We plead for the strictest principles of peace, not only because they are true, but also because they are the best security both for individuals and for nations.

‘But what security do these principles afford for our liberties and rights?’—The best possible; incomparably better than the sword can give. Search all history, and you will find war to have been the deadliest foe to popular freedom and rights. True, it has been alleged to have secured them both; but far more truly has it ever trampled them under its iron hoof. Peace is the best, if not the only soil for the sure and steady growth of free institutions; and one century of universal, unbroken peace, would accomplish wonders for the liberty and rights of mankind.

‘But *will* nations ever act on the *strict* principles of peace?’—Individuals have, and nations may; but whether they will or not, time alone can determine. We believe they one day will, for God has promised they shall; but until they do, surely these principles cannot be held responsible for their safety, any more than a medicine can cure those who do not take it. If *all* nations would adopt them, there would of course be an end to war, and the fear of its evils. We cannot flatter ourselves that the great national brotherhood of Christendom, or any of its members, will *soon* come fully into these views, discarding the sword as the arbiter of international disputes, and ceasing from all war, and all preparations for war; but already the whole civilized world are gradually approaching this policy; and, just as fast as they do, will their safety, as well as their general prosperity and happiness, be correspondingly increased. No fair-minded man will now deny that a pacific policy is in every respect the best; and, if we cannot bring all nations, or any one of them, up to the high standard of the gospel, we would fain bring them as near to it as we can. Our utmost efforts will doubtless leave them much below that standard; but every approximation to it will strongly tend to insure their peace, and to promote their general and permanent welfare.

WAR-PRAYERS.

It is not more strange than true, that war has been treated very much as a *religious* affair. It has claimed the special favor of heaven; and even Christians, scarcely less than ancient pagans, modern savages, or the terrible war-men of the North, the blood-thirsty devotees of Thor and Odin, have engaged in it as a sacred work. They still accompany it with forms of devotion. It is preceded by a season of general fasting and prayer; chaplains are sent to its camps and its battle-fields, with forms of supplication to the God of Peace; the whole Christian community are expected continually to remember before his throne its tented or embattled hosts; and after every important victory, they have been wont to return thanks to the Father of all for success in the butchery of his children.

Such is the practice; but is it right? We put it to the test of no extreme or radical views; but is it consistent with the lowest principles of peace, with any possible construction of the gospel? Every body now condemns war as wrong, as coming only from lusts, or sinful passions; and will such admissions allow us still to sanction the whole custom by imploring the smiles of heaven on its deeds of vengeance, and returning solemn thanks for such atrocities and horrors as are crowded into every considerable victory?

Let us see how it strikes most men. When the influence of Napoleon led to a proclamation of war between Sweden and England, an additional prayer was introduced, as usual, into the church-service of Sweden, to call down wrath and ruin on her enemies; but some Christians in Dalecarlin, on finding this war-prayer thrust into their devotions, very naturally asked, "Who *are* our enemies? Against whom are we thus to pray?" 'The English.' "The English!" exclaimed those simple-hearted people; "the English! Impossible! They sent us Bibles; it cannot be that *they* have become our enemies; we *cannot* pray against them." Nor did they, but successfully petitioned the government to discontinue the war-prayer in their section of Sweden.

Nor have these inconsistencies escaped the notice even of aliens or enemies to Christianity. Voltaire ridicules and denounces them with the bitterest sarcasm; Napoleon, who used in his fits of momentary candor to call war "the trade of barbarians," and to say that soldiers, if not already vicious, should be made so in order to qualify them fully for their work, sternly excluded chaplains and public prayers from his armies; Wellington himself once said, that 'men of nice scruples about religion, have no business in the army or navy;' and statesmen of our own, though at the hazard of being branded as infidels, have objected to the employment of

chaplains among our soldiers, on the ground that the religion they teach is incompatible with the *duties* of war. 'Ought the Christian religion,' they ask, 'to be encouraged in our army or navy? Does it afford incentives to vigilance and energy in the discharge of their engagements to the government?' If we were living under the Jewish dispensation, where the law was "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," with some propriety might we employ *Jewish* priests; ay, if we were followers of the later Prophet who enforced his religion by fire and sword, we might very properly have chaplains of *that* persuasion. But what does the *Christian* religion teach? Humble, entire submission to every species of indignity and wrong. What does its very Founder say? "Resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Such is the gospel; but the doctrine is incompatible with a military establishment. What is the duty of a chaplain? To imbue the soldiers and sailors with the spirit of the Christian religion. What would be the result? Instead of firing them with zeal, with energy, with *revenge*, it is to tell them, 'humbly submit; receive whatever indignity may be offered, and, though tripled upon you, make no resistance.'

War-prayers, if they mean any thing, must certainly give to war our sanction and support; but can we consistently do this? Is the war-system compatible with the gospel? If not, is it right for Christians to countenance and uphold it by their prayers in its favor? If war, as Edmund Burke says, "suspends the rules of moral obligation;" if, as Robert Hall declares, 'it includes every vice, and excludes almost every virtue;' if, according to Dr. Scott, "it is in *every case* the triumph of the first great murderer, the devil;" if it is, according to Jeremy Taylor, 'as contrary to the Christian religion as cruelty is to mercy, tyranny to charity;' can it be right for disciples of the Prince of Peace to lend such a custom their sanction?

Let us examine this subject for ourselves. What does the gospel require of us? 'To lay aside all anger, malice and revenge; to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us; to do good unto *all* men, and love even our enemies; to feed them when hungry, and give them drink when thirsty; to turn the other cheek to the smiter, and overcome evil only with good.' Thus the gospel bids us do; but every one of these principles war contradicts both in theory and practice. Can we consistently pray for *such* a custom? Our prayers, if made in accordance with the *pacific* principles of the gospel, would oppose war, and be discarded by all war-makers as hostile to their designs.

Let us imagine a chaplain, just before a battle, weaving this part of the gospel into his prayer. 'O Lord, whose tender mercies are over *all* they creatures, teach us now to imitate thine own example, who givest thy sunshine and showers alike to the evil and the good. Restrain us from anger, from malice, from the slightest degree of ill-will towards any of our fellow-men; but may we love them all as we do ourselves, and do unto our worst

enemies all the good in our power. If hungry, may we feed them ; if thirsty, may we give them drink ; may we ever do unto others what we would fain have them do to us ; nor ever may we forget thy commands to follow peace with *all* men, not to kill, to forgive as we would wish ourselves to be forgiven, to recompense to no man evil for evil, but overcome evil with good.' Are such the prayers that war-makers want of their chaplains ? Would not the spirit of such a prayer, if breathed into a whole army before battle, keep every sword in its scabbard, and unnerve every arm for the work of blood ?

Conceive a prayer in the spirit of war. "Push hard with the bayonet !" says the Soldier's Catechism. "Stab once ; and off with your foe from the bayonet ! Stab the second ! Stab the third !" Lord Nelson bade his midshipmen, as the climax of his instructions, 'obey promptly all orders from their superiors without inquiring whether they were right or wrong, and *hate a Frenchman as they would the devil !*' An American general once said, 'a battle is the veriest hell upon earth ;' and there will you find the worst passions in fiercest rage, thousands hating, cursing and butchering one another, and then proceeding to plunder, and burn, and commit every species of violence and outrage. For all this, if for any thing, must the chaplain pray on the eve of battle :—"O Lord of hosts, smile upon thy servants now marshalled before thee for the work of death. Breathe into them, O God of war, the spirit of their profession. Let them for the time forget thy prohibition of old, *thou shalt not kill*, and also those commands of thy gospel which bid them do good unto *all* men, to love even their enemies, and turn the other cheek to the smiter. Thou knowest, Omniscient Father of all, this is no time for the application of such principles ; and we pray thee to animate them with sentiments more appropriate to the awful duties of this hour, and thus prepare them for a signal and glorious triumph over their enemies. Fill them with the spirit of war, and enable them, in humble reliance on thee, to shoot, and stab, and trample down their foes. Nerve every arm ; direct every blow ; guide every sword, every bayonet, every bullet to the seat of life, that we may soon reap a glorious harvest of death. Thou knowest, O God most holy, that our enemies, murderers in heart, if not in deed, all deserve the damnation of hell ; and we beseech thee to aid us in sending as many of them as possible to the place "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Fight thou for us, and give thy servants a great victory, for which all the people shall praise thee.'

Do you say, that such prayers are found in the Old Testament ? If so, still it would not follow that they are right for Christians. Jewish wars were expressly enjoined or permitted by Jehovah ; the enemies of the state were regarded as the enemies of God, the real King of the Jews ; those who uttered the war-prayers recorded in the Bible, were inspired men, and lived under a dispensation which allowed many things now forbidden in the gospel. Our case is in all these respects different from theirs ; and this difference entirely neutralizes the argument.

‘But are chaplains of no use in the army and navy?’—They certainly may, if they will, do good by preaching *other parts* of the gospel; we merely say they cannot, consistently with their office, enforce its *pacific* principles. If exempted from all responsibility for the war-system, and allowed freely to preach the whole truth of God, it would be perfectly proper for any minister to do this on board a man-of-war, in a camp, or on a field of battle. He might, if he would, carry the gospel to the very gates of pandemonium; but, when there, he should not shake hands with the devil, or any of his imps.

‘Would you, then, have warriors without the means of grace? Do they not need the gospel?’—Most certainly; but it may be carried to them without encouraging any of their evil deeds. A gang of pirates need the gospel; but would you send a minister to countenance their piracy, and pray for their success? The gospel is needed in the grog-shop and the brothel; but would Paul have acted as a chaplain to either? If war is wrong, its chaplain, employed for its support, *must* countenance what the gospel condemns; and hence his very office is unchristian. For the most part, too, it is a mere farce; for the chaplain, sworn to obey his superior, and compelled to do so, or quit the service, is seldom allowed to pursue his own course. He can neither preach, nor pray, nor converse with the soldiers, except by permission from his commander, generally an irreligious man. One sermon fifteen minutes long on the Sabbath, a short burial service over the dead, now and then a prayer—how much good can this do? Yet such, for the most part, are war-chaplaincies, little better than mockeries, a stealing of heaven’s mantle to cover or sanctify deeds of hell.

‘How, then, shall we treat war?’—Just as you would the twin practice of duelling. Should two duellists meet to blow out each other’s brains, would you appoint chaplains on each side to encourage them, and ask their common God to take part in the bloody affray? Yet might you pray *about* it. Do you ask how? Pray *against* the whole thing as utterly wrong, and beseech God to hold the combatants back from blood, and bring them to a fraternal adjustment, and the custom itself to a speedy end. Thus, and only thus, can we pray aright on the subject of war.

Far be it from us to sit in judgment on chaplains or soldiers. We doubt not there have been, and still are, real Christians among them. We judge not the *men*; we merely condemn their *business* as unchristian. So the gospel itself does; so common sense is fast coming to do; and posterity will yet look back, and wonder how any ambassador or disciple of the Prince of Peace could ever have lent himself to such a libel of blood on his peaceful religion. Would you have war cease? It never can so long as Christians support it by their prayers.

CLAIMS OF PEACE ON WOMEN.

WOMEN are so much inclined to excuse themselves from the cause of peace, that I would fain expostulate with them on the subject. I know too well how they reason; for I once had the same views myself, and used to say, as most of my sex still do, 'women have little or no concern with this matter. We are peaceable enough ourselves, we never go forth to battle; nor can we, by any personal share in the government, by our votes at the ballot-box, or our voice before the public, affect the question of peace or war in any case. It belongs entirely to men; and we leave it in their hands. They alone make war; it is theirs, if they will, to secure peace.'

This reasoning is quite plausible; but, having myself seen its fallacy, I must entreat my sisters to pause and reflect before they turn their backs upon a cause so important to the whole human race. Are your sympathies in their behalf less tender, less generous than those of the sterner sex? Care you not for their weal or their wo? War has ever been their direst scourge; and are you willing to fold your hands, and let it still roll its deluge of crime, and blood, and tears over myriads after myriads of future victims? Feel you no interest in the race to which you belong; none in the country where you dwell; none in the friends endeared to your hearts, in your husbands and your children, your parents, brothers and sisters, all of whom are exposed to the evils of war? Tell me not you deplore the continuance of this custom, but can do nothing to restrain its ravages. Woman do nothing! Does she exert no influence with God or man? Have you no access by prayer to the mercy-seat of Him who hath the hearts of all entirely in his hand? Have you no influence over the men around you; none over your father or your brothers, your husband or your sons? Have you no pen to write, no tongue to speak, no example to set, no spirit of your own to infuse into those around you? Have you not contributed, do you not still contribute, your full share of influence to form and continue the wrong public sentiment which alone sustains the anti-christian, barbarous custom of war even under the full blaze of the gospel? Can you not change this influence, and throw it into the scale of peace?

But let us see how we reason on kindred topics. Men alone carried on the slave-trade; but did that fact hold the women of England back from efforts for the abolition of that accursed traffic in the bodies and souls of men? Did the wives, the mothers, the daughters of our father-land say, 'men, not women, are engaged in this nefarious business, and they alone should put a stop to it? We have no control over it, no responsibility for it; and, though we

grieve to think of tribe warring against tribe to procure victims for the slave-dealer, of village after village wrapt in flames, of wives torn from their husbands forever, parents from their children, brothers and sisters from each other, carried in all the horrors of the middle passage across the Atlantic, and there doomed, with their whole posterity, to hopeless bondage, still *we* have nothing to do with the matter—*we are WOMEN!* Did the women of England reason thus? They would have blushed at the thought; yet nearly all the women of Christendom are now reasoning in the same way respecting a custom which has done a hundred-fold more evil than the slave-trade ever did.

Bring this logic nearer home. 'Women have nothing to do with the cause of temperance; it belongs to men as their business alone. Theirs are the laws which protect and encourage the traffic in ardent spirits; they alone make and sell the "liquid fire;" they are the chief drunkards, as well as drunkard-makers; and, since the power to cure the evil rests with them, not in us, we leave the matter entirely in their hands.' Have the women of our country reasoned thus on the subject of temperance? Yet is the argument just as applicable to intemperance as to war; and the logic that would excuse *us* from the cause of peace, would have kept our mothers from the cause of temperance. We all thank God that their hearts taught them a better sort of logic; and I trust that their daughters will yet apply this better logic to a cause not less important, and hereafter array themselves as resolutely against war as they have against intemperance.

So of other benevolent enterprises. Men are at the head of them all; but do women therefore withhold their co-operation? Have they no interest, no responsibility in such movements? Because men alone publicly preach the gospel, and hold the helm of whatever instrumentalities are employed for its spread over the earth, do the sisters in Christ excuse themselves from all share in the blessed work of reclaiming a world to God and heaven? Have they no money, no time, no talents, no learning, no zeal, no prayers to give? Woman no power to aid such enterprises! Can we do nothing to diffuse the right spirit; nothing to form the right sentiments and habits; nothing to rally "the sacramental host of God's elect" for the spiritual conquest of the world; nothing to call down his blessing upon their efforts for the rescue of perishing souls from sin and hell? How would the church blush to hear her daughters saying of such enterprises, 'they belong to men; women have little, if any thing, to do with them; we are Christians ourselves, and that is enough for us!' Yet the very argument that binds women to the support of these causes, would rivet upon every one of them the claims of peace.

But let us look at the subject more in detail, and see if the main arguments for peace are not as applicable to women as to men. If war is inconsistent with Christianity, and the true interests of mankind; if it outrages every principle of our religion, and all the dictates of humanity; if it is a wholesale destroyer of human happiness for time and eternity; if it wastes so vast an amount of

property, and makes such fearful havoc of human life ; if it cripples commerce, and interrupts agriculture, and sheds a blight over every department of gainful industry, and thus cuts off the chief sources of a nation's wealth and comforts ; if it plunders and burns cities, and lays villages in ashes, and ravages whole provinces and empires ; if it reverses for the time all the laws of morality, and proclaims in their stead the war-code of violence and revenge ; if it tramples on the Sabbath, revels in the lowest vices, and instigates to the foulest crimes ; if it dishonors our religion before the whole world, neutralizes its efficacy at home, and obstructs its spread and triumph over the globe ; if it ripens its own agents for perdition, and then sends them, thousands after thousands, to their last account in guilt and blood ; if it is from first to last a tissue of sin and misery, a mass of abominations and woes, the master-curse of our race from Nimrod to the present hour ; has not woman as deep an interest as man, in removing such an evil from the earth ? Does not every one of these arguments come home to her bosom in all its force ?

So of the means requisite for the extinction of war ; women can use most of these as well as men. The gospel is the grand remedy ; and cannot woman aid in applying this remedy ? War has always resulted from a wrong public opinion ; that opinion must be radically, universally changed ; for the production of such a change, all the main-springs of influence upon the popular mind must be set and kept at work ; and sure I am that woman's hand can touch a multitude of these springs, and reach the great mass of minds with a most effective influence. We can abolish war only by christianizing public sentiment on the subject ; but never can this be done without the zealous, omnipresent co-operation of Christian women.

I wish I could regard my sex as free from responsibility for this custom ; but I fear they have had their full share, if not in its origin, yet in its continuance and support. Their admiration of war-exploits, their presence at military parades and balls, their smiles upon the warrior in his harlequin dress, their strange yet well known preference of officers as companions for life, all conspire to throw a charm around this trade of blood. It is a fact I blush to record, that a soldier's coat or cockade has hitherto been a passport to the favor of even delicate, accomplished women ; and so notorious has this partiality been, that one of the British essayists relates the story of a suitor, rejected in the plain dress of a citizen, but afterwards successful in the gay, fantastic costume of a soldier, which he assumed solely for the purpose of winning his way to her heart. Strange fatuity ! yet quite as common as strange. In this country, we see comparatively little of such partiality for warriors ; but pass through the old world, and you will meet it at every turn. There a man with a feather in his cap, an epaulette on his shoulder, and a sword dangling at his side, is a favorite in the most splendid saloons, in the most courtly circles. Beauty, and fashion, and gentility, all caress the gilded man of blood. The same thing, only much more polished, that you find in those sav-

age countries, where a suitor estimates his claims upon the heart of his mistress by the number of human scalps or skulls he lays at her feet! And do ye see nothing like this in our own country? Do not our women, instead of starting back from the warrior as from the hangman, treat him with special respect and favor? Does not beauty's lily hand embroider banners for the brave, and strew flowers in his path who comes in triumph through the blood of husbands and sons, fathers and brothers?

Nor has woman been free from a passion even for the stern realities of war. "Among the French dead on the field of Waterloo," says an English traveller, "were found the bodies of several Parisian girls who had gone forth with their paramours, and actually fought in their company. This, I understood, was no uncommon event in the French armies. One morning, when passing through the Palais Royal at Paris, I saw one of these women dressed in military style, with boots, spurs and sabre; nor did any Frenchman seem to consider the sight a strange one." Bulwer, the chief modern eulogist of profligacy, whose rare but unenviable genius transforms prostitutes into heroines, goes so far as to say, that "never have the French armies been engaged in the neighborhood of Paris, without there being found many of those delicate and fragile females whom one sees in the saloons of Paris, slain on the battle-field to which they had been led, not so much by a violent passion for their lovers, as by a passion for that action and adventure which they are willing to seek even in the camp. At the battle of Jemappes, Dumourier had for his aids-de-camp, two of the most *delicate* and accomplished young women in the city," whom, though probably the general's paramours, Bulwer has the effrontery to characterize as "equally *chaste* and warlike (!) Those modern Camillas felt a *veneration* for the profession of arms, and delighted in the smoke of cannon, and the sound of the trumpet."

But bad women are not the only female abettors of war. How often do we find one of the first ladies in a village or a city selected to present, in the name of her sex, a military banner, wrought by their hands, to some company of volunteers, and seizing the occasion to eulogize war and warriors. During the progress of our petty but nefarious war in Florida, a lady—so the papers called her—tendered a flag, with a speech full of fire and fury, to the "Muscogee Blues," on their return from the butchery of the poor Seminoles, lauding to the skies their deeds of blood, and charging them either to perish beneath the folds of their banner, or bring it back in triumph over their country's foes. During the war of Texas against Mexico, sustained chiefly by mercenary adventurers from the United States, a young fellow went from Tennessee to join the Texians; and his mother, a professed follower of the Prince of Peace, wrote a letter to encourage him in his bloody purpose, praying the Almighty to crown him with triumph, but promising him, if he fell, his spirit would rise from the gory field to realms of celestial bliss, and receive, as a reward for his deeds of blood, a crown of glory from the God of Peace!! Yet was that

letter copied into *religious* newspapers all over the land, and the writer eulogized as a woman worthy of Sparta in its best days!

Such has been the agency of women in sustaining the custom of war; and the mischief we have thus done, demands of us a prompt and large reparation. We *can* repair it, if we will; we have, in some respects, peculiar ability to servè the cause of peace; and hence I must infer its *special* claims on women.

Let us look at their character, and we shall find both nature and education peculiarly fitting them for such a service. They are rightly termed 'the gentler sex;' their sensibilities are quicker, deeper than those of men; they know better how to sympathize in the joys and sorrows of others; they live on the sweet and hallowed reciprocities of affection; and all their influence comes not from terror or violence, or even authority, but from goodness, from kind offices, from the resistless power of love. Theirs is the empire of the heart. They wield no sword; they threaten no violence; they claim little authority; they seldom insist even on their acknowledged rights; and yet do they exert their full share of influence in every department of society, and silently move unseen the hands that sway the world. They rule by obedience; they conquer by retreat; they triumph by submission; they carry nearly all their points by insisting strenuously on none. Such a temper is the spirit of peace; such a character an embodiment of its principles, and the result a decisive illustration of their power. Women, if not disposed, are compelled to adopt the policy of peace; and their general success proves the superiority of moral over physical power, the efficacy of returning good for evil, and giving the other cheek to the smiter. Their nature, their training, their condition and relations in life, all conspire to render them peace-makers, and peculiarly fit them for co-operation in this cause.

Women may, if they will, perform for this cause services which no others can. They are the mothers of men, and leave on their children an indelible impress of themselves. The hand that rocks the cradle, will be found in the end to rule the world; and the voice which whispers in the infant and youthful ear lessons of truth or error, of goodness or guilt, will yet give tone to morals, law to society, and character to the whole human race. We *must* win the young to peace; and their character is necessarily moulded almost entirely by female hands. As mothers and teachers, they are the chief educators of mankind; they teach the first ideas how to shoot, the first feelings where to flow; they have access in childhood to every mind under circumstances peculiarly favorable; they cast the mould of society through the world; they may under God make its character very much what they please; and would they stamp upon every young mind under their care a deep, indelible impress of peace, war must of necessity come to an end with the very next generation thus trained.

But, alas! look at the usual training of the young even under pious mothers. What are the first toys of children? Toys of war. What pictures do they most frequently see and admire? Pictures of war and warriors. What songs did they once use most com-

monly to hear? Songs of war. Whom are they still taught to hold in the highest admiration? Heroes, men of blood. What books are now most generally, most eagerly read by the young? Tales, real or fictitious, of war and warriors. Do parents, even Christian parents, carefully guard their own children against the manifold delusions of this custom? Alas! they talk before their little ones, ere the dawn of reason or conscience, about the glories of war, the trade of human butchery, and train them, with scarce a thought of what they are doing, to look upon it as the great theatre of man's noblest deeds! The surest means are taken to dazzle and delude their young minds in its favor. When a company of gaily dressed soldiers are passing through the street, the children who are old enough, go forth to gaze on the pageantry, and the mother takes even her babe to the window that he may inhale with his first breath a bewitching fondness for war. The glowing canvass, and the breathing marble, and the glittering sword, and the gilded epaulette, and the waving plume, and the prancing steed, and all the witchery of fife, and drum, and bugle-horn, are suffered to beguile the young into a blind, wild admiration of what, if seen as it really is, they would regard with almost instinctive disgust or abhorrence.

The evil is well nigh universal. Even pious mothers and Christian ministers will purchase—once they certainly did—caps, and feathers, and tin swords, and wooden guns, for their own sons, and then encourage them in forming little companies of juvenile volunteers to prepare in beardless boyhood for the trade of human butchery! Thus have Christians themselves been, age after age, scattering broad-cast over Christendom the veriest seeds of war, and then started back aghast to see every where springing up such a harvest of death as lately waved in blood and fire all over Europe. But no wonder; for how came Napoleon, the destroyer of some six millions, or Alexander, the butcher of I know not how many millions, to be such blood-leeches of the world? Were they *born* monsters? No more than we ourselves. How then did they become such monsters of blood? On the plat of green before his father's house in Corsica, Napoleon in his boyhood was permitted to go forth with the mock accoutrements of war, and there sport, day after day, with its mock manœuvres, until his boyish bosom began to swell, and kindle, and glow with the very same passions in embryo that afterwards sent him, like a comet of wrath, over a scathed and desolated continent.

I must avow it; for on every side do I see at work causes not designed, yet fatally calculated to nourish the war-spirit, to perpetuate the war-system, and thus pave the way for more military Molochs, for other deluges of blood. Go to many a toy shop, kept perhaps by Christians themselves; and what will you there find? A whole cart-load of war toys—drums, and guns, and swords, and rude busts of warriors, and entire platoons of mounted horsemen, or armed footmen, all painted and gilded to dazzle the minds of children into a premature, unnatural fondness for war. Go to the houses of Christians; and will you there find no statues or portraits

of ancient or modern warriors, no pictures of battles or other war-scenes? Almost the only pictures I ever saw in my childhood; and, should you go through the land, you would, I fear, find a hundred or a thousand portraits of Napoleon to one of such a man as Brainard, Schwartz or Howard.

No wonder, then, that this custom still continues; and never can it cease so long as pious mothers persist in thus training their own children to a love of war. It is all wrong, utterly wrong; and I would to God I could peal a note of warning and remonstrance in the ear of all the mothers in Christendom. I would say, guard your children against the manifold delusions of war, and let them sport with no more of its toys, and listen to no more of its songs, and gaze at no more of its pictures or glittering armor, and be present at none of its fascinating displays, and witness no more of its pomp, parade or splendor, but honestly teach them to regard every shred of this custom as reeking with pollution, blood and tears.

Such a training is possible, and would prove successful. I know the propensities of children; but these propensities may all be restrained from the love of war, and moulded into a settled preference of peace. "A distinguished instructor of youth," says the late William Ladd, "told me his sons were so taken up with military notions, that he could not reason with them; and he asked me to talk to them. I took the oldest boy, aged about seven years, between my knees, and something like the following conversation ensued:—'Do you love to see the soldiers?' 'Yes, I love to see the rub-a-dubs.' 'Would you like to be one yourself?' 'O, yes!' 'Well, but do you know what these soldiers are for?' 'No.' 'Why, they are learning to kill people. Those bright guns are made to kill people with, and those bright bayonets to stab them with.' The boy turned pale; such a thought never before entered his head. 'Do you know who killed the little babes in Bethlehem, because a wicked man told them to?' 'No.' 'They were soldiers. Do you know who crucified our Lord, and drove the spikes through his hands and feet?' The boy was silent. 'They were soldiers; and soldiers would burn *your* house, and cut down your fruit-trees, and kill your pa, if they were told to.' Both the boys were astonished; tears stood in their eyes. 'Do you want to be a soldier?' 'No.' 'Do you want to see the rub-a-dubs?' 'No.'" How easy for a mother or teacher to impress such artless, susceptible minds with the horrors of war, and cast their views and feelings in the mould of peace!

There is hardly a relation in life where a woman cannot serve the cause of peace. Are you a wife? You may, if you will, mould your husband's habits of thinking on this subject. Are you a mother? You can train your children to a love of peace, and a deep, habitual, undying abhorrence of war. Have you a father, brothers, or other near relatives? You can influence them all in favor of this blessed cause, and diffuse the principles of peace more or less through the whole circle of your acquaintances. Are you a teacher in a Sabbath or any other school? You can impress

your own views of peace upon the minds of your pupils, and infuse your spirit into their hearts. Do you write for the press? You can there plead this cause with an eloquence all your own.

Do you ask for still further specifications of what you can and should do for peace? First examine the subject until you have made it a part of your moral being. Catch its spirit, appreciate its importance, and familiarize its main principles, arguments and facts. Thus have you done to every other cause in which you now take an active interest; and thus ought you to do for the cause of peace. Nor keep this information to yourself, but diffuse it as widely as possible. Write, if you can, for the press; converse with those around you; take a periodical on peace, and circulate it among your neighbors; have something of the kind occasionally read at your sewing and other circles; get peace tracts into circulation through your village, your town or city; persuade your minister to preach on the subject, and prompt the brethren and sisters of your church to examine it for themselves. Do what you can also to raise funds for this cause. Give from your own purse, and solicit contributions from others. Purchase tracts for gratuitous distribution, and constitute your pastor and his wife (\$20 each) life members of the Peace Society. Money is just as necessary for this cause as for any other; nor do I see why women should not help procure funds for peace as well as for temperance or missions. At all events, forget not to pray for this cause. Never can it triumph without the blessing of the Almighty; but that blessing he will bestow only in answer to the prayers of his people; and they are as truly bound to pray for the world's pacification as for its conversion to God. Both are alike promised in his word; and for both are all Christians equally required to use the means of his appointment, and then look to him in faith for the blessing requisite to full success.

I know that the chief responsibility for this cause, as for every other, rests on men; but I believe it is in the power of women, if we will, to prevent the recurrence of war, and undermine ere long the entire war-system. Let us as Christians, as members of society, as sisters and daughters, as wives, mothers and teachers, array against it our utmost influence; let us chant no more songs in its praise, nor lavish any more favors on its epauletted agents, but look upon their trade of blood with disgust and horror; let us unite to bring it under the perpetual ban of our whole sex as a deadly foe to ourselves and the world; let us loathe and abhor it as we do robbery or murder, and regard its instruments of death as we should a gallows or guillotine, and shun its myrmidons as we would so many executioners; let *all* women do this, and war would soon cease from every land.

There is no end to the motives which should constrain women especially to such efforts as these against war. It has inflicted on them a world of evils. I know we are required to take no active part in its prosecution; yet are we still among its deepest sufferers. It seems to take little of our money; but its enormous taxes keep

millions of our sisters on the brink of starvation from year to year. True, we go not forth to its battles; but our fathers and brothers, our husbands and sons are *compelled* to go, and leave not a few of us to want and grief. The sufferings of war are not all heaped upon the battle-field; but for every victim there many a female heart at home must writhe in anguish. Not a battle can be fought, not the slightest victory won, without sending grief through hundreds, if not thousands of domestic circles. Alas! how many mothers must lose a son; how many wives a husband; how many daughters a father; how many sisters a brother beloved! Here is anguish which no historian records; but, if you would learn the widest, keenest, most incurable sufferings of war, you must go through the land, enter its humblest dwellings, and there behold the disconsolate mother, the heart-broken widow, the lonely, helpless orphan, doomed to want and sorrow that can end only in the grave.

I will not attempt to sketch a tithe of the peculiar evils inflicted by war upon our sex. Look at the siege of Magdeburg, at the occupation of Moscow by the French, at their career in Spain and Portugal—babes stabbed at their mothers' breasts; little infants not a year old lying in the mud of the road, transfixed with wounds; women beheaded or bayoneted on the very spot where they had been violated; daughters dishonored at the feet of their parents, wives in the arms of their husbands, and multitudes destroyed either by themselves or their friends solely to escape indignities deemed worse than death itself! Nor is all this the worst of their outrages; but decency blushes to record, language itself would fail to describe, the horrid brutalities often perpetrated on women during the late wars in the very heart of Christendom by men calling themselves Christians!!

Take one of the mildest specimens in the maid of Moscow. That ancient capital of Russia was in ruins; and the French soldiers, while eagerly searching every part of a ruined church, perceived a lamp at the end of a dark gallery, glimmering on a small altar. They immediately proceeded towards it, and found there a young female elegantly dressed, and kneeling in the attitude of devotion. At the noise of the soldiers, she screamed, and fell into a swoon, in which condition she was carried before a French general. Her countenance, in which grief and despair were equally blended, was irresistibly interesting. As her recollection returned, she seemed to deprecate the care taken in recalling her to life; but the general begged her to relate her misfortunes.

"Alas!" said she, "of what use to mention the wealth of a house that will soon be annihilated? Suffice it that the name of my father is celebrated in the history of our empire; and he is now serving with distinction in the army which is fighting in our defence. My name is Paulowna. On the day preceding your entrance into Moscow, I was to have been united to one of the young warriors who had distinguished himself at the battle of Majaïsk; but, in the midst of the nuptial solemnities, my father was informed that the French were at the gates of the city, and, suspending our

marriage, he hastened, in company with my husband, to join the army. Our anxieties grew apace. The next morning, as I sat with our afflicted family, we heard the roar of cannon. The noise evidently came nearer; and we no longer doubted we must leave Moscow. We instantly fled; but, when arrived near the Kremlin, an immense crowd met us, and, rushing hastily by, parted me from my mother and sisters. I endeavored to call them by my cries; but the noise of arms, and the shouts of an infuriated populace, entirely overpowered my feeble voice. Meanwhile the French penetrated into the town, and, driving all before them, advanced towards the Kremlin. To find a shelter from their excesses, I ran with many others into the citadel, which was considered a place of security; and, as I could not mix with the combatants, I retired to the church of St. Michael, seeking refuge among the graves of the Czars. Kneeling near their sepulchres, I was invoking the spirits of those illustrious founders of our country, when on a sudden some brutal soldiers broke in upon my retreat, and dragged me from a sacred and inviolable asylum."

'When the wretched girl had finished her story,' continues Labaume, 'she burst into a flood of tears, and, throwing herself at the general's feet, implored him to respect her virtue, and restore her to her relatives. The general, pretending to pity her misfortunes, pledged himself to relieve them. He offered her his house as a protection, and promised his best endeavors to discover her father and distressed mother; but this apparent generosity was only a lure to deceive the innocent Paulowna, and make her an easier victim of his treachery and lusts. Young, artless and confiding, she trusted his word; and the general, by feigning sentiments he never knew, and persuading her that it was impossible to discover her parents or her lover, brought her at length to regard him as her friend and protector. He offered her his hand in marriage; and, on the faith of repeated promises, the poor helpless girl became the victim of a base seducer. Alas! the general was already married; and she who had expected to be his wife, found herself only a dishonored slave.'

Let me quote here a few cases somewhat different from that of Paulowna. "The French women," says Labaume, "who followed us from Moscow to escape the vengeance of the Russians, hoped to find with us certain protection. Most of those on foot, with shoes of stuff little fitted to defend them from the frozen snow, and clad in robes of silk or the thinnest muslin, were glad to cover themselves with tattered pieces of military cloaks torn from the bodies of dead soldiers. But of all these victims, none excited a warmer pity than the young and interesting Fanny. Beautiful and affectionate, amiable and sprightly, speaking many different languages, and possessing every quality calculated to win the most insensible heart, she now begged for the most menial employment; and the morsel of bread she obtained, drew from her the strongest expressions of gratitude. Imploring succor from us all, she was compelled to submit to the vilest abuse; and, though her soul loathed the prostitution, she belonged every night to him who

would charge himself with her support. I saw her when we quitted Smolensko. She was no longer able to walk. She was clinging to the tail of a horse, and was thus dragged along! At length her powers were quite exhausted; she fell on the snow, and there remained unburied, without exciting one emotion of pity, or obtaining one look of compassion!!”

Nor does peace secure women from the soldier's abuse. ‘After the old French war, an English regiment came to Albany. The flash and finery of the officers quite turned the heads of the young; and, ingratiating themselves by degrees, they corrupted at length the morals of both sexes by balls and dances, masquerades, temporary theatres, and other arts of seduction. The good old minister early took the alarm, and preached boldly against these demoralizing innovations; but, though sustained by the aged and the wise, the influence of the army, rallying the young on their side, prevailed, and drove the preacher from his pulpit, from the city, and even the country. They silenced his voice, but could not falsify his predictions, which soon began to be visibly fulfilled. More than a dozen of the most ancient and respectable families were disgraced, and a multitude of the common people.

‘The fall of one female was too deplorable to be soon forgotten. She was the favorite grand-daughter of an ancient, superannuated domine of great respectability and wealth, by the name of Lydius, at whose house Col. Schuyler, commander of the regiment, was billeted. In vain did the wife of Col. Schuyler warn the young lady of her danger. She fell a victim to seduction. The poor old grand-father offered her seducer, a Capt. Rogers, all his property, if he would marry his grand-daughter, and thus remove the disgrace from his family. He offered in vain; perhaps the villain was already married. Proud and high-spirited, of great pretensions from her birth and fortune, the disgrace bereft the young lady of her reason; and for thirty years after the birth of her child, did the maniac mother constantly sit at the garret window of the house in which she was born, anxiously looking down the river for the return of her seducer, who had told her he was going to Ireland, his native country, and would soon return and marry her. She believed it all; and, when the south wind blew, the poor lunatic was in ecstasies, expecting every moment to see him coming up to fulfil his promise; and then she would clap her hands in a rapture of delight, and tears of joy would flow down her cheeks. Her deceiver never came; instead of going to Ireland, he merely got transferred to a regiment in Quebec.

‘When the brother of his victim learned the truth of the case, he publicly vowed revenge, and followed him to Quebec; but a friend of Rogers, hastening to inform him of his danger, arrived three days before the avenger, and thus gave the villain time to apply for a furlough. The cause of it got wind, and drew so many gibes and jeers from his brother officers, that he challenged them all, and wounded three of them in duels; but the seducer, however brave, dared not meet the exasperated brother of his victim, and embarked the very day on which Lydius arrived. The latter

had not the means of following him ; but he vowed, if ever he set foot on this continent again, he would be the death of the gold-laced villain. He never came ; but the influence of that regiment on the morals of Albany has not to this day been entirely effaced.

Nor have such outrages ceased. In 1843, 'a shore-boat,' says a New York paper of the day, 'brought a young female along side the U. S. ship Independence, who desired to know if midshipman — was on board, and insisted on seeing him ; but the officer of the deck told her it was inconsistent with his orders. She urged, implored, entreated ; but the officer adhered to his original resolution ; and, finding him inexorable, the girl, without a moment's thought, leaped from the boat, and sank. A seaman, who had been listening to her conversation, instantly sprang overboard after her, and succeeded in holding her up till the shore-boat came to their relief. The officer of the deck, surmising that something extraordinary must have occurred, had her brought on board ; and the midshipman who had first seduced, and then deserted her, being called on deck, and confronted with his victim, was at once recognized. What steps were taken with the seducer, we know not ; but the girl was sent ashore with the assurance that ample justice should be done.' Justice ! what reparation *can* be made for *such* villany ? Alas ! we hear of none having been attempted in this case ; it was probably the last she ever heard of redress.

Nor do we quote these as cases of very unusual depravity. War swarms with them as its own offspring. It must, from its nature, reek with licentiousness. Marriage is forbidden in fact, if not in form, to nearly all its agents ; and wherever troops are quartered, or a war-ship moored, or even single officers found for any length of time, there is woman too surely tempted to her ruin. Alas ! how often does she, already ruined herself, lure the other sex into guilt ! "On a ship coming into port," says an English naval officer, "large numbers of prostitutes are frequently allowed to come and live on board, or come off in the evening, and are sent ashore in the morning." No less than six hundred of such wretches were said to have sunk in the Royal George at Spithead, Eng. ; and a naval officer of our own says of his ship while in Port Mahon, "I have seen five hundred of these lost, degraded creatures on board at a time ; all the decks full of them ; between the guns, and in every direction, were they to be seen with the seamen."

Let me, then, call upon my sex to array themselves against a custom which makes such monsters of men, and such victims of women. By the hearth and the altar it desecrates, by every principle of our holy religion, by every dictate of humanity, by your regard for the welfare of society, for your own honor, rights and interests, I conjure you to unite with the noble band of philanthropists who are toiling to remove this sin, and scourge, and shame from every Christian land, and eventually from the face of the whole earth.

SOLEMN APPEAL

TO ALL CHRISTIANS IN FAVOR OF PEACE.

BY WILLIAM LADD.

THE apathy of professed Christians respecting the moral evils of war seems truly surprising; but, when we consider how they have been educated, our wonder ceases. The toys of children, the sports of youth, the gorgeous habiliments of war, songs, poems, and sober history itself, but particularly the heathen literature which even pious youth study to fit themselves to be ministers of the Prince of Peace, all conspire to make mankind look with complacency on a custom which, if we include all the time from the murder of Abel to the slaughter of Waterloo, has brought more sin and misery into the world than any other.

I shall not attempt to describe scenes of carnage, the sufferings of the battle-field, the hospital or the prison, nor will I dwell on the protracted miseries of the widow and orphan. Unbaptized philanthropy may weep over the miseries of war, but will do little to avert them. Nor shall I now show how war impoverishes a nation, and loads its starving poor with taxes; how nations, in enslaving others, have lost their own liberty; how a Cæsar, a Cromwell, or a Bonaparte, have usurped arbitrary power by means of armies raised to conquer foreign countries, or to contend with an opposing faction at home. Mankind love glory so much more than they love liberty, that the cause of peace has little to hope from mere patriotism, which is often nothing more than the desire of elevating one's own country on the ruins of another, regardless of the liberty of both.

Such motives, however good in their place, are utterly inadequate; and my appeal is *now* to the Church of Christ, to all such persons as are influenced by Christian principles. I wish to set forth the *moral* evils and the *sin* of war, and show Christians their duty to labor for its immediate abolition. The demon of war is of that kind which cometh not forth but by prayer and fasting. He laughs at the common modes of exorcism; but the *church* has a weapon by which she can lay him low. By the sword of the Spirit, she can with prayer achieve the victory. The Prince of Peace will honor his church by making it the instrument of this great moral revolution which will usher in the millennium; and I long to see her secure this honor to herself by doing the work.

There are, even among good men, mistaken views on this subject. The opposers of war have so often contented themselves with exhibiting only the *temporal* calamities of war, that many clergymen have acquired the habit of considering war as only a temporal evil; and, when a friend of peace requests the use of

their pulpit on the Sabbath, he is put off with the admonition that temporal evils, however great, should not be discussed on a day devoted to the salvation of souls. Now, if war were *only* a temporal evil, there would be better reason for such a refusal; but, when we consider that it plunges millions of souls into endless perdition, and is a greater obstacle to the conversion of sinners, and the spread of the gospel, than almost any other sinful custom, it would appear that the followers of the Prince of Peace ought to be earnestly engaged in its abolition, and that a minister, while engaged in this work, is in fact promoting the salvation of souls more than at any other time. He operates on a larger scale, and surely is not the less doing the work of Him who said, "Blessed are the peace-makers."

Unreflecting minds may object to agitating this subject while Christendom enjoys a more profound peace than ever before. True, Christian nations are less inclined to war than formerly, and events which, half a century ago, would have set all Europe in a blaze, now scarcely disturb the serenity of the prospect; but the *principles* of war have not been eradicated. Its *causes* still operate; the *occasions* only are wanting. I do not say, that the same spark which would formerly have lighted up a war, would do it now; but the materials, though less inflammable, are still combustible. What mean the great armaments of Europe even in peace? Russia has nearly a million of men under arms, Austria some half a million, France almost as many, Great Britain nearly half as many as France, and in Christian Europe there are some four millions of men daily losing their moral sense of right and wrong, and fitting themselves for deeds of blood, eager for pay, panting for glory, as they call a love of slaughter, like fierce bull dogs kept in check only by the want of occasion.

True, our own country has less of the military spirit than almost any other; but even we still think it necessary to be prepared for war, and spend more money in building fortifications, and equipping a navy, than would be required to evangelize the world. It is evident that we do not think the principles of war are eradicated; for, although it might require a small military power to keep down the poor slaves, and to kill them if they attempted to obtain their liberty by force, a navy and a northern militia would be of but little use in such a service. Are we then preparing for civil war? I must confess when I see a militia muster, I think I see my fellow citizens sharpening their bayonets for the hearts of their brethren, since I see no other use for them. No, the principles of war are not yet eradicated, but ready to spring up again whenever occasion shall call for them, unless the present opportunity be seized of smothering them forever.

If we wished to reclaim a drunkard, should we preach to him while under the influence of liquor? No, we wait until he is sober, until the fumes of intoxication have evaporated, and the man is restored to his right mind. But, if we let him alone to fill up his jugs and decanters, and prepare for another debauch, with-

out a word of caution and exhortation, are we doing our duty to him? Can we excuse ourselves by saying he is *now* sober, and there is no need of our admonition? We may "lay this flattering unction to our souls;" but God will require his life and his soul at our hands. So, when the nations have recovered from a fit of martial intoxication, is the right time to disseminate correct principles, and root out erroneous ones.

I shall not agitate the question of the lawfulness of defensive war, but consider war only as a moral evil, destructive to the souls no less than the bodies of men, and show that the Church of Christ is able, with God's help, to banish war forever from Christendom, and that the blood of souls now stains the skirts of her garments by reason of her neglect of duty. I wish merely to show **WHY CHRISTIANS SHOULD LABOR FOR THE ABOLITION OF WAR.**

I. INFLUENCE OF WAR ON MORALS AND PIETY.—The celebrated Robert Hall observes, "war reverses, with respect to its objects, all the rules of morality. It is nothing less than a temporary repeal of all the principles of virtue, and is a system from which almost all the virtues are excluded, and into which nearly all the vices are incorporated."

National rejoicings at the misery of others cannot fail to brutalize the feelings of a people, especially when that misery is inflicted by their own hands. It is a shocking spectacle to see a large city illuminated at the news of a victory. We have sent ten thousand of our fellow-creatures into endless misery, and we rejoice! We have made thousands of widows and orphans, and we rejoice! We have taken away the stay and staff of the aged, and we rejoice! At the moment of the illumination, perhaps thousands of wounded men are yet stretched on the field of slaughter, expiring in agony, and still we rejoice! Thousands have been carted to hospitals and prisons, where their life slowly ebbs away in protracted torments, and still we rejoice! Had all this been done by the judgment of God, without our instrumentality, we should not dare to rejoice. Had fire and brimstone rained from heaven, had the cholera swept over the land of our adversaries, we should not dare to rejoice. We rejoice because *we* did it. If an angel should visit this earth for the first time, knowing nothing of its inhabitants, and approach a large city in the midst of a rejoicing for victory, and hear the report of cannon, and the ringing of church-bells, and see the illuminations, the feasting, revelry, dancing, gluttony and drunkenness, and then should learn that all this was because they had sent ten thousand of their fellow-creatures to perdition, could he possibly be persuaded, that these were the subjects of the Prince of Peace? Would he not think, as Franklin fabled, that he had made a mistake, and had arrived at the abode of devils?

Monuments and trophies of victory also harden the heart of nations. Christian people contribute their money to erect huge piles of ever-during granite, to perpetuate the remembrance of a

fatal strife, where the professed disciples of the Savior fell by each other's hands. Is it any wonder that the sight of these monuments of wrath should render the heart as hard as the granite of which they are built, and excite the ire and revenge of the nation whose defeat they commemorate?

In Europe, temples devoted to the meek and benevolent Jesus, are profaned by being made the receptacles of the trophies of war, and the spoils of victory. Drums, trumpets, spears, bloody standards rent with bullets, and all the horrid array of Moloch, are exhibited to feed a nation's vanity, and love of conquest. What inconsistency! what insanity and sacrilege! Are these fit objects to inspire our hearts with the spirit of Christ?

Lately Christians have very generally agreed in reprobating wars of conquest; and therefore Christian rulers, when they cast a longing eye on the territory of some other nation, must feign some excuse for engaging in war. And what is the pretext generally set forth by Christian rulers? Why nothing less than retaliation and revenge. They say, 'a nation has injured us, and *therefore* we will injure them. We will rob and sink their ships, destroy their commerce, ravage their fields, burn their cities, kill their men, make their women widows, their children orphans, and reduce them all to poverty and distress.' Yes, retaliation is the *avowed* reason with nations professing to believe in a religion which strictly forbids *all* retaliation, and teaches us to recompense to *no* man evil for evil, to love our enemies, and to render good for evil; and yet nations strangely persist in calling such wars of retaliation, wars of self-defence. It is a principle of human nature that, when determined to persevere in a line of conduct forbidden by any doctrine of the gospel, we are imperceptibly led to deny the truth of that doctrine, and study to explain away all the precepts which enforce it; and then God gives a man or a nation over to blindness of mind, and hardness of heart.

The frequency of any evil reconciles us to it. It has been reckoned that the numbers who have perished in war, are equal to seventy times the present number of inhabitants on the globe; but seventy or seven times strike our imagination alike, for they are equally inconceivable; and, when we hear of the slaughter of thousands, the story is so old as to be disregarded. Had we never been used to such things, we could not believe they would ever happen, and the first sight of a battle-field would astonish us as much as the corpse of murdered Abel astonished Adam and Eve.

In war, a nation becomes accustomed to robbery and murder. The sight of rich prizes, brought in by privateers, excites a covetous desire, and a spirit of piracy pervades the whole nation. Men who, at the commencement of a war, shuddered at the bare idea of privateering, seeing others growing rich by it, throw off their scruples, and readily engage in it. Thus the nation insensibly sinks into a band of pirates, restrained indeed by certain limits; but its heart becomes the heart of a robber.

War is declared to revenge an insult. An armed ship ap-

proaches one of equal force, which hoists the flag of the declared enemy. In both ships, the Bibles, if the sailors have any, are bundled up in the hammocks, and stowed away in the nettings, to stop the enemy's shot. All thought of the holy precepts contained in them, is suspended. The only thought is to maim, kill, burn, sink and destroy. The chaplains on board each vessel resort to their respective stations, to pray for victory to the same God, through the intercession of the same Redeemer. Broadside after broadside is poured into the contending ships. The scuppers run with blood. Groans, screams, curses, blasphemy are heard above the roar of cannon, and the rattle of musketry. The ships grapple, timbers crack, spars are shivered, the masts fall on the reeling vessels, unheeded by the crew, except when they crush some of them to pieces. Their only object is to thrust their pikes through the hearts of their opponents. The victory is achieved, or perhaps both ships sink to the bottom, carrying down the killed and wounded, victors and vanquished. Or, perhaps, one ship is set on fire, and the crew are driven by the flames to the extreme parts of the vessel. In some such instances, men have been known, as at the victory of Trafalgar, to blow out their own brains, or jump overboard, to prevent their being burnt alive, or swallow immense quantities of ardent spirits to make them insensible to their sufferings. At length the fire reaches the magazine, a tremendous explosion ensues, and the other ship, if not destroyed, is covered with mangled limbs, and pieces of the wreck. These and their own dead they throw overboard, and then indulge in revelling; death, hell, and judgment are mocked, and, with joyful hearts, they bear away for home, to boast of their victory, and tell how many of the enemy they have sent to endless perdition! and a whole Christian nation gives itself up to diabolical joy and rejoicing!! Pictures of the battle are painted and engraved, and scattered round by hundreds; the enemy are caricatured, ridiculed and insulted; and pride, boasting and self-confidence every where prevail. Does not this injure the moral feelings of a nation? 'Ah! but we have had our revenge; and revenge is sweet.' Yes, it *is* sweet to a savage, and a nation becomes savage when indulging in it.

II. WAR DEGRADING TO ITS AGENTS.—If war demoralizes a whole nation, much more does it debase those immediately concerned in it. The vices of the camp are proverbial. No one ever looks there for piety or virtue. Dr. Doddridge, in his life of Col. Gardiner, speaks of the camp as a place "where the temptations are so many, and the prevalence of the vicious character is so great, that it may seem no inconsiderable praise and felicity to be free from dissolute vice. The few who do escape, should be reckoned heroes indeed, and highly favored of heaven." That there is in camps a principle called honor, I allow; but that is a principle which enforces practices which are directly contrary to the gospel. There is "honor among thieves;" but who ever thought of finding piety there?

The *slavery* to which one is subjected the moment he enlists, tends, like all other slavery, to debase the man, and assimilate him to a brute. A soldier's oath is, "I swear to obey the orders of the officers set over me; so help me God." No matter what the command is, whether it violates the law of God, or not, he must submit. Every action, every motion, becomes the object of command. He must face to the right or left, advance or recede, and be in all things like a machine; and, in fact, he becomes a machine with a single spring, and that is passive obedience. If he is commanded to burn a poor widow's house, he must obey. In vain the widow and the orphan kneel, entreat and weep, orders must be obeyed. If commanded to take her last cow, her last sheaf of wheat, or loaf of bread, he must obey. Habituated to rob and murder those whom the state calls enemies, he easily learns to rob and murder all whom *he* pleases to call enemies, and acquires a *habit* of robbery and murder, which makes the next act of robbery and murder more easy, and confirms the habit. No one can habitually violate any one of God's commandments, without acquiring a propensity to violate all the others.

Perhaps the young soldier has been brought up in a pious family, and taught to honor the Sabbath; but, when ordered out on a foraging, a plundering or a fighting party on the Sabbath, he must go. To talk of the laws of God would make him an object of ridicule. War abolishes them all. The British armies are often quartered among Roman Catholic allies; and, however Protestant may be the officers and soldiers, they are sometimes ordered to assist in what they deem the idolatries of popery. Two officers who refused to do this, were cashiered, and the sentence confirmed by the king who virtually said, that, if soldiers were allowed to have a conscience, there would be an end of discipline. Bonaparte boasted, that he could convert his whole army to Mahometanism by a single order.

When men become so degraded, it is not at all astonishing that they fall into every vice and sin without compunction. Accustomed to plunder for the public, they learn to plunder on their own account. Used to bloodshed and violence, life appears a trifle to them. Far from the instructions of the sanctuary, amid companions who make a jest of religion, and glory in despising death and judgment, what shall prevent the soldier from falling into intemperance, profaneness, lasciviousness, and every other vice? Universal experience confirms these remarks. Many have left the paternal roof for the camp comparatively innocent; few have returned uncorrupted; and the corruption of the army is not confined to the camp, but spreads its blighting influence through every rank in society. Morals and piety deteriorate as the war advances. A deacon of the church with which I am connected, was a soldier of the revolution. He says that, when he entered the army, they had prayers, at least once a day, and divine service on the Sabbath; but during the last three years of the war, he never heard a prayer or a sermon.

III. WAR A NURSERY OF INTEMPERANCE.—Intemperance is an inlet to all other sins. Should we mark in our own history the point at which the custom of war opens the flood-gates of this evil we should say it is in the militia system. True, there has been a partial reform in that system; but the militia is still (1836) the strong hold of intemperance. If the officers of some companies agree not to treat their men with ardent spirits, the number is comparatively small. It is not long since a militia officer of my acquaintance accused me of pressing him too hard on the subject of temperance. ‘You make no allowance for us, militia officers,’ said he. ‘We *must* treat our soldiers, or we shall be called stingy and niggardly. You may well subscribe to the temperance pledge, for it is no cross for you to take up. I would do so too, if I were not a militia officer.’ The gentleman has since resigned his commission, and become an active member of a temperance society. Beside the intoxicating liquors dealt out to the soldiers, the muster-field is surrounded with stalls for the sale of strong drink. The people who go to these musters as spectators, go for the very purpose of excitement, and will of course indulge in the use of exciting liquors. What is to hinder? The bottle is put to their mouths; and there are rum-sellers and drinkers enough to keep them in countenance.

In a time of profound peace, there may be some show of temperance in the army and navy; but I fear there is, as yet, little in reality. A rendezvous, without intoxicating liquors, would meet with poor success. It is not long since the Secretary of War observed, it would never do to give up the use of ardent spirits in the army and navy; for, said he, “no one enlists when he is sober.” I have not heard that sutlers are forbidden to sell rum to the soldiers; and I once heard one say, he sold a hundred gills of rum a day to the soldiers of his company, which I believe did not number over fifty men, and this beside their regular allowance. In a time of profound peace, there may be some effect produced in a small army like that of the United States, in the temperance reform; but, should war break out, especially a civil war, all the barriers against intemperance would be broken down. Rendezvous, with all their temptations, would be opened in all our villages; the double allowance of grog, and the mixed rum and gunpowder would again be dealt out before a battle; and floods of intemperance would again flow over our land, and sweep away all our temperance societies.

Would victories be celebrated with cold water? Has there ever been such a thing? Has the victory of New Orleans, though achieved so long ago, ever been celebrated with cold water? If so, I have not heard of it. True, some of our independence dinners go off with cold water; but how few! not one perhaps in a thousand! The Fourth of July, however, is coming to be more like a civil than a military festival.

Our military balls are, also, great inlets to intemperance and dissipation; and the visits which our companies of young and newly feathered heroes make to our principal cities, to show off their fine dresses and ornaments, are more like the triumphs of Bacchus than

of Mars. The quantities of intoxicating liquors drank on these occasions, are absolutely incredible! I have been informed by a young cadet, of the quantity used on one occasion of this kind; but I dare not mention it, for fear I should not be believed. Must not such influences greatly obstruct the temperance reform, and create a fearful increase of intemperance?

IV. INFLUENCE OF WAR ON THE SABBATH.—“War acknowledges no Sabbath,” said a militia officer to a subaltern who demurred at serving notices of a training on Sunday. I believe more battles have been fought by Christians, so called, on the holy Sabbath, than on any other day. I never heard of but one general in modern times who refused to give battle on the Sabbath lest he should break God’s holy law, and he was a Roman Catholic. That war totally disregards the Sabbath, and abolishes the fourth commandment, is too notorious to require proof. So habituated do soldiers become to its violation in a time of actual war, that they carry their disregard of it through every thing relating to war in a time of peace. Men-of-war are launched, and fitted out on the Sabbath; and so accustomed are we to the sight, that what would be considered very wicked on board a merchant-man, is thought nothing of on board ships of war. More duty is demanded of sailors on the Sabbath, than is common on other days of the week. The decks must be scrubbed, the boats manned, and every thing put in order for company on the Sabbath, which is usually much more numerous on that day than on any other day in the week. In garrisons they have the Sunday-dress-parade of military foppery, colors, and military evolutions, with more music than is usual on other days, to please the gaping multitude who are released from labor and care, only that they may spend the day in dissipation, idleness and revelry. Sunday is the greatest of all days in Europe for militia musters, as well as the parade of the regular army, because they had rather give God’s day than any other. We have not yet arrived at that pitch in this country, for we have as yet seen but little of actual war; but our militia reviews are frequently on Monday, so that a part of Sunday is often employed in preparing arms, and resorting to the place of display.

Our naval officers make no scruple of exchanging salutes on the Sabbath, or visiting naval stations; and not long since the inhabitants of one of our seaports, while at church, were alarmed at the report of cannon, fired in honor of the arrival of the navy commissioners at the navy yard in the vicinity. If these officers had not been used to treat the Sabbath with contempt, they might just as well have visited the station on Monday; but it is not likely that they ever thought of the impropriety of their conduct. Commodore Porter, in the journal of his cruise in the Pacific Ocean, published at the close of the late war, calls the religious observance of the Sabbath “a vulgar Protestant prejudice.” In time of war, fortifications are erected on the Sabbath, and thousands go to work on them, and exhibit their punch and patriotism on the Lord’s day, who are seen there on no other day of the week.

The revolutionary war gave a severe blow to the strict observance of the Sabbath, which was practised by our pilgrim forefathers, from which it has never recovered, and never will, until the custom of war is banished from Christendom. The last war followed up that blow; and hence we see so great a neglect of God's holy day. The desecration of the Sabbath does not stop when war stops; but continues from generation to generation. If religion, without the Sabbath, would soon be supplanted by infidelity, and a general corruption of morals, is it not strange, that pious men, ardently devoted to a better observance of the Sabbath, should be blind to the greatest cause of the evil they deplore?

Nor will any provisions made for the religious instruction of soldiers, prevent this evil. Even in our own Military Academy at West Point, "the whole amount of the religious services and religious influence of each week, favorable to the institution," said one of its friends in 1835, "is contained within the compass of one sermon, and one exercise of public worship upon the forenoon of the Lord's day. There is no daily public prayer. The Sabbath is officially recognized as a day of study. It was not long ago, that this day was selected by authority as the time for breaking up the customary two months' encampment, and then, with tents struck, and baggage regularly bestowed, marching into barracks. If, after this, any one should inquire into the actual religious feeling prevalent in the institution, he would find the religiously disposed cadets to be few in number, and ready to tell him, if inquired of, that their seriousness meets with but little countenance from the body of their fellows, and that a decided disbelief of the Christian religion is a fashionable sentiment under the form of *Atheism*, but more commonly of *Deism*. We were informed, not long since, that, in a particular department,—the immediate military command of the cadets,—a majority of the officers were infidels or sceptics.—The President of the Board, an officer of the highest rank in the United States army, having choice of the day to receive the honors due to his superior command, chose *Sunday*; and that same officer in 1826, when he visited the post, in his capacity of inspector of the academy, and having at that time almost his choice of days on which to receive the honors of the post, again chose the *Sabbath*. Grieved at the selection, the chaplain petitioned for a change; but no change was granted. He remonstrated; but the remonstrance was unnoticed; and on *Sunday* morning, with the march of a battalion, amid the roll of drums, and the firing of artillery, a mortal man received from his fellow mortals his measured perquisite of sound and circumgyration, before going up to the house of public worship. The chaplain's text was appropriate to the circumstances, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' " The chaplain soon left; and the kind as well as amount of religion among the soldiers, may be inferred not only from the preceding statements, but from the reply of an American officer to a clergyman who asked the necessity of inspections on the Sabbath:—"O sir," said he, "if you dispense with Sunday inspections, you would break up all the religion (!) of the army."

V. WAR A HOTBED OF LICENTIOUSNESS.—Efforts to prevent breaches of the seventh commandment, and produce a greater degree of purity among our youth, must meet the approbation of all good men. Whatever may be our opinion of the *means* used, every one must applaud the *end*. But though licentiousness may lurk in our great cities, and spread contamination into the country, as yet lasciviousness does not openly stalk abroad at noon day, as it does in those countries which have been exposed to the blighting influence of great military and naval establishments; nor does the general immorality of our country bear a greater proportion to the vices of Europe, than our puny warlike preparations do to their stupendous and overwhelming establishments.

Such a state of things is to be expected in Europe. When we see an army of one hundred thousand men, we should reflect that nearly an equal number of the other sex are deprived of their natural support, and exposed to all the temptations of vice, increased by poverty, and the absence of their natural protectors. This is what would be the case in time of peace; but in war the average life of a soldier does not exceed three years, that is, an army of one hundred thousand men would require one hundred thousand recruits in the course of three years to keep its ranks full. The mortality in the French army during the late wars in Europe, at times, exceeded that proportion. Of the five hundred and sixty thousand men with which Napoleon entered Russia, not twenty thousand re-crossed the Rhine. I believe the number of men in our army and navy during the last war, did not average over forty thousand. The war did not continue three years; yet it is calculated, that we lost over forty thousand men though we had little fighting. Dissipation, and the diseases of the camp were, as usual, more fatal than the sword. If this calculation of the mortality in armies in general is correct, then a nation that maintains an army of one hundred thousand men, must, in three years of war, have an increase of one hundred thousand women unprovided for. And then, when we consider, that the greater part of the army are men of dissolute habits, and constantly moving about from place to place, it would be strange, indeed, if a vast number of women did not become the victims of seduction. Such is the fact. I have seen in Europe vast numbers of women following the camp; and in some instances, especially in the French armies, they were even known to put on male attire, and follow their paramours into the deadly conflict. A considerable number of women were killed at the battle of Waterloo. That some of these women were wives, is admitted; but a far greater part of them, nearly all, had no claim to this character. But if they had been married, what, after their husbands were killed, would prevent them from falling a prey to the many temptations which surrounded them? These women become practised in every evil, and their hearts are hardened to every crime. Some of them are beautiful; lured from scenes of elegance and refinement, they sink into incarnate fiends, and are turned on society to take a horrible vengeance on our guilty sex.

Hence in the great cities of Europe, there are scenes of vice,

of which happily, in this country, we are as yet ignorant. Here vice shuns the day; but there she walks forth without a blush. There abandoned women are seen at the corners of the streets, to lure the simple ones. At night the streets of London are thronged with them; and a young man is repeatedly assaulted by these harpies, and many a one lured to his ruin. At the theatres they abound, and form a great part of the audience in some of them, where intemperance and lasciviousness go hand in hand, and the play-house becomes indeed the gate to hell. But the picture has already become too disgusting, though only an outline; and it cannot be filled up without shocking decency too much.

But, if these faint sketches are too disgusting for detail, I can assure my readers, that they are but rose-leaves to what takes place in naval and military depots. My heart sickens at the remembrance; and my pen refuses to develope the truth of those things which my own eyes have seen. If sin makes hell, then a British man-of-war is indeed "a floating hell." When the Royal George sunk at Spithead, six hundred lewd women went down in her; and yet, in ships anchored near the wreck, the same scenes are acted over, and allowed by the Government, as necessary to the navy!

Do you suppose such things would not be permitted in this country? If we had as large a navy as Great Britain, we should, like her, resort to impressment to keep it manned; and the sailors, not being permitted to go on shore for fear of desertion, would be allowed the same vicious indulgences to keep them content on board. Our females are by nature no better than theirs; and their religious privileges are fully equal to ours. The same causes would produce the same result in this country. In France, from what I have heard, I believe, the state of morals is still worse than in England—in full proportion to her more warlike spirit. In this country, the corruption has begun; and it will increase with our army and navy. Will not Christians labor to dry up this prolific source of pollution, profligacy and vice?

VI. WAR A SCHOOL OF PROFANENESS.—There are vices which, if they do not originally grow out of war, are much promoted by it; and among these may be reckoned the heaven-daring sin of profanity. Perhaps the soldier may have some peculiar temptation to this sin. Courage is the only mental quality, except implicit obedience, which is required of a soldier. If he has these two, he may be destitute of every other, and be a first-rate soldier; and, if to the fierceness of a tiger, he add the cunning of a fox, he may become a hero. He who braves the Almighty, may think himself a greater hero than he who braves only his equals. Hence a man often swears to show his courage; and, as courage is more esteemed in fleets and armies than any where else, it is there most practised. To swear like a man-of-wars-man, is a common expression when one would speak of great profaneness. Whoever has been on board a man-of-war, can scarcely help noticing the horrid oaths which interlard the usual orders given to

sailors, insomuch that some have expressed the grave opinion, that the work of the ship could not be done without swearing!

How terrible to see men rushing on mutual destruction, while imprecating damnation on themselves and others! Col. Gardiner was shot through the mouth, "while he was calling to his men, probably in that horrid language which is so peculiar a disgrace to our soldiery." These are the words of Dr. Doddridge, his biographer. Whether this "horrid language" was applied to his own men, or the enemy, is immaterial; for to curse one's enemies, or one's friends, is equally offensive to God.

The example set in the camp and the fleet, has a lamentable effect on civil society. Navy and military officers are considered fine gentlemen, smart fellows; and they give a tone to society wherever war is practised. They lead the fashion; and therefore swearing, though one of the most vulgar vices, in which the greatest blackguard can surpass the greatest gentleman, becomes, by the influence of the army and navy, fashionable and genteel.

VII. WAR THE ORIGIN AND SUPPORT OF DUELLING.—It is true, and strange as it is true, that the practice of duelling took its rise in the nominal church of Christ, and is a relic of the barbarous judicial combat of the dark ages. It was unknown to the ancients; and its present practice is confined to Christendom, it being never heard of among savages or heathens. It originated in the absurd opinion, that a trial of valor and skill was an "appeal to Heaven." All true Christians now see the folly, as well as the impiety, of such an appeal, so far as *individuals* are concerned; but many are yet utterly blinded when they apply the same principles to nations. What is war but a national duel? What warrant is there in the gospel for one more than the other? They originate in the same causes, a love of revenge, or a fear of being thought weak or pusillanimous; and these motives are almost the only ones by which any man openly defends war. Our wars are for revenge, or to preserve our honor; for a nation seldom thinks of noticing the *ostensible causes* of war in a treaty of peace. We have fought; we have gained glory; we have had our revenge, and have preserved our honor. Just so with the duellist.

Duelling, however, has long since been excluded from the church, and is now confined to that class of men who fear man more than God. Indeed, were it not for this slavish fear, duelling would cease entirely; for it has never been found necessary to the preservation of order in *civil* society, though many have supposed that the army and navy could not get along without it; that, were it not for fear of consequences, the gentlemen of war, particularly in their cups, would abuse one another. The reason why duelling is kept up is, that men esteem physical courage more than they do moral courage, or any other virtue. Especially in the army and navy, physical courage is indispensable; and the man who is wanting in it, whatever else he may possess, is not fit for a soldier. To doubt a soldier's courage, is to wound his honor in its nicest point. You may doubt every thing else, and he cares not; nay,

he often boasts of his vices ; but, if he suffers his *courage* to be called in question, he must quit the service. Therefore, so long as the custom of war is kept up, so long will that of duelling prevail.

The army and navy have the same influence on society, in respect to duelling, which they have as it respects profanity. They set the fashion which will always be followed with those who love the honor that cometh from man, more than they do the approbation of God, so long as our youth are educated in the belief that courage is more estimable than virtue. So long as Christian nations uphold the custom of war, so long will the custom of duelling continue. Courts of honor may be erected to abolish the custom ; but they will be altogether in vain so long as war continues ; for men now fight duels solely because the parties have more physical than moral courage, and *fear* being called cowards, which fear courts of honor never can prevent or allay.

VIII. WAR AN OBSTACLE TO THE REVIVAL OF RELIGION.—

Man is placed here in a state of trial to prepare him for another world ; and every thing favorable to that preparation, should be sedulously cherished, and every thing unfavorable carefully avoided. Now, nothing can be more unfavorable to self-examination, the study of the holy scriptures, and prayer, than a state of war. Allowing the war to be ever so justifiable, the very excitement, the all-absorbing interest, which engrosses the whole soul in a time of war, and chains it down to things of time and sense, militates strongly against revivals. Suppose that, by a miracle of divine grace, a soldier should be converted. He loves God, and all God's creatures. How can he, in such a state of feeling, plunge his bayonet into the heart of a sinner, and send him to everlasting perdition ? However others may conceive the abstract idea of loving an enemy, and then sending his soul to hell, to my mind it is perfectly inconceivable. The very object of war is to distress the enemy, to cut off his supplies, and starve him into submission. "If thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him drink," are commands which the soldier *must* violate. To obey them, would be to subject himself to the charge of treason, and the punishment of death. If he then lives in the habitual violation of Christ's commands how can he grow in grace ? A young convert loves the sanctuary and the Sabbath ; but he is commanded to fight, kill and destroy on that holy day. How can he be in the spirit on the Lord's day ? Can we suppose that a general would ever pray for a revival in his army ? What would he do with a revival on the eve of a battle ? It would destroy all his hopes of victory. Accordingly we find, that the most able generals have deprecated religion. Bonaparte, the greatest general the world ever saw, allowed no priests in his army. He said he did not like a religious soldier ; the worse the man, the better the soldier ; and, if soldiers were *not* corrupt, they should be made so. And his great success showed he understood human nature too well.

But further proof is superfluous. There can be no hope of a re-

vival in time of war; and though, in times of peace when the common practices of war are suspended, there may be some show of religion in a barrack, I fear there is little of the reality. We heard, some years ago, of a revival of religion at West-Point Academy. My curiosity was much excited by such an anomaly; and I took some pains to inquire of the chaplain concerning it. He informed me, that there was some seriousness; but, in almost, if not quite every instance, when the subject of it did not leave the institution, his religion left him, and the chaplain himself left also. This was in peace, and under the most favorable circumstances. The young men there had not yet become contaminated with scenes of bloodshed; yet religion could not live there. But who ever heard of a revival in a camp or barrack in a time of war?

Not only has war this deplorable effect on those immediately engaged in it, but its very nature is calculated to destroy all religious feeling in the nation that wages it. In the excitement of war caused by military display, the noise of cannon, drums and fifes, the clangor of trumpets, and the din of arms, what time is there for religious meditation? All the conversation turns on the news of the war. The stillness of the Sabbath is disturbed by the march of armies, the arrival of prizes, the rejoicing for victories, the rage of defeat, and the confusion occasioned by preparation against attack. A revival of religion cannot be expected at such a time; and facts, I believe, will warrant me in saying, that they seldom, or never, occur. A great revival of religion commenced in New England about 1740, which continued at intervals down to the French war and the revolution. There were a few partial revivals at the commencement of the latter; but the war extinguished them all, and a general dissoluteness of manners prevailed. This, I believe, is undeniable. There may have been some revivals of religion during the last war; but I do not recollect that I ever heard of any. Indeed, my proposition is almost self-evident; and I appeal to my readers, whether war does not in fact put an end to revivals of religion.

IX. WAR AN OBSTACLE TO THE SPREAD OF THE GOSPEL.— I have already noticed some particular modes in which war promotes sin, and opposes piety and virtue; but I have not named all the vices and sins which follow in its train. Besides murder, robbery, theft, falsehood, intemperance, lasciviousness, Sabbath breaking and duelling, I might mention other sinful practices which follow in the wake of war; for there is, perhaps, not a single vice which war does not draw after it.

If the moral evils of war, by which it sinks millions of souls into perdition, were confined to the Christian nations that carry it on, there would surely be sufficient cause for the most active opposition to it, and for humble and fervent prayer to God for its cessation; but the exceeding sinfulness of war does not end here. It is "evil, only evil, and that continually." It sheds its blighting influence on heathen nations, and is the greatest of all obstacles to their conversion. Christians not only have destroyed one

another during the past century more than pagans or Mahometans, but the history of their settlements in heathen lands is written in letters of blood. The sword has preceded the gospel, and extermination has followed it. No wonder it is so difficult to convert the heathen to Christianity. As in Christian lands men of the world judge of Christianity more by the conduct of Christians than by the word of God, so the heathen read the gospel in the history and example of Christian nations, rather than in the Bible. 'The natives of India have seen the Portuguese, the Dutch, the French and the English, bearing the standard of the cross, arrive on their shores, and, after having spread their conquests by fire and sword, turn on each other their deadly weapons. 'If this be Christianity,' say they, 'we want no such bloody religion.' The emperor of China refused the admittance of the Christian religion into his vast empire, because, said he, "wherever Christians go, they whiten the soil with human bones." O, I could write page after page to show, that war has been the greatest of all obstacles to the spread of the gospel among heathen nations.

One recent event, however, I must notice. In the islands of the Pacific Ocean, the natives had seen little or nothing of Christian warfare. They readily embraced Christianity. Its peaceful, humbling truths took hold on their feelings. They were converted. They read the gospel, and saw clearly that it prohibited war. They did not beat their spears into pruning-hooks, for happily they had no vineyards; but they converted the points of them into instruments of husbandry, and took the shafts to make railings for the pulpit stairs. War was banished from among them, to the astonishment of the missionaries, who, it seems, were not prepared for such results from the preaching of the gospel. It led them to consider whether the gospel allows war; and they were converted to the principles of peace by their own disciples. "The last pulpit stairs I ascended in Rurutu," says Rev. Mr. Ellis, "were railed with warrior's spears." But mark the change, since the natives have seen more of Christians, so called. They find that Christians bite and devour one another; and they too have left the precepts of Christ to follow the practice of his professed disciples. Mark the consequences. In the Society Islands, says Mr. Orsmoud, "the insubordination, confusion and disregard of the ordinary restraints, which the occurrence of actual war produced, appear to have increased the evils of intemperance." In reference to the effect of war on many of the people, the same writer observes, "I have seen more wickedness within the last two weeks than in sixteen years before." The ordinances of the church were discontinued, and these once peaceful nations have sunk back to nearly their original state. Mr. Simpson, missionary at Eimeo, says, "our people returned from Tahiti dreadfully chagrined,"—they had been defeated,—"and in their anger, for a time, determined to abandon both law and gospel. A great falling off in our adult and children's school followed, and has continued to a great extent to the present time." The spears have disappeared from Rurutu; and the nations now fight, like Christians here, with muskets. That rum has been in

part the cause of the deplorable change, I grant. New England rum, and Old England muskets, like Herod and Pilate, have agreed in crucifying the Prince of Peace afresh.

X. WOMEN SHOULD OPPOSE WAR BECAUSE SO DEGRADING TO THEMSELVES.—Should I descend to particulars respecting the degraded condition of females among nations that delight in war, I might fill a volume; but it would be both disgusting and unnecessary. Nor let the matrons of our country think, that their fair and virtuous daughters would be exempted from these evils, if ever America should be infatuated enough to desire a military reputation. The females of England who crowd the navy and the camp, or are thrown degraded on an unfeeling world by some gold-laced villain who has lured only to destroy, were some of them once as virtuous, and blessed with as many religious privileges, as their own daughters. The only difference is, that God has appointed their habitation in a land where arms are hardly known as a profession. Let them thank Him who has made them to differ, and show their gratitude by doing what they can to abolish war.

And women can do much. “Women are the mothers of men;” and the future character of a man is often formed in the nursery. The characters of Alexander, Charles XII. and Napoleon, those scourges of God, were formed in the nursery, and the school-room; and, did we know the early history of their compeers, Attila, Jenghis-Khan and Tamerlane, we should probably find it similar. Let matrons then look carefully to the education of their children, and sedulously exclude from them those toys, pictures, histories and poems which foster a military spirit. Let ladies of every age throw the weight of their influence into the scale of peace. Let them read and circulate peace tracts, assist in forming peace societies, contribute their mite, make their ministers life-members of the peace society, and above all pray for the success of this cause.

XI. CLAIMS OF PEACE ON MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL.—Ministers of the Gospel are ambassadors of the Prince of Peace, and bound to take him for their pattern and example. Did he ever engage in war, or have any concern in it? If not, how can his representatives take any share in it? The first sermon which he preached on earth, was a peace sermon, the first that was ever preached. How many ministers, who have lived in the world longer than he did, have never preached a peace sermon in all their lives! Do they faithfully represent the Prince of Peace, or do they “shun to declare the whole counsel of God?” Christ blessed the peace-makers, and in that act blessed the cause of peace. Can that minister be called a peace-maker, who has never preached on the subject, or prayed for a blessing on the exertions of the friends of peace? Can he who gives his sanction to war by acting as chaplain at a militia muster where men meet together to learn the art of homicide, or to a regiment, or man-of-war engaged in putting these lessons into practice, and sending hundreds of immortal souls to perdition, say he is the imitator of Christ? Did

Christ, or any of his apostles, ever appear on the field of mortal strife? There is no record of any such example; nor did *any* Christians engage in war for the first two centuries of our era.

The success of the cause of peace rests on the church in general, and on ministers in particular. It is in their power, whenever they will unite for the purpose, to put an end to war in Christendom. If they neglect to do what they can, *blood*, not only the blood of the body, but the blood of souls, will be found in the skirts of their garments. Hitherto the still, small voice of the gospel could hardly be heard amid the confused noise of the warrior; but God has, for a long time, wonderfully preserved the nations of Christendom in a state of comparative peace, and I have no doubt the labors of the peace societies have been greatly blessed to this end. There is no need of ministers interfering with the politics of the day. Simply to preach on this subject, or to meet with their flocks, and pray for a continuance of peace, can give no offence to any party. If they have any faith in prayer, any trust in the promises of God, can they refuse? Churches look up to their ministers for example. They cannot, or will not, act without their head. If ministers refuse their aid to the work, it can never be done; and although God has promised a time when nations shall learn war no more, this event will not arrive, until ministers take up the cause of peace in good earnest. It requires a special effort, more than the cause of missions or temperance. It is greater than either; for on it these two mainly depend.

XII. PROMISE OF SUCCESS IN THE WORD OF GOD.—If God had not promised a time when nations shall learn war no more, I should never have called the attention of Christians to this object; for, without such promises, I should never have thought it attainable. But I have full faith in the “sure word of prophecy,” which, at the same time that it foretells the advent of the Prince of Peace, foretells that his religion, when rightly understood and practised, will forever abolish war among his disciples, and finally throughout the whole earth; and when I see that the precepts he taught, forbid war, I cannot doubt that the prophecies will begin to be fulfilled as soon as his church shall undertake the work.

The prophecies which foretell the abolition of war, are too numerous to be quoted. See Isaiah ii. 2—4, and xi. 1—9, Hosea ii. 18, and Micah iv. 1—4, which closes thus: “and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.” Now, who will dare to doubt this word of the Lord? But are we to suppose that, because God has promised these things, we may fold our hands in indolence, and do nothing? We do not reason so on any other subject. God has promised to give his Son the heathen for his inheritance; but so far is this from preventing our prayers and labors to convert the heathen, that it is the very reason we give for our exertions. By what strange fatality is it, that Christians look to heathen lands, and neglect Christendom, laboring with a laudable zeal to convert the heathen,

while they leave the greatest obstacle to their conversion untouched? We pray for the success of missions; but alas! how few pray that the horrible custom of war among Christians, which prevents the advancement of Christianity both at home and abroad, should be abolished!

'Ah! but,' say some Christians, 'wars will be abolished when the millennium comes, not before. Let us labor to make all men Christians, and we need not trouble ourselves about universal peace; that will come of course.'—This is making cause and effect change places. As well might the husbandman say in the spring, 'I need not trouble myself about planting corn; I shall have a crop when the harvest comes; for God has promised that seed time and harvest shall not fail.' We can hardly suppose any man could be so foolish; but it is just the way many people reason with respect to war. Do they reason so on any other subject? Do they say, when the millennium comes, all men will be temperate; let intemperance alone until the millennium? Far otherwise, yet they virtually say, 'let Christians continue to kill one another, and glory in it, until the millennium.' Instead of saying wars cannot cease until the millennium, we say the millennium can never come until wars cease. It is morally impossible that heathen nations can, to any great extent, be converted, while Christian nations continue the custom of war. This Achan in our camp paralyzes all the exertions of our missionary armies. It is the scoff and scorn of the Jew, the stumbling-block of the heathen and the Mussulman. "Why do you come here, Wolfe?" said a Jew to that missionary in Jerusalem. "To preach the gospel of peace," replied Wolfe. "Peace!" retorted the Jew, "look there at Calvary, where your different sects of Christians would fight for an empty sepulchre, if the sword of the Mussulman did not restrain you. When the true Messiah comes, he will banish war."

It is remarked by experienced Christians, that God seldom, or never, grants a revival when the state of religion in the church is low, and for the best of reasons. Converts will come up only to the standard of the church that receives them. The higher her standard, not only the more, but the purer will be her converts. So of the church universal—while she allows war, intemperance, and kindred practices, her converts, what few there may be, will allow themselves in the very same. Had the primitive church allowed polygamy, that vicious custom would have remained in the church; and if the church continue to allow war, war will continue to the end of the world. The heathen cannot be converted until the church renounces and denounces war. They would be converted only to a fighting Christianity which would bring the millennium no nearer. But let the church renounce all the abominations of the world, particularly war; and the heathen, seeing the peace and purity of Christianity, will of themselves flock to her. Their conversion will be the effect, not the cause. God has promised the time when nations shall learn war no more; and when Christian nations shall set the example, he will crown with success their labors to convert the heathen.

XIII. THE CAUSE OF PEACE BELONGS TO CHRISTIANS.—Christians are the salt of the earth; but if the salt hath lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? Are they to look to the world for an example, and expect it to go ahead of them in accomplishing the will of God? They are the light of the world. If that light shall be obscured or put out, are they to borrow light from morality, philanthropy, or other unbaptized virtues? No, an extinguished sun might as well be lighted by a taper. Let us pray, that the cloud of prejudice on the subject of war may be removed, and the church shine in all the splendor which she at first exhibited, when no one was justified in rendering evil for evil—when the church preached and practised the duty of loving enemies, and overcoming evil with good.

I have endeavored to produce a few reasons why all who profess to be governed by Christian principles, should put their shoulders to this work, and call on God for help; but do any ask, what can we do? I answer, just the same that you do for the conversion of the heathen. Let every minister of the gospel labor to undeceive his people as to the true nature of war, and show its absolute inconsistency with the religion of Christ. Christian nations must *first* be converted from this sin. All its abominations should be clearly pointed out; and the exceeding sinfulness of war should be clearly brought to light. Next, let the churches unite in humble and hearty prayer to Almighty God, that he would remember his promise, and 'do as he hath said.' Let them pray, and pray fervently, that wars may cease to the ends of the earth. An annual concert of prayer is recommended on or near the 25th of December in each year; and, if a majority of the churches in this country would unite in observing some part of that day or evening to implore God's blessing on the cause of peace, might we not expect that the churches of England, where the peace cause has many more efficient friends than it has in this country, would imitate our example, as they have in the temperance cause? If the churches generally in Great Britain and the United States, should engage in this concert, would it be possible for the rulers of either country to declare war against the other? When this concert of prayer has been established in the United States and Great Britain, it is reasonable to expect that evangelical churches on the continent, and through the world, will eventually join in it. Who that has any faith in the efficacy of prayer, can doubt that such prayers would be answered? Christian rulers would not dare to declare war, when they saw the best part of their subjects engaged in prayer against it. War would begin to be considered as a *sin*, a relic of barbarism, and would be abandoned by all Christian and civilized people. Disputes might still arise among nations; but war never was, and never will be, necessary to settle them, any more than boxing and duelling are necessary to settle disputes between individuals. Nations can, if they will, as easily find some peaceable method of settling their difficulties, as professors of religion find a way to settle difficulties in the church without resorting to personal violence. Arbitration, or a congress of nations,

might take the place of war; and then Christians would wonder that they had ever countenanced this diabolical custom.

The effect of the abolition of war would be great and glorious. Virtue would flourish; learning and religion would go hand in hand; the yoke of tyranny and oppression would be broken; intemperance would hide her blushing head; the Sabbath would be observed; moral reform would advance; swearing and duelling would go out of fashion; and theft, robbery and murder would seldom be heard of. The mouths of infidels would be stopped; for the prophecies would be fulfilled, and the precepts of Christ universally prevail. All objections of the Jews against the Christian religion, drawn from belligerent nominal Christians, would be removed. Mohammedans would admire the wondrous change, and open their hearts to receive the gospel; heathens would send to us for missionaries and the Bible; and, when the vast expenses of war should be turned into the treasury of the Lord, missionaries and Bibles could be easily furnished for the whole world.

But how is this great change to be effected? The means are so simple that it is difficult to make men believe so great a cure can be performed by so simple means. It is only necessary that those Christians who believe war to be a heaven-daring, soul-destroying sin, and that God is able and willing to perform his promise when his children shall require it of him, should pray for its abolition, and send publications, tracts and agents to lay these views before their sister churches all over the world; and the work would speedily be accomplished.

But how are such operations to be carried on? Just as other enterprises of benevolence—by the contributions of Christians. Let every church observe the peace prayer-meeting, and take up a contribution for the cause. Let peace societies be formed in every church and society. Let the ladies form themselves into peace societies, and make their ministers and minister's wives life members of the American Peace Society. Let them also be careful to educate their children in peace principles, and in every way give their influence to the cause. Finally, let all men and women give the subject a fair and impartial investigation. Use the means, and the cause *must* triumph.

For aid in this work, we turn to the church of Christ, the Prince of Peace; for God will honor his church by making her the instrument of abolishing war, nor will he ever give that glory to the world. Large and numerous ecclesiastical bodies have recommended that ministers preach, and churches hold a concert of prayer for the peace cause, and take up a collection, once every year. Shall their recommendations be unavailing? Do Christians believe that the soul is immortal; that a vast majority of those who perish in battle, go down to endless perdition; that war is the mother of all abominations, and the greatest obstacle to the spread of vital piety both at home and abroad? And will they refuse to offer their prayers and their alms for its abolition?

THE BATTLE-FIELD.

THE sword is not the only nor the chief destroyer of life in war ; yet the field of battle multiplies its victims with the most fearful rapidity. It is the grand carnival of the war-god ; and fiercely does this Moloch riot there in fire and blood, in shrieks and groans, in a sort of temporary hell upon earth !

Imagine yourself on some lofty eminence surveying a field of battle like Cannæ or Arbela, Austerlitz or Borodino, Leipsic or Waterloo. A forest of swords and bayonets are bristling there ; the fierce war-horses are pawing the earth impatient for the onset ; and thousands on either side are waiting, with compressed yet quivering lip, for the signal to begin the work of mutual slaughter. At length that signal is given ; and anon the whole field, wrapt in flame and smoke, is hid from your view ; but the roar of cannon, and the rattle of musketry, and the clashing of arms, and the furious shouts, and the agonizing shrieks, and the dying groans, all tell you that the work of death is going on with horrible rapidity. Now the smoke rolls off from part of the field ; and you see whole battalions riddled, rank after rank mowed down by the deathful volleys of artillery, and descry the wounded, the dying and the dead strewed far and near, while soldiers, and horses, and cannon are passing and repassing over them in the fight.

Night closes the scene, but leaves its victims still on the ground either cold in death, or moaning in despair, or howling in agony. Wait till another morn, and then go over that field. What a human slaughter-yard ! Wherever your eye now turns, you behold men, and horses, and weapons, and broken carriages, all mingled in most shocking confusion. At every step, you tread in blood that only yesterday flowed, warm as your own, in the veins of a father, a son or a brother. The wounded, the dying, the dead are all heaped together ; and already have the wolf and the vulture come to prey upon them without distinction. Friends, too, are here in quest of these fallen victims. Yonder is a wife, a mother, a sister, each frantic with grief, searching on this field of blood for a husband, a son, a brother. Here is a wretch with his limbs horribly mangled, yet still alive ; and there is another all covered with blood, and crushed by the tread of the war-horse, or the wheels of cannon passing over him. Yonder is an athletic frame that had struggled hard against his pains, and survived his mortal wounds long enough in his anguish to gnaw the turf with his teeth, and plough the earth with his hands. Here is another still that had dragged himself along in his own gore till death kindly released him from his agonies ; and yonder is a young man of fair

form and noble mien, who felt the dews of death fast settling on his brow, and, knowing his hour had come, pulled from his bosom the last letter of a mother, the picture of a wife, or the braided lock of a loved and plighted one, and, pressing the fond memorial to his lips, expired with no kind one near to ease his dying head, or catch his last farewell.

Would to God that this were all! But every battle is followed by a long train of the keenest sufferings. Often are thousands left day after day stretched on the open field, without food, or drink, or any shelter from scorching suns, from drenching rains, from the damps and chills of night, or even from the voracity of famished beasts of prey, till multitudes linger out a most miserable death, the wounds of many become incurable, and the excruciating pains of others drive them to madness.

Go to a hospital crowded with such victims—victims jolted thither, days and even weeks after the battle, in rude carts, with their undressed wounds all festering and gangrened! Here is a limb shattered to pieces, and there another torn almost from the body. Yonder is a wretch with his skull fractured, his jaw broken, an eye dislocated, or crushed in its socket. Here is one feebly gasping in death, and there another driven to madness by his sufferings, raving in wild, fierce delirium, and pouring forth a torrent of horrid imprecations. Here you behold one pleading piteously for the surgeon's knife to ease his pains, and yonder another writhing and shrieking under an operation more painful than even his wounds.

But let us look at a single one of these sufferers. 'In the melee,' says Gen. Ponsonby wounded at the battle of Waterloo, 'I was almost instantly disabled in both arms; and, followed by a few of my men who were at once cut down, I was carried along by my horse, till receiving a blow from a sabre, I fell senseless on my face to the ground. Recovering, I raised myself a little to look around, being unable to get up, and run away, when a lancer passing by, struck his lance through my back. My head dropped, the blood gushed into my mouth, and a difficulty of breathing came on. A soldier stopped to plunder me, and threatened my life. I directed him to a small side-pocket, where he found three dollars, all I had. But he still threatened, and I said he might search me, which he immediately did, unloosing my stock, tearing open my waistcoat, and leaving me in a very uneasy posture. No sooner was he gone than an officer, bringing up some troops, and happening to halt where I lay, stooped down, and addressed me, saying he feared I was badly wounded. I told him I was, and expressed a wish to be carried to the rear. He said it was against their orders to remove even their own men; but, if they gained the day, as he expected they would, every attention in his power should be shown me. I complained of thirst; and he held his bottle to my lips, directing one of his soldiers to lay me straight on my side, and place a knapsack under my head. He then passed on into action; and I never knew to whom I was thus indebted for my life.

‘It was dusk when two squadrons of Prussian cavalry, each of them two deep, came across the valley, and passed me in full trot, lifting me from the ground, and tumbling me about cruelly. This was horrid enough; but a gun taking that direction, must have destroyed me.—The battle was now at an end; but the groans of the wounded all around me became every instant more and more audible. There I lay in my agony, and thought the night would never end. About this time I found a soldier lying across my legs. He had probably crawled thither in his anguish; and his weight, his convulsive motions, his doleful noises, and the air rushing through a wound in his side, distressed me greatly—the last circumstance more than all, as I had a wound of the same nature myself. Several stragglers of our own allies, wandering about in quest of plunder, came one after another to look at me, and at last one stopped to examine me. I told him I was a British officer, and had been plundered already; yet he did not desist, but pulled me about roughly. Near midnight, I saw a man in English uniform walking towards me. I spoke instantly to him, told him who I was, and offered him a reward to remain with me. He relieved me from the dying soldier, and stood over me as a sentinel till day broke, when, a messenger being sent to Hervey, a *cart* came, and carried me, a mile and a half, to the village of Waterloo, where I was found to have received seven wounds.’

Let us hear the testimony of some eye-witnesses. ‘The battle of Preuss-Eylau was suspended awhile; and never did a more horrid spectacle present itself! Fifty thousand men killed and wounded since sun-rise, and a great part of them, being struck by cannon shot, exposed still on the ground without any means or hopes of succor! Near fifty thousand more, worn out with fatigue, and exhausted with hunger, were unable to keep the field, and about to abandon their mangled comrades who vainly implored their assistance and protection!

‘The cannon thundered at Heilsberg, and the musketry rolled, illuminating the atmosphere with continued flame, until the combat gradually relaxed; but a little before ten at night, a deserter came over to the Russians, and informed the general that another assault was preparing from the wood. Soon the batteries were opened, and the fury of battle raged again; but the assailants, unable to force the passage, fell back almost annihilated, and shouted, *cease the fight*. The massacre was terminated; but the uproar of conflict was followed by the groans of the wounded who, tortured with pain, and anticipating a renewal of the fight on the morrow, in vain implored removal, relief, and even death. When the light broke, a most disgusting sight attracted the attention of both the armies. The ground between them, about a quarter of a mile, was a sheet of naked human bodies which friends and foes had during the night mutually stripped, not leaving the poorest rag upon them, although numbers were still alive, and retained consciousness of their situation!’

Glance at the battle-field of Borodino. ‘As we passed over the

ground which the Russians had occupied, we could judge of the immense loss they had sustained. In the space of *nine square miles*, almost every spot was covered with the killed or wounded! On many places the bursting of shells had promiscuously heaped together men and horses. The fire of our howitzers had been so destructive, that *mountains* of dead bodies were scattered over the plain; but the most horrid spectacle was in the interior of the ravines, where those of the wounded who were able to drag themselves along, had taken refuge to avoid the shot. These miserable wretches, heaped one upon another, and almost suffocated with blood, uttering the most dreadful groans, and invoking death with piercing cries, eagerly besought us to end their torments by killing them on the spot!

Take the following account of scenes after the battle of Soldin, from the pen of a clergyman. 'At one o'clock the cannonading ceased; and I went out on foot as far as Soldin to learn to whose advantage the battle had turned. Towards evening, seven hundred Russian fugitives came to Soldin, a most pitiful sight! some holding up their hands, cursing and swearing; others praying, and praising the king of Prussia; without hats, without clothes; some on foot, others two on a horse, with their heads and arms tied up; some dragging along by the stirrups, and others by the tails of the horses.—When the battle was decided in favor of the Prussians, I ventured to the place where the cannonading had been. After walking some way, a Cossack's horse came running full speed towards me. I mounted him; and on my way for seven miles and a half on this side the field of battle, I found the dead and wounded lying on the ground, sadly cut in pieces. The further I advanced, the more these poor creatures lay heaped one upon another. That scene I shall never forget. The Cossacks, as soon as they saw me, cried out, Dear sir, water, *water, WATER!* Righteous God! what a sight! Men, women and children, Russians and Prussians, carriages and horses, oxen, chests and baggage, all lying one upon another to the height of a man! and seven villages around me in flames, and the inhabitants either massacred, or thrown into the fire!—Nor were the embers of mutual rage yet extinguished in the hearts of the combatants; for the poor wounded were still firing at each other in the greatest exasperation! The field of battle was a plain two miles and a half long, and so entirely covered with dead and wounded, that there was not even room to set my foot without treading on some of them! Several brooks were so filled up with Russians, that they lay heaped one upon another as high as two men, and appeared like hills to the even ground! I could hardly recover myself from the fright occasioned by the miserable outcries of the wounded. A noble Prussian officer, who had lost both his legs, cried out to me, Sir, you are a priest, and preach mercy; pray, show me some compassion, and despatch me at once.'

INEFFICACY OF WAR,

OR

THE SWORD A SUICIDAL RESORT.

BY HON. WILLIAM JAY.

THE only avowed aim of war is the removal of some present, or the prevention of some future evil; and, could we even be sure of success, its wisdom would still depend on the proportion between its cost, and the value of the object to be gained. But war, as Jefferson well said, is an instrument wholly uncertain in its operation, and frequently, if not generally, occasions more evil than it cures or prevents.

It is customary for nations to appeal to heaven for the justice of their cause. Such appeals are rarely sincere, and too often are more likely to repel than invite Divine assistance; but, whether sincere or not, the justice of the cause affords little, if any, ground for anticipating the favorable interposition of heaven. Both sacred and profane history teach us, that base and perfidious men have often waged with success most iniquitous wars; and that conquerors, like other instruments of wrath, are but agents in executing Divine judgments. Nations are all more or less deserving of punishment; and it frequently comports with the providence of God to inflict that punishment by permitting them to be the prey of lawless violence.

If the result of war, then, is wholly independent of the justice of its origin, on what is it dependent? To this the common reply is, the relative strength and skill of the parties; but the race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong. A powerful nation has often been foiled in its attempts upon a weak one, and numerous are the instances in which unexpected revolutions and alliances have turned the tide of war. Indeed, the very existence of war is owing to the uncertainty of its result; for it is obvious that, if success could be distinctly foreseen, the party doomed to defeat would refuse to contend.

The folly of war is also apparent from the fact, that the object for which it is waged, could almost always be obtained by other and less hazardous means, and that, when obtained, it is rarely worth the blood and treasure lavished in its acquisition. Cicero long since declared 'the worst peace preferable to the best war;' and the sagacious Franklin remarked, "whatever advantage one nation would obtain from another, it would be cheaper to purchase such advantage with ready money, than to pay the expense of acquiring it by war." Only eight days after this illustrious patriot had placed his name to the treaty of peace which acknowledged the independence of his country, he wrote to a friend, "may we

never see another war ; for, in my opinion, there never was a good war, or a bad peace." Both reason and experience bear their testimony to the correctness of these sentiments. The chance of defeat, which is always great, of course lessens the value of the object for which we contend, for the same reason that, when the result of a lawsuit is doubtful, a prudent man will accept a compromise rather than hazard his whole demand. The value of the object is also lessened by the prodigious expense at which alone it can be obtained.

Let us test these principles by an appeal to history. Great Britain claimed the right of raising a revenue from her colonies by taxation, and made war upon them for the purpose of collecting this revenue. The colonies, on the other hand, took up arms to establish, not their independence as a distinct nation, but simply their exemption from taxation by the British parliament, instead of their own colonial legislatures. To human view the contest was unequal, and the success of the mother-country beyond a doubt. Yet in her attempt to extort a few thousand pounds from her feeble and defenceless colonies, she drew upon herself a seven years' war, in which she found the power of France, Spain and Holland arrayed against her, and after sacrificing, as is estimated, 200,000 of her subjects, and adding \$500,000,000 to her national debt, she was compelled to purchase peace by the severance of her empire. Had she condescended to limit her demand on the colonies, and to offer equivalent privileges and immunities, her blood and her treasure would have been spared, and her power would have been augmented instead of being impaired.

But it may be said, that this war, though disastrous for Great Britain, was glorious and happy for the colonies. Let it, however, be recollected that this glory and happiness consisted, not in exemption from British taxation, the sole object of the war on the part of the colonies, but in the establishment of a great confederated republic ; an incident of the war, as unwished for as it was unexpected. As this assertion may startle many, it may not be amiss to correct the prevailing error on the subject by an appeal to indisputable authorities. The Congress of 1774, specified the acts of Parliament which infringed upon the rights of the colonies, and in their petition to the king, after setting forth their grievances, remarked, "these sentiments are extorted from hearts that would much more willingly bleed in your Majesty's service. We wish not a diminution of the prerogative, nor do we solicit the grant of any new right in our favor ; your royal authority over us, and our connection with Great Britain, we shall always carefully and zealously endeavor to support and maintain." The Congress of 1775, after the commencement of hostilities, and the capture of Ticonderoga, ordered an inventory of the royal stores taken in the fort to be made, in order that they might be returned "when the restoration of the former harmony between Great Britain and the colonies, so ardently wished for by the latter, should render it prudent and consistent with the overruling law of self-preservation."

Even after organizing the army, Congress published a declaration, in which they affirm, "we mean not to dissolve that union which has so long and so happily subsisted between us, and which we sincerely wish to see restored. Necessity has not yet driven us into that desperate measure; we have not raised armies with ambitious designs of separating from Great Britain and establishing independent states." But the pertinacity of the British ministry prevented the colonists from laying down their arms, and they soon found it impossible to use them with efficiency in the character of loyal subjects, and hence the necessity which, in 1776, drove them into the "desperate measure" of a declaration of independence. The New York Convention, on receiving this declaration, resolved, "that while we lament the cruel necessity which has rendered this measure unavoidable, we approve the same." Should it be pretended that these official asseverations were hypocritical, and the subterfuges of state policy, we appeal to the following individual testimonies:—Franklin, in 1775, said, "I never heard in any conversation from any person, drunk or sober, the least expression of a wish for separation, or a hint that such a thing would be advantageous to America." "During the course of my life," says John Jay, "and until after the second petition of Congress in 1775, I never did hear any American express a wish for the independence of the colonies." "That there existed a general desire of independence of the crown in any part of America before the Revolution," John Adams avers, "is as far from truth as the zenith is from the nadir. For my own part, there was not a moment during the Revolution, when I would not have given every thing I possessed for a restoration to the state of things before the contest began, provided we could have had a sufficient security for its continuance." "Before the commencement of hostilities," Thomas Jefferson adds, "I never had heard a whisper of a disposition to separate from Great Britain; and after that, its possibility was contemplated with affliction by all."

Now, had the war been continued by the colonies, as it commenced, only in resistance to British taxation, and had the peace of 1783 guaranteed them from all future taxation by Parliament, the object for which they had appealed to arms, would have been obtained; and we may fairly ask, if they would not have obtained it at a price incalculably beyond its value? Let us endeavor to form some estimate of the amount of taxation which the colonies imposed upon themselves, rather than pay the stamp and other duties claimed by Great Britain. It appears from official documents, that so early as September, 1779, the money borrowed by Congress for carrying on the war, independent of the proceeds of taxes, amounted to 197,682,985 dollars; and other large loans, it is well known, were afterwards made both at home and abroad. If to the amount expended by Congress, we add the contributions of the several States, and the losses sustained by individuals, we cannot resist the conviction that the mere interest of the aggregate sum would greatly exceed any taxes the British ministry had ever contemplated imposing upon the colonies

But pecuniary disbursements formed as usual but a secondary item in the cost of the war. The slaughter of their fellow-citizens, (287,954 were called into service,) the capture of their cities, and the devastation of large portions of their country, together with the depreciation of morals always consequent on a long war, are to be included in the price paid by our fathers for their exemption from British taxation. And can we doubt that Britain would have rejoiced to have sold that exemption at a trifle compared with what we actually paid for it? What an accumulation of human misery would such a contract have prevented! To the colonies it would have secured without a groan all the independence they desired; and to England, and to Europe, it would have saved the lives and happiness of multitudes.

A later period of our history furnishes a still more striking illustration of the folly of war as a mode of redress. In 1812, the United States declared war against Great Britain on account of certain orders in council destructive of neutral commerce, and on account of the right claimed and exercised by Great Britain of impressing her native subjects from the merchant vessels of other nations when on the high seas. The obnoxious orders were revoked before the news of the war reached England, and the contest was continued solely on account of impressment. "The impressment of seamen," said our government, "being deservedly considered a principal cause of the war, it ought to be prosecuted until that cause is removed. The omission of it in a treaty of peace would not leave it on its former ground; it would in effect be an absolute relinquishment, and the United States would have appealed to arms in vain."

Now, the greatest number of American seamen ever officially alleged to have been compulsorily serving in the British navy, was about 800; and to suppress this abuse, we drew the sword, and formally threw away the scabbard. To prevent the impressment of a few seamen, the whole country was subjected, for about three years, to the burdens, hazards and vicissitudes of war. Our commerce was swept from the ocean, our citizens oppressed with taxes, the villages on the Canadian frontier laid in ashes, and the very metropolis of the republic captured, and its public edifices fired by foreign troops.

Great Britain at length found herself, by the overthrow of Napoleon, at liberty to direct her fleets and armies exclusively against the United States; and our government, in despair of extorting from her a relinquishment of the obnoxious claim, and foreseeing only an accumulation of calamities from an obstinate prosecution of the war, wisely directed their negotiators, in concluding a treaty of peace, "*to omit any stipulation on the subject of impressment.*" The instruction was obeyed; the treaty contained not the most distant allusion to the subject of impressment; nor did it provide for the surrender of a single American sailor detained in the service of the British navy; and thus, by the confession of our own government, "the United States had appealed to arms in vain."

But was the conduct of Great Britain more consistent with true wisdom? Although she must be regarded as the victorious party, not having surrendered the claim on account of which the war was waged, yet at what an immense cost did she avoid the surrender? To retain the privilege of taking from American merchant vessels a few straggling seamen, she encountered a three years' war in which nearly 3000 of her vessels were captured by the Americans; more vessels probably than all the seamen she had ever recovered by impressment! In return for these losses, for the cost of the war, and the consequent additions to her debt and taxes, she retained a claim which, for the last twenty-six years, (1841,) she has chosen not to enforce.

The last fifty years have been fruitful in wars, and also in proofs of their exceeding folly. The impetuous and frantic proceedings of the French Legislative Assembly, struck Europe with awe, and her monarchs trembled on their thrones, while witnessing the indignities cast upon the unfortunate Louis. It was supposed that the permanency of all monarchical governments was involved in the future fortunes of the French king; and hence the declaration at Pilnitz, August, 1791, by which Austria and Prussia virtually invited the other powers of Europe to unite with them in breaking the fetters with which the French people had bound their sovereign. The invitation not being accepted, the emperor of Austria, and the king of Prussia, resolved to hasten alone to the rescue of their royal brother, and as a preliminary step, submitted to France such demands as plainly intimated an intention to resort, if necessary, to force. These demands probably hastened the fate of him in whose behalf they were made. They were answered by a declaration of war, and in a few months Louis was led to the scaffold. The allied army invaded France, and were soon compelled to retreat. They were followed by the enemy, who spread dismay through Germany, and wrested the Netherlands from the sway of Austria.

Great Britain, on the execution of Louis, recalled her ambassador from Paris, refused any longer to acknowledge the French minister at her court, and was preparing to join in the *melee*, when her intentions were anticipated by the energetic leaders of the new republic. An English army was sent to the Continent, and driven from it with disgrace.—Prussia, wearied with defeat, sought for peace, and obtained a treaty which, instead of re-establishing the French monarchy, transferred to the regicides a portion of her dominions.—Austria, after a disastrous war of six years, saw a victorious army approaching her capital, and joyfully accepted peace as a boon, although purchased at the expense of the Netherlands, and a portion of her Italian possessions.—England, deserted by her allies, continued the war with an obstinacy that no experience of its futility could shake, and with a pride that disdained to inquire for what object it was waged.

France, triumphant over every enemy accessible to her arms, resolved, in her wantonness of power, to plant her standards on

the Pyramids, and without condescending to offer an excuse for assaulting an unoffending people, already looked on the land of the Pharaohs as an appendage of the great republic. On the 10th of May, 1798, the most formidable and magnificent armament that had ever been equipped on the French shores, took its departure for Egypt; and within three months that proud fleet had been captured, and the army it transported, was subsequently returned as prisoners in the vessels of their enemies.

The French troops having taken possession of the papal territories, the king of Naples, alarmed by the proximity of such formidable neighbors, thought it expedient, for the security of his own dominions, to throw down the gauntlet to the French republic; and in a few months he found himself a fugitive, and his kingdom in the entire possession of his enemies.

The growing power of France, which had been aggrandized by every effort made to check it, now excited an alliance against it between Austria and Prussia. During the progress of this new war, the fortunate soldier who swayed the destinies of France, proposed peace to Great Britain. That nation, safe in her Island fortress, and guarded by her wooden walls, had little to fear from any continental power; yet seduced by the meteor of glory, she preferred war to peace, and her people were burdened with taxes, not merely to maintain her own armaments, but to replenish the exhausted coffers of Austria. That rash state, weakened and humiliated by successive defeats, at last closed the contest she had herself commenced, by the ignominious treaty of Luneville. Prussia, likewise, after a murderous conflict, concluded a peace which gave no guarantee whatever of her own safety, or that of others.

England was thus left to struggle alone with her gigantic foe. The war she had provoked and prolonged, contributed nothing to her prosperity or security, and had in truth no real object but the gratification of her national pride; and even that was at length compelled to submit to the inglorious peace of Amiens, by which England obtained, in return for her prodigal expenditure of blood and treasure, Ceylon in the East, and Trinidad in the West Indies—possessions which would have been dearly purchased at the cost of one year's hostility.

Such was the result of ten years' war waged against the French republic, not to resist, but to *prevent* aggression. Had the powers of Europe abstained from all interference with the internal dissensions of France, order would soon have succeeded to confusion, either through the energy of some successful chieftain, or the establishment of a regular government; but the attempts made to coerce and conquer France, armed a whole nation in defence of its liberties, and created that military enthusiasm and desperation which, like a volcanic eruption, burst forth with resistless fury, spreading terror and desolation in its course.

Never had the precarious issue of war been more forcibly taught to mankind; but it was a lesson unheeded by Europe, and least of

all by England. Mortified by the failure of all her vast efforts to limit the power of the new republic, confident in her naval superiority, and trusting to her pecuniary resources to enlist new allies in her cause, she panted to renew the contest from which she had so recently retired. Britain could not complain of any infraction of the late treaty, as it had been violated only by herself in refusing to surrender Malta. France had offered her no violence, nor was there proof that any was intended. She was therefore compelled to assume the attitude of champion and protector of Europe; and, scarcely twelve months after the peace of Amiens, she renewed the war against France avowedly on account of the grasping and inordinate ambition of her ruler, as manifested in his recent encroachments on Switzerland and Piedmont! But the hostility of Great Britain, instead of curbing the ambition of Napoleon, opened new paths for its splendid and adventurous career; and the petty encroachments which had excited alarm were followed by the occupation of Hanover, the patrimonial possession of the house of Brunswick. In the course of a few months England beheld, with amazement and dismay, arrayed on the opposite coast, a numerous force, indicating in the name it bore, *Army of England*, the invasion it meditated. The terror inspired by this army, is evinced by the preparations made to repel it. To nearly 100,000 troops of the line were added 80,000 disciplined militia, and about 300,000 volunteers. "The land," says a distinguished historian, "seemed converted into an immense camp, and the whole nation into soldiers." The mere expense of these preparations must have far exceeded the value of any acquisitions rationally anticipated from the war; and in less than one year after its declaration, that ruler whose ambition it sought to repress, had exchanged the truncheon of first Consul for the imperial sceptre.

Soon after his coronation, Bonaparte once more offered peace to England; but her passion for war led her not only again to refuse the proffered boon, but to lavish her wealth in rekindling on the Continent the flames which had but just been extinguished. An alliance was formed against France, between Great Britain, Austria and Russia. This new war was announced by Napoleon to his senate on the 22d September, 1805, and on the 13th November following, he entered Vienna in triumph! The Russians hastened to the succor of their unfortunate ally; and on the 2d December the battle of Austerlitz dissolved the confederacy, and, in a few days after, the treaty of Presburg completed the humiliation of Austria by depriving her of more than a million of square miles of territory, and two and a half millions of subjects. With a folly bordering on insanity, Prussia now resolved to take the field against France. The grievances of which she complained, were trivial, and utterly unworthy the risk of an appeal to arms. Yet on the 1st of October, 1806, she issued her declaration of war, and the campaign immediately commenced. After gaining some advantages, Bonaparte offered peace to Prussia; but her infatuated monarch did not deign to return an answer; and, on the 13th day

after his declaration of war, his power was prostrated in the battle of Jena, he himself was a fugitive, and his capital in the occupation of the very enemy he had just defied. At Berlin the French emperor issued a decree which was the beginning of what was afterwards called the continental system, by which all commercial intercourse between Great Britain and France, and her allies, was interdicted. The operation of this system occasioned vast loss and distress to England, and greatly aggravated her sufferings from this unnecessary war. The Russians had advanced to the support of Prussia; but finding their ally already conquered, immediately retreated. They were pursued by the victor, and a series of murderous conflicts ensued, in one of which 50,000 human beings perished. At length the treaty of Tilsit gave peace to Prussia and Russia, and converted them from allies into enemies to Great Britain, and supporters of the continental system.

Thus had Britain the mortification of witnessing the coalitions which her subsidies and intrigues had raised against France, serving only to swell the triumphs, and augment the power of her rival. She had renewed the war to rescue Europe from the grasping ambition of the first Consul; and yet, notwithstanding all her mighty efforts, that Consul had become emperor of France, and his brothers, kings of Holland, Naples and Westphalia; and Austria, Prussia and Russia, enrolled themselves among his allies. Could peace have rendered France more powerful, Europe more enslaved, or England herself more burdened and exposed?

Soon after the treaty of Tilsit, France and Russia jointly offered peace to England, consenting to leave her in possession of whatever she had acquired in the course of the war. But again was the blessing spurned, not because the rights of Britain were in jeopardy, but because the same boon was not also tendered to Spain and Sweden! And on what principle of duty, on what plea of state expediency, could the continuance of the contest by Britain under such circumstances be justified? Had it been in the power of Britain to rescue Spain and Sweden from the designs of their enemies, her right to shed her own blood in defence of other nations might well be questioned. The result of her former efforts as the champion of Europe, ought to have taught her humility; and she was doomed soon to receive another lesson not more gratifying to her pride. As if Providence designed to rebuke her arrogance, only a few months elapsed after she had rejected peace, that she might extend her protection to Spain and Sweden, before Madrid surrendered to the French emperor; an English army was ignominiously driven from the Peninsula, and Finland, wrested from Sweden, became a province of Russia.

The infatuation of England communicated itself to Austria. To that power France had given no cause of complaint since the treaty of Presburg, but had faithfully observed all its articles. Still Austria found in the ever increasing power of Napoleon, a pretext for renewing hostilities against him. An army of 550,000 men flattered Austria with a glorious issue to the war she commenced

on the 9th April, 1809. In thirty days Vienna was once more in possession of the French, and on the 6th July the battle of Wagram placed the house of Austria, for the third time, at the mercy of Napoleon, and for the third time was peace purchased by prodigious sacrifices.

Surely this brief retrospect of the wars arising from the French revolution, is sufficient to humble the pride of human reason. We see nations rejecting peace as an evil, counting war as a blessing, spurning the lessons of experience, and again and again seeking safety and power in the same paths which had repeatedly led them to defeat and spoliation. It has been very far from our design in this retrospect to justify the conduct of Napoleon. The ends he pursued, and the means he employed, were generally alike unlawful; but we must admit that, for very many of the wars waged against him, he had given no other provocation than the possession of great power and inordinate ambition. That his power was augmented, and his ambition indulged by the very assaults of his enemies, cannot be questioned; and their retrospect forcibly illustrates the little dependence that can rationally be placed on war as a means of national security.

But it may be contended that the successive defeats sustained by Russia, Prussia and Austria, were owing to their inferiority to their enemy; and that the nation which can bring into the field the most numerous and best appointed army, must invariably be successful. Were we to admit this, still, unless the superiority of the army to which victory is destined can be previously ascertained, war must remain as uncertain as ever. But if this superiority *can* be discovered before the contest is commenced, how are we to account for the fact, that Austria, Russia and Prussia were so often and so grievously deceived? Their wars against France were either declared or invited by themselves, and they must therefore have flattered themselves that they had at least an even chance for success. All history, however, and none more fully than that of Napoleon himself, bears testimony to the great and instructive truth, that the battle is not always to the strong, and that no military force or skill whatever can enable the eye of man to penetrate the future, and distinctly foresee the result of a single campaign.

This truth is strikingly illustrated in Napoleon. On taking a survey of Europe, after his last conquest of Austria, he beheld the whole continent courting his alliance and protection, with the single exception of Spain, in which the arms and treasures of England were employed in strengthening a popular resistance to his will. Bent on the destruction of his insular foe who, inaccessible to his armies, was both indefatigable and implacable in her hostility, he determined to enforce against her the continental system in every country that could be controlled by his power. Russia refused to submit to all the restrictions of this system, and he sternly resolved to compel obedience to his mandate. The preparations for this war by France exceeded in effective strength

any the world had ever witnessed. Greater numbers may have assembled in arms; but history affords no reason to believe that any body of men were ever summoned to the field possessed in as great a degree of the constituents of military power, as the army now collected by Napoleon. The gross amount of the regular disciplined force of the empire, and its dependencies and allies, amounted to the almost incredible number of 1,187,000. From this mighty mass the emperor could draw at pleasure to maintain the war; and he selected about half a million to carry the French eagles into the heart of Russia. This prodigious multitude, inured to arms, and accustomed to victory, were commanded not by a Xerxes or Darius, but by one of the most energetic, skilful and fortunate soldiers that Europe had ever known. Could military superiority insure success, surely Napoleon was justified in his confident anticipations of triumph; and yet in a few months this mighty monarch was seen deserting at night the wreck of an army that had lost 450,000 men, and seeking safety in flight under a borrowed name! It is unnecessary to trace further the progress of this memorable war, which terminated in the entire subjugation of France, and in the exile and captivity of her late powerful emperor. Of these results England claims the chief credit; but they would probably have come without her agency. Napoleon was indeed banished to Elba; but that was effected almost without the aid of a British musket. British troops caused his downfall at Waterloo; but, had there not been a British soldier on the continent, he could not long have retained the throne of France.

For her wanton waste of human life and happiness, Great Britain is now suffering a severe retribution in her enormous debt, which represses industry, and has filled the kingdom with mourning and sedition. Institutions long her pride and boast, are now tottering to their fall, and she is threatened with a portentous revolution. For her blood poured out like water, for the millions on millions wrung from her people to sustain her wars, Great Britain has received no one substantial good!

‘But liberty is a blessing worth every sacrifice, and war is often indispensable to its acquisition and protection.’—Could liberty be always attained and preserved by war, there would certainly be strong inducements to wage it; but if you consult the records of history, you will find war far more frequently the foe than the friend of freedom. Rarely have usurpers triumphed over the liberties of their country but by the sword. The ancient despotism of France was overthrown by representative assemblies, and a republic established on its ruins; and that republic was annihilated by an adventurous soldier through the agency of the army entrusted to him for its defence. The liberties of England have been acquired not by force of arms, but by the energy of parliaments. The ruin of almost every republic that has been blotted from the list of nations, may be ascribed to the military spirit fostered by its citizens.

War has always been adverse to political freedom. A Roman

statesman declared, that 'laws are silent in the midst of arms;' and the experience of ages has converted the words into a proverb. Civil liberty requires the substitution of laws for the will of the ruler; but in war, the will of the ruler becomes the source of legitimate authority, and the bulwarks erected around civil rights, are all levelled on the proclamation of martial law. Constitutional liberty is often sacrificed to the policy of war, and almost every campaign produces its dictator. Few men have ever been more jealous of encroachments on their rights than the fathers of the American Revolution; yet were they frequently induced by the exigencies of the war to submit to the most despotic measures. At one period, no citizen of New York was permitted to pass from one county to another without a passport; and the convention of the same State authorized a committee of three to send for persons and papers; to call out detachments of the militia; to apprehend, imprison, and banish whom they thought proper; to impose secrecy on those they employed; to make draughts on the treasury; to raise officers, and employ as they pleased 220 soldiers. All history bears testimony to the natural tendency of war to establish and strengthen arbitrary power. The pride and pomp of war, the unlimited power of the commander, the gradations of rank, and the blind, mechanical obedience exacted from the troops, all conspire to render an army a fit instrument of tyranny.

In the policy of nations no maxim is more universally received, with undoubting confidence in its truth, than that "to preserve peace, it is necessary to be prepared for war." But the wisdom of man is foolishness with God; and upon few maxims of worldly wisdom has Providence more indelibly impressed the stamp of folly and of falsehood. The maxim is founded in ignorance or forgetfulness of the depravity of human nature. It supposes that aggression will be prevented by the power to repel it; while the incitement to aggression by the power to commit it, is wholly overlooked. It is not true that military preparation prevents assaults. The very possession of power, provoking envy, jealousy and hatred, invites hostility. When has Europe beheld a nation more thoroughly prepared for war than France under Napoleon? Yet when has any nation, in the same period of time, been more frequently and violently attacked? History affords no example of a nation so powerful as to be exempted from enemies. On the other hand, great military strength has certainly no tendency to encourage pacific dispositions in its possessor. While the nature of man remains unchanged, his cupidity, oppression and injustice will ordinarily be proportioned to his means of indulging them, and those nations will be most frequently engaged in war, who are most competent to wage it.

From the commencement of the eighteenth century, Great Britain, France and Russia have been the most formidable powers in Europe, while Holland, Denmark and Portugal have ranked among the minor states. From 1700 to the general peace in 1815, these countries had been engaged in war as follows:—Great

Britain 69 years, Russia 68, France 63, Holland 43, Portugal 40, Denmark 28. Thus their wars have been pretty much in proportion to their military strength; and thus, in the righteous retribution of Providence, those nations which most cultivate the arts of war, are made to drink most deeply of its bloody cup. We also learn the folly of the opinion current in all ages, that national power is conducive to national happiness. The importance attached by statesmen to national wealth, population and military resources, arises from the wretched delusion, that national happiness can be insured only by force of arms. But no truth can be more obvious than that national happiness is merely the aggregate happiness of individuals; and surely the happiness of individuals rests on other grounds than the revenues, fleets and armies of the government to which they are subject. Military power is too often the instrument of a barbarous and debasing despotism. The actual amount of individual and domestic suffering in France, while Napoleon was arbiter of Europe, was probably greater than under any other sovereign that had ever wielded the French sceptre; and who can doubt for a moment, that there is comparatively more comfort, and less misery, in the diminutive state of Connecticut, than in the mighty empire of Russia?

The last plea in behalf of war is, that it is indispensable in self-defence. To this we reply, that every war is professedly defensive, while scarcely any one is so in fact. It will be difficult to specify a single instance in which a war might not have been averted by honest and sincere negotiation, or by a sacrifice far less costly to either party than the prosecution of hostilities. Let it be remembered, that precisely the same plea is advanced in vindication of duelling; a plea we all know to be utterly false. War is national duelling, in which each party is exposed to calamities incomparably more dreadful than the grievances they are seeking to redress.

MADISON.—Of all the enemies of public liberty, war is perhaps the most to be dreaded. It is the parent of armies; from these proceed debts and taxes; and armies, and debts, and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under the dominion of the few. In war, too, the discretionary power of the executive is extended; and all the means of seducing the mind, are added to those of subduing the force, of the people. *No nation could preserve its freedom in the midst of continued warfare.*

SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH.—The army is the last resource of power; a tremendous weapon, which cannot burst without threatening destruction to all around, and which, if it were not sometimes happily so overcharged as to recoil on him who wields it, would rob all the slaves in the world of hope, and all the freemen of safety.

O'CONNELL.—Remember no political change is worth a single crime, or, above all, a single drop of human blood.

MILITIA DRILLS.

NATIONS have always claimed the right of war, and made it their great business to prepare for it, either by having every man a warrior, as among savages; or by standing armies, as in Europe since the middle of the fifteenth century; or by a militia system which places the defence of a country in its own citizens, and keeps more or less of them trained for this service. Such a system, though extremely crude and inefficient, existed in the feudal ages; and the elements of even our own militia may be traced back as far as Alfred the Great.

I shall not now discuss the *principle* of such preparations; for the rightfulness of these turns very much, if not entirely, on that of war itself. I may certainly prepare for whatever I am bound or permitted to do; but, if the thing itself is wrong, then is it equally so to make any preparation for doing it. If duelling or piracy is wrong, I must not prepare myself for either. If wrong to counterfeit, or steal, or commit robbery or murder, I have no right to make the slightest preparation for such crimes; and, on the same principle, it is just as right, or just as wrong, to prepare for war as it is to use such preparations in actual warfare. I believe the gospel forbids both; but, supposing war to be right in the emergencies for which preparations are made, I still contend that militia drills are worse than useless. I do not now call in question the system itself, or the principle of repelling, and being prepared to repel aggression; but I think it possible, in perfect consistency with this admission, to prove that our militia drills are an expensive and pernicious superfluity, and might, without the least injury or danger, be entirely discarded.

Few suspect how much our militia drills cost and waste. Take a case which I myself learned on the spot. In a small town of New England, there were formed even in 1842 no less than three military companies with some aid from an adjoining town, and one company of juvenile volunteers. Of the latter a shrewd, economical man said, 'I wish this training fever were over; for it has cost me eight or ten dollars to fit up my boys, and lost me a great deal of their time during the best season of the year.' If there were only forty boys in the company, and their equipments cost four dollars each, and their time was worth only twenty-five cents a day, the sum total for these items alone, would have been \$340. If we suppose the whole number from that town in the adult companies to have been only one hundred, the time spent through the season a single week at merely half a dollar a day, their incidental expenses barely twenty-five cents more, and their equipments of every kind eight dollars each, the aggregate, though most of these

estimates are too low by half, would amount to no less than \$1250, in all for boys and men, \$1590; and, should we reckon the loss of time and money to the spectators, and the general suspension or derangement of business, the sum total would probably reach \$3000 or more. Put it, however, at only \$2000 for a population of one thousand; and, even at this rate, you would make our militia drills now (1845) a tax upon the country of some \$40,000,000 a year!

Nor does even this tell the whole truth. A good man once said to me, 'I trained some ten years; and, though a subordinate officer only a year or two, it must have cost me, in all, not less than \$500. I have also known individuals, hard-working, economical mechanics, embarrass themselves for ten or twelve years by the debts they began, while apprentices, to contract in the militia. Their uniforms, which must be changed or renewed every few years, cost them nearly forty dollars apiece; and then came their personal expenses, and a succession of assessments for I hardly know what purposes.' A venerable man, a soldier of the Revolution, and for a long time at the head of the militia in Connecticut, said to me, 'I know what these things cost; for I have been through the mill. I have spent, as an officer in the militia, not less than \$10,000 in my life; and my son yonder,' pointing to his residence hard by, 'has probably spent about as much more.' Such statements may seem incredible; but we should remember, that every officer was obliged not only to purchase his own uniform and equipments, but to *treat* all his electors at every promotion, and provide subsequently expensive entertainments for his subordinates in office and arms. I have known an officer give \$300 for the use of a horse on a single occasion; and one training cost him alone some \$1500! The commander of a brigade in Connecticut was supposed on one occasion to have spent from his own purse three or four thousand dollars for a single training; and the sum total of its cost to the community in time, and money, and suspension of business, was estimated by a shrewd, candid eye-witness at \$80,000! probably an average of nearly two dollars to every inhabitant in the district.

Let us look a little more into the details of this matter. Our militia system has now dwindled into comparative insignificance; but, when in its full vigor and glory, the number of trainings varied, in different parts of our country, from three or four to ten or twelve every year; and, at one or two of them, the mass of the people were wont to suspend their business, and turn the occasion into a holiday of idleness, intemperance and revelry. If we suppose but four trainings a year requisite to keep the system in successful operation, and the people generally to turn aside from their work only twice, we should now have, if our militia were, as usual, about one-tenth of our entire population, nearly two millions enrolled for military service. Every training may be fairly expected to consume, in one way and another, two days; and, at this rate, two million soldiers would spend every year sixteen million days, worth as many dollars. Their incidental expenses, at only fifty

cents a day, would be \$8,000,000; their equipments, at five dollars each, would be \$10,000,000; the personal expenses of all the officers could hardly be less than those of all the privates, or \$18,000,000; and the time lost by the community at large, if reckoned in all equal in value to that of the troops, would be \$16,000,000; a sum total of \$68,000,000 a year! All this without reckoning a variety of expenditures and losses in other ways. Perfect accuracy on such a subject is quite impossible; but these suppositions, certainly not extravagant, may suffice to give us a glimpse of what is annually wasted, or would be if sustained in full vigor, upon our system of militia drills.

On this point, let us hear one of our ablest and most candid writers. "The first item," says Judge Jay, "in the expense of our militia system, is the annual loss of many millions of days' labor. But this multitude must be 'armed and equipped as the law directs;' and hence an expenditure of fifteen or twenty millions more. Next, the commissioned officers must be arrayed in regimentals, and many thousands of the militia organized in 'uniform corps,' and compelled of course to provide themselves with expensive clothes. Then comes the cost of music, of standards, of artillery, of cavalry, and of state arsenals and magazines. It is impossible to ascertain with precision the yearly aggregate expense of our militia; but it certainly cannot fall much, if any, short of *fifty millions*." All this when our population did not exceed fifteen or sixteen millions.

But its waste of property is the least evil resulting from this system. It has been a source of general corruption to the community, and formed habits of idleness, dissipation and profligacy. It did a great deal to flood our land with intemperance; and muster-fields have generally been scenes or occasions of gambling, licentiousness, and almost every vice. The history of our militia drills is a tissue of such facts. In answer to inquiries made by our General Government in 1826, the highest officers of the militia in different sections of the country represented 'militia musters as prejudicial to the morals of the community; as assemblies of idle and dissipated persons; as making idlers and drunkards rather than soldiers; as attended, under the most favorable circumstances, with riot, drunkenness, and every species of immorality; as *always* scenes of the lowest and most destructive dissipation, where nothing was acquired but the most pernicious habits.'

To compensate for such enormous evils, what *good* have our militia trainings done? Have they rendered *any* valuable equivalent for the two thousand millions of dollars probably wasted upon them since we became a nation, and for the flood of intemperance, and other vices which they have poured over the whole land? Strange indeed would it be, had they been of no use whatever; but what good have they done that might not have been secured without them? More than sixty years have now (1845) elapsed since our revolutionary war; and, during all this period, scarce an emergency has arisen which might not have been met just as well

without the drilling of a single muster. Assume, if you please, the necessity of armed preparation, and the expediency of an organized militia, I still say that the *drills* are superfluous, and that a simple enrolment, as for the jury-box, would be amply sufficient. The best officers in the militia confess, that such exercises are almost useless as a preparation for actual warfare; and so ineffectual did they prove in our last war, the only fair test to which they have ever been put, that raw recruits were generally preferred to the best drilled militia. If ever so serviceable, however, ought we to waste so much money, time and moral character in preparing for a danger that will not occur once in thirty years, and might even then be met quite as well by other means?

‘But would you have *no* means of defence against war?’—I must own I can see little need of such means; there has been no occasion for them the last thirty years; nor is there any in immediate or remote prospect. Why then squander so much in preparations to avert an evil so unlikely to occur? Why drill nearly two millions of men half a dozen times every year, just to fight against the merest bugbear? There is not the slightest probability, that any nation will either dare or wish to invade us; and why take such infinite pains to guard against an emergency that will never occur? Should it occur, it might be met just as well without drills, by a simple enrolment of the men liable to military service; and thus should we secure all the alleged advantages of our militia system, without the evils incident to its periodical trainings.

If you insist on the necessity of having the militia as an armed police, I reply, that, as peace-men, we have nothing to do with this question. Aiming solely to abolish international war, we do not interfere with the internal operations of government, but leave it to restrain or punish its own subjects in whatever way it pleases. It may err; but the peace movement was not started to correct such errors. If the militia were necessary as a police force, it does by no means follow, that we must have its expensive, ridiculous, demoralizing drills. We can uphold government, enforce law, and suppress riots, mobs and insurrections quite as well without as with them. In such emergencies, could we rely on the militia? When Boston in 1837 was threatened with a mob, some one proposed to call out the militia; but who and where were they? He looked around him, and saw them in the very mob they were wanted to suppress. So the government of Rhode Island, when assailed in 1842, was obliged in some cases to disband the existing militia, and form new companies of men rightly disposed, because some of the old companies had gone over in a body to the insurgents; and, should a mobocratic or rebellious spirit seize the mass of our people, our militia system would just furnish them with the means of accomplishing their purpose, and thus leave our rulers entirely at their mercy.

UNITED STATES NAVY.

WHAT IS ITS USE?

BY SAMUEL E. COUES.

I ASK of judicious and practical men the following questions :—
 What is the advantage of a Navy? What is its function in peace?
 What does it accomplish in war? In plain words, what is the use
 of the Navy?

A few years since, it was taken for granted, that a navy was absolutely necessary. This was the established public opinion; no one questioned the utility of our ships of war. Fighting vessels were deemed as important as colleges or schools. But the times have changed; and the question is now boldly and openly asked, all over New England, more or less through the land, what is the use of the navy? It is asked, not only by ultra peace-men who set themselves against all wars, offensive and defensive, but by those who still hold to the opinion, that at times war is unavoidable. There are very many who can see no benefit from the navy in time of peace, and who regard fighting ships as the means of useless slaughter in times of war.

A very common apology for the expenditure upon our navy, by those who take a limited view of the subject, is, that the money is not wasted, because it supports mechanics, artisans, seamen and officers, giving to them their means of living. It is true, that it thus affords to many their support. The navy is popular among those towards whom the money flows out in golden streams. For instance, the navy pays annually to about sixty men, as captains, a quarter of a million of dollars. The building, and repairing, and sailing of one ship of the line, disburse one million of dollars. There are many who desire thus to live out of the public. Since the accession of Mr. Polk, in the short space of three or four months, there have been several thousand applicants for midshipmen's warrants. For one vacant office, that of second lieutenant of marines, we were told there were over *twelve hundred applicants!* But we ask, who pays the money for the navy? It comes from the pockets of those who have earned it, to go to those who spend it. It is a mere transfer from hand to hand. The nation does not gain. The nation, in fact, loses when it supports men who do nothing for the common good.

The next answer to our question,—and it is the answer most relied upon,—is, a navy is needed for the protection of commerce.

Commerce is the interchange of merchandize, the circulation throughout the world of the conveniences and luxuries of life. It supplies the United States with the productions of other countries, and furnishes other countries with the surplus goods of our own. We do not underrate the value of commerce. It builds up our cities. It supplies many wants. It accumulates capital, and stimulates the productive industry of our citizens.

But our country could have all this profitable commerce, without owning a single ton of shipping, without one sail on the ocean bearing the stars and stripes. Foreign vessels would carry on our freighting as well, as cheaply, as our own, and do their own fighting, if fighting were necessary to protect them. The carrying trade is a distinct branch of business. The owning of ships has no necessary connection with commerce, more than carting or wagoning has with the merchant's purchases and sales.

Already nearly half of the merchandize imported into, and exported from, the United States, is carried by foreign vessels. In 1843, the proportion of foreign tonnage employed by our commerce to American tonnage, was as 500,000 to 1,200,000 tons. In 1845, in four of our cotton ports, there were, at one time, 150 foreign ships to 300 American; the tonnage of the foreign ships, being larger vessels, almost equalled the tonnage of the American. Of all the foreign arrivals at Boston in the year 1844, half (though small vessels generally) were British vessels; and at other eastern ports existed the same state of things. The ships of northern Europe have the bulk of the exports from New York to that part of Europe. The tobacco of Virginia, the coffee of Cuba, the oil of our whale ships, go usually on board of these vessels; and foreign vessels have been chartered or employed by our own merchants for their East India voyages.

If we had not a single ship, we could receive or send away all the goods which, in the prosecution of commercial business, are required to be received or to be sent away. This, too, at fair prices of freight; for so rapid can be made the increase of ships, that goods will always be freighted at the lowest possible price, and, as experience thus far has manifested, at lower prices in foreign vessels than in the vessels of the United States. From this cause, we are now rapidly losing the employment of our ships; they are not able to encounter the foreign competition. We certainly, therefore, need no navy for the protection of commerce.*

It will, however, be said, that if the navy is not needed, for the protection of our commerce, it is for the protection of our navigation; that having merchant ships afloat, they require the navy. Let us compare the cost of the navy with the profits of the navigation interest which it is said to protect.

* We are informed that a foreign ship brought goods from China to New York at \$7 per ton freight, the average price in American ships being over \$20 per ton.

The annual expenditure for our navy for the last few years has been,

	1838,	\$6,131,580 53
	1839,	6,182,294 25
	1840,	6,113,896 89
	1841,	6,001,076 97
	1842,	8,397,242 95
First 6 months of	1843,	3,727,711 53
From 1st July, 1843, to 30th June, 1844,	6,498,199 11
		<hr/>
		43,052,002 23
Add the expense of the Navy Department,		350,000 00

And we have \$43,402,002 23

A sum much larger than the profits of our navigation for the same period of time, as every ship owner will readily admit.

From official reports, we learn that the expenditures, including the first cost, repairs and armament, for the ship of the line *Delaware*, is \$1,051,000; for the *Columbus*, \$674,000; for the *Pennsylvania*, \$784,000; for the *Ohio*, \$843,000; for the *N. Carolina*, \$812,000.

The average cost of a line of battle ship is	\$830,000
One year in service, wages, provisions, &c.,	220,000
Ship's proportion of navy yard, &c.,	50,000
	<hr/>
	\$1,100,000

The expenditure has been, for the frigate *Potomac*, \$527,000; for the *Macedonian*, \$269,000; for the *Brandywine*, \$699,000; for the *Columbia*, \$398,000.

Average expenditure for a frigate,	\$475,000
One year in use,	110,000
Navy yards, &c.,	25,000
	<hr/>
	\$610,000

For the sloop of war *Warren*, \$267,000; *Vincennes*, \$300,000; *Falmouth*, \$335,000; *Adams*, \$275,000.

Average expenditure for a sloop of war,	\$315,000
One year in service,	50,000
Navy yards, &c.,	10,000
	<hr/>
	\$375,000

The average expense of each gun thus carried, as we say, uselessly over the ocean, for one year, amounts to about \$15,000. Now, admitting the profit of an American ship to be four thousand dollars per annum,—and this rate of profit would cover the ocean with ships,—it will take the year's earnings of one hundred ships to pay the expenditure necessary to have a sloop of war, and to use her for one year; one hundred and fifty ships for a frigate; and nearly three hundred ships for a line of battle ship; i. e. a little fleet of a seventy-four, a frigate and sloop, requires five hundred and fifty ships to do a profitable business, to earn enough in a year

to build, repair and sail this fleet. Thus *seventeen hundred merchant ships*, even if every one clears \$4000 per annum, must be employed *every year* to earn the *annual* expenses of our navy!

We have about 1,000,000 tons of shipping engaged in the foreign trade, which is two thousand ships, averaging five hundred tons each. The cost of this shipping is \$60 per ton. The actual value of our mercantile marine is about \$40 per ton, taking them together, new and old. This would make the value of our shipping to be forty millions of dollars, about five times the annual cost of our navy. Our navigation, therefore, must earn every year, or benefit the country, 20 per cent. of its value, to pay for its protection by our navy. The ship owner does not, upon an average, one year with another, earn five per cent. beside the interest on the capital employed. This estimate—5 per cent.—would give two millions as the profit to the owners. The captains, officers and *American* seamen engaged in foreign trade, do not receive over three millions in wages. The increased value of American ship building materials, (principally timber, for the iron, copper, hemp and canvass are mostly imported,) on account of the construction of ships, does not exceed one and a half millions. The labor paid in ship building, is about one million dollars. Altogether seven and a half millions are the national profit of our navigation, or about the cost of the navy. But, if you please, double this estimate of the profit of our navigation; prove, if you can, that I undervalue the benefit of our commercial marine, and that I overvalue the cost of the fighting ships, still it settles nothing in favor of the navy, for the navy is not of the least practical advantage to the navigation. There are nations now enjoying a profitable navigation, who have not a single vessel of war; and who are sailing their ships so cheaply, as to interfere most seriously with the employment of our ships by our own commerce.

In time of peace, all the protection for merchant ships, which will be claimed as necessary, is protection against pirates. Now, seventy-fours and frigates never catch pirates, certainly not as many as they educate to the business; for it is universally admitted, that pirates are made by men living among death-dealing instruments, by their being trained to the use of the weapons of war. If we must have a defence against pirates, it should be small vessels always in commission, not ships of the line, or frigates, swinging idly at their moorings, or making their passages across the ocean. Who, in his senses, would employ our large ships to catch pirates?

In peace, the huge, clumsy floating batteries carry abroad in state some minister plenipotentiary, or sail to exercise the crew, or to try their comparative speed; a most idle, wanton expenditure of money. In war there is no navigation to be protected; vessels of neutral nations then make the profit, they do the business; the vessels of belligerents rot quietly at the wharves. It is not, then, either for our commerce or our navigation that we need the navy.

The use of the armed force in war is for two purposes--to pro-

tect our own country, and to annoy and distress the enemy. Let us see which function our navy discharges, if it discharge either.

The navy is no protection to our homes, to our firesides, to our country, in war. For this we rely on the army, the militia, the forts and military posts. Anchored in our harbors, our seventy-fours, compared with the land battery, are very inefficient; and, surely, sailing over the ocean, they do not defend the country. The whole navy of Great Britain could not defend us, or prevent an enemy from landing on some part of our extended coast. What could our fifty ships do in this service? Military men themselves never depend on ships of war for the defence of the country which employs them. On the other hand, the navy cannot seriously annoy the enemy on the ocean. Privateers, who pay themselves by their plunder, are the most efficient means of annoyance. In this kind of glory, our navy would not share to any extent; theirs is the glory, not of stealing, but of slaughter without any profit or advantage whatever from the slaughter.

In war, our ships are but slaughter-houses for American seamen. Those not blockaded, would sail on the ocean singly,—that is said to be the best arrangement,—flying from the stronger, and chasing the weaker enemy. Now and then, some of them would catch a fight—a hard fight—gun for gun—man for man—and the issue about as many killed on their decks as on the decks of the enemy. In the name of God, our common Father, I ask, why drag out our seamen thus to be killed, in killing others? Grant a successful termination to the fight, aye, to the whole naval war; let every ship of our navy capture or sink an enemy's ship; let each seventy-four kill five hundred men, and every frigate, two hundred men, and every sloop, one hundred men, would this loss so humble Great Britain, as to make her down upon her knees, and beg for peace? Great Britain could lose more ships than we could possibly fight with in a five years' war, and very calmly go about building others. Queen Victoria's throne would not be overturned. If we were to lose the same comparative number of our fighting ships, as we could in a most successful ocean war conquer of hers, it would not severely distress us; we could bear this; she could bear this. It would not alarm either, or tend to bring about a peace. The fighting on the ocean is aimless and objectless; we can in no event seriously injure the enemy, and most probably the extent of the injury done, would be about the amount of the injury that we suffered in doing it.

It may be said, that we have forgotten the glory of this warfare, the wreath of laurels that would entwine the brows of more than a dozen captains. It is most true that we have overlooked it; and generosity should compel us to allow this *glory*, for this is *all* that our fighting ships ever possibly achieve. Let us then admit **GLORY** frankly and freely. How to estimate it, is the difficulty. A captain has battered and sunk an enemy's frigate, and his own frigate is only half torn to pieces. He has killed one hundred and ten Englishmen, and has wounded fifty-eight more, while *only* fifty

five of his own crew have been slaughtered outright, and *only* twenty-nine more are in the cock-pit, maimed and mutilated, some slowly dying of their wounds, some writhing in agony under the surgeon's knife. The ocean is reddened a little more by the life-blood of Englishmen than by the life-blood of Americans. Most glorious! for this, gallant sir! for this you sail on the ocean—for glory—your proudest achievement is the killing of more of the enemy than you cause to be slaughtered of your own crew, upon your own decks!

Imagine that between this country and some other country, lay a broad tract of land, a sandy desert, uninhabited, useful only as the passage ground between the nations. A war is declared. We send out some fifty wagons, armed with swivels and muskets. The enemy sends out his wagons too. These wagons meet occasionally, and fight, and attempt to destroy each other; a species of guerilla warfare is kept up. About as many are killed in the wagons of one country as in those of the other. What matter who succeeds, who has the little victory? Tears of the bereaved fall, the wail of orphans goes up to God, and there is sorrow in both the countries at every encounter; but, however sanguinary this guerilla warfare, whatever be the number killed on either side, or how many wagons destroyed, it has no effect whatever seriously to injure or benefit either nation, or induce either to sue for peace. Such is naval warfare, most glorious and chivalric!

There is one apology for a navy, which can hardly fail to create a smile. It was once said, that a navy was necessary, if our nation were in this predicament—if it had declared war, and a nation against whom it issued the proclamation of war, did not choose to attack us, how could we fight without a navy to go in quest of a foe!

Reader, are you a Christian, and can you support an establishment, the only function of which is useless carnage, offensive war? We do not now say to you, that you should not call out the army, or build forts for your protection. You may not be prepared to carry out in full the principle of "overcoming evil with good;" but, if you claim the name of Christian, how can you support a navy useless in peace, and which in war carries on the work of death without the poor apology or excuse that the bloodshed is useful to you? In the name of common sense, give up useless murder. Do not make unnecessary slaughter. Defend your country, if you will; but remember that your trade and commerce with other countries are not worth fighting for; that even were they worth fighting for, you annihilate trade and commerce by the very declaration of war.

Unpopular as this view may appear to some, depend upon it, the time is rapidly approaching when fighting will be deemed disgraceful to a civilized people. In saying this, we cast no reflection upon the officers of the navy, or upon its friends. Their education and habits of life cause them to look upon this service in a false light. When the true light comes to their minds, they will be ready to abandon the navy at once. "Onward," is the watchword of every heroic soul.

A SEA-FIGHT.—Can the friends of the navy, as Christians, or as men possessing the usual kindly feelings of our nature, read the following description by an eye-witness, and not pray for our success in overthrowing a navy, the only function of which is useless carnage? The veteran officers, they who have seen service of this kind, will bid us God speed in our efforts to make an end of such unnecessary slaughter.

“As the approaching ship,” says Leech, then a boy on board a British man-of-war, “showed American colors, we all felt we must fight her, and made every possible arrangement for success. The firing commenced. The roaring of cannon could now be heard from all parts of our trembling ship, and mingling with that of our foes, it made a most hideous noise. By-and-by I heard the shot strike the sides of our ship; the whole scene grew indescribably confused and horrible; it was like some awfully tremendous thunder-storm, carrying death in every flash, and strewing the ground with its victims; only in our case the scene was rendered more horrible by the torrents of blood on our decks.

The cries of the wounded now rang through all parts of the ship. These were carried to the cockpit as fast as they fell, while those more fortunate men who were killed outright, were immediately thrown overboard. A man had one of his hands cut off by a shot, and almost at the same moment he received another shot, which tore open his bowels in a terrible manner. As he fell, two or three men took him, and, as he could not live, threw him overboard. The battle went on. Our men kept cheering with all their might. I cheered with them, though I confess I scarcely knew for what. Certainly, there was nothing very inspiring in the aspect of things where I was stationed. So terrible had been the work of destruction round us, it was termed the slaughter-house. Not only had we had several boys and men killed and wounded, but several of the guns were disabled. The schoolmaster received a death wound. The brave boatswain, who came from the sick bed to the din of battle, was fastening a stopper on a back-stay which had been shot away, when his head was smashed to pieces by a cannon-ball; another man, going to complete the unfinished task, was also struck down. The ward-room steward was killed. A fellow named John, was carried past me, wounded; and I distinctly heard the large blood-drops fall pat, pat, on the deck; his wounds were mortal. Such was the terrible scene, amid which we kept on shouting and firing. Our men fought like tigers. Some of them pulled off their jackets, others their jackets and vests; while some, with nothing but a handkerchief tied round the waistbands of their trowsers, fought like heroes.

We all appeared cheerful; but I know that many a serious thought ran through my mind. I thought a great deal of the other world; every groan, every falling man, told me that the next instant I might be before the Judge of all the earth. For this I felt unprepared; but being without any particular knowledge of religious truth, I satisfied myself by repeating again and again the Lord's

prayer, and promising, that if spared, I would be more attentive to religious duties than ever before.

While these thoughts secretly agitated my bosom, the din of battle continued. Grape and canister shot were pouring through our port-holes like leaden rain, carrying death in their trail. The large shot came against the ship's side like iron hail, shaking her to the very keel, or passing through her timbers, and scattering terrific splinters, which did a more appalling work than even their own death-giving blows. What with splinters, cannon balls, grape and canister, poured incessantly upon us, the reader may be assured that the work of death went on in a manner which must have been satisfactory even to the King of terrors himself.

Suddenly, the rattling of the iron hail ceased. We were ordered to cease firing. A profound silence ensued, broken only by the stifled groans of the brave sufferers below. The enemy had shot ahead to repair damages, while we were so cut up that we lay utterly helpless. Our head braces were shot away; the fore and main top-masts were gone; the mizzen mast hung over the stern, having carried several men over in its fall; we were a complete wreck. The officers held a council, and concluded to strike our colors.

I now went below, to see how matters appeared there. The first object I met, was a man bearing a limb which had just been detached from some suffering wretch. Pursuing my way to the ward-room, I necessarily passed through the steerage, which was strewed with the wounded; it was a sad spectacle, made more appalling by the groans and cries which rent the air. Some were groaning, others were swearing most bitterly, a few were praying, while those last arrived, were begging most piteously to have their wounds dressed next. The surgeon and his mate were smeared with blood from head to foot; they looked more like butchers than doctors. Having so many patients, they had once shifted their quarters from the cockpit to the steerage; they now removed to the ward-room, and the long table, round which the officers had set over many a merry feast, was soon covered with the bleeding forms of maimed and mutilated seamen. I now set to work to render all the aid in my power to the sufferers. Our carpenter, named Reed, had his leg cut off. I helped to carry him to the after ward-room; but he soon breathed out his life there, and then I assisted in throwing his mangled remains overboard. We got out the cots as fast as possible; for most of them were stretched out on the gory deck. One poor fellow who lay with a broken thigh, begged me to give him water. I gave him some. He looked unutterable gratitude, drank, and died. It was with exceeding difficulty I moved through the steerage, it was so covered with mangled men, and so slippery with streams of blood. Such scenes of suffering as I saw in that ward-room, I hope never to witness again. Could the civilized world behold them as they were, and as they often are, infinitely worse than on that occasion, it seems to me they would forever put down the barbarous practice of war by universal consent."

MISTAKES ABOUT PEACE.

THE cause of peace, aiming solely to abolish war, is fairly responsible merely for what is necessary to this result. Some of its friends may take ground too high, others too low, and occasionally use arguments or measures which we cannot approve; but the cause itself is bound to meet only *objections against special, associated efforts for the abolition of this custom*. If this object is not a good one, or if no specific efforts ought to be made for its accomplishment, then is the cause of peace unworthy of support. But will any fair-minded man take either of these positions? If not, what valid objections can there be to this cause? Yet such objections are now and then urged, and we will here attempt a very brief answer to the most common and plausible.

1. *The gospel is the only remedy for war; preach that, and war will cease.*—So we believe, but insist on the necessity of its being rightly applied. Will the best medicine in the world heal the man that does not take it? Surely not; you must apply the remedy to the disease, put the salve on the sore, before it can effect a cure. Is the gospel an exception to this law of common sense? Can it cure evils to which it is never applied? How does it produce any result? How bring the sinner to repentance? Only by its truths addressed to his soul. How will it ever abolish paganism? Solely by being sent and applied to paganism. How refute any error, or reform any sin? Only by a right, direct, specific application to such errors and sins. The gospel is the only effectual antidote to war; but we insist on a right application of its pacific principles. It has never been thus applied; and the mistake lies in supposing, that the gospel, *as hitherto received by Christians*, will abolish this custom. If it *will*, why *has it not*? The nations of Christendom are the most notorious fighters on earth, and its standing armies have increased in a single century from half a million to three and even four millions;—an increase of eight hundred per cent! Can such a process ever bring war to an end?

2. *But you need only make men REAL Christians, and they will cease to fight.*—Will they? Have they? No *real* Christians ever engage in war? Are there none such among the three millions of standing warriors now in Christendom? Were there none among the fathers of our own Revolution? Not one among all the myriads who have fought from time immemorial in the wars of Christendom?—‘You mean that men, brought under the *full* power of the gospel, will wage no *unjust* wars.’ Does any body *now* wage them? Who shall judge what *are* such wars? ‘Those of course who wage them.’ But has any monster of blood in Christendom engaged for centuries past in a war that *he* admitted to be

unjust, offensive? Napoleon himself, on his death-bed, solemnly declared he had ever acted solely in defence, and went to his last account under the delusion, that he had been only a defensive warrior. Can such a theory ever put an end to war?—‘You mean, that when *all* men become *real, millennial* Christians, there will be none to make *aggressive* wars, and of course no wars *in defence*.’ But it must be long before *all* men will become *such* Christians; and meanwhile shall we make no efforts to abolish war?

3. *What need of special, associated efforts for peace? Let existing agencies, such as the church, the ministry and the press, do the work, and thus supersede the necessity of peace societies.*—Most earnestly do we wish they would; and, whenever they *shall*, they will take the matter very much out of our hands. As yet, however, they have *not* done so; and, until they do, shall nothing be done for peace? May we not even attempt to rouse the church? She *ought* to have arrested the ravages of intemperance, and spread the gospel over the whole earth; but, since she did neither, and gave no promise of doing either very soon, was it a superfluous and reprehensible service for individual volunteers, as they did, to lead the van in those movements, and rouse the church to her long neglected duty on those subjects? If the church *will* do what is needed in the cause of peace, then let her do it, and thus supersede our efforts; but, *until* she does this, we certainly ought, as the pioneers of temperance and of missions did, to stimulate her to her duty on this subject, and rally as many as we can in special efforts for the extinction of war.

4. *The time has not come for such efforts.*—Why not? God has promised (Isa. ii. 1—4) that wars shall cease under the Christian dispensation. Are we not living under this very dispensation? Then ought God’s promise of peace *now* to be in a course of actual fulfilment through all Christendom. The time for God to fulfil any of his promises, is just when men will use the requisite means; and, if the time for peace co-extensive with Christianity has not yet come, in what year of our Lord will it come?

5. *Wait till the millennium; when that comes,—never before,—peace will follow as a matter of course.*—Very true; and so will repentance and faith follow equally as a matter of course; but how? Is the millennium to come first, and then all mankind to be converted as one of its results; or is the conversion of the whole world to usher in and to constitute the millennium itself? How would you introduce a millennium of repentance? Solely by first filling the world with repentance—with men penitent for their sins. How a millennium of faith? By filling the earth with faith—with believers in Jesus. How then a millennium of peace? In the same way; for peace, just like repentance and faith, must come *before* the millennium, as one of its indispensable harbingers, or along *with* the millennium, as one of its inseparable concomitants.

6. *SPECIAL efforts are not necessary for this purpose; peace will come as the result of the good general influences exerted by Christianity, and civilization, and commerce, and various other agencies already at work.*—We are far from undervaluing such agencies or

influences ; but they can supersede special efforts in this cause no more than they have in that of temperance, missions, or any similar enterprise. If such efforts were needed to start and sustain those causes, are they not equally so in this cause? Doubtless these good general influences contribute much to the peace of Christendom ; but have they heretofore sufficed in every case to hold back the thunder-bolts of war? Commerce, and civilization, and a degenerate Christianity, have been in operation all over Europe for centuries ; and yet have they utterly failed to abolish the war-system, or to prevent a rapid succession of the most desolating wars. Shall we then abandon the cause of peace to such agencies? These agencies can become useful mainly by receiving a right direction ; and it is ours to concentrate them upon our purpose of abolishing war. As no power of steam or of water-falls can, until rightly applied, propel machinery of any kind, so would we apply all the good general influences of the age to insure the perpetual peace of Christendom and the world.

7. *But there are other causes more important.*—If it were so, has this cause *no* importance? If it has, then let it receive its *proper share* of support. Only *one* cause can be the *most* important of all ; but do you contribute to none besides that single one? Why? Because every wheel in the general machinery of benevolence is essential to the grand results ultimately sought ; and hence you inquire, not whether this or that wheel is more important than some others, but whether the entire machine, with all its subordinate and complicated parts, is needed for the work to be done ; for, if so, then must every part be sustained in its place. We would not, cannot exaggerate the importance of peace ; but, to say nothing about the millions of lives, and the myriads of treasure which it would save, nothing of the vices, and crimes, and deluge of miseries for two worlds which it would prevent, it is an important, if not indispensable auxiliary to every cause now in progress for this world's conversion or general improvement. More has been done for such purposes during the last thirty years of general peace, (1845,) than had been done for many centuries before ; and the continuance of peace is essential to the full success, if not to the very existence of these great benevolent enterprises. We *must* have peace, or stop in our work of recovering a world from the ruins of the fall.

8. *But there is no war at present, none in prospect ; and why labor for peace now?*—Just because now is the best, the only time to labor with success. Let war come or approach ; and no man could then plead for peace without being branded as a traitor to his country. Would you try to reform the drunkard while reeling into the gutter, or wait for the flames to envelope your house, and sweep in a whirlwind over your whole city, before you prepare engines to extinguish the devouring element?

9. *Well, we are peaceable enough ourselves ; go to warriors and war-makers with your pleas for peace.*—So we mean to do ; but, if you are so pacific, will you not go with us, and help make them as peaceable as yourselves? We look to the temperate for the pro-

motion of temperance, to Christians for the spread of Christianity; and must we not rely in like manner upon the professed friends of peace to carry forward this enterprise?

10. *But we do not agree with you in ALL your views.*—Very like; but you agree with us precisely as much as we do with you; and, if you may excuse yourselves because you differ from us, we may excuse ourselves because we differ from you, and thus could nothing ever be done for this cause by any body. We certainly agree in thinking that war ought to be abolished; and no further agreement is necessary for cordial, zealous, efficient co-operation. Then, why not unite with us for its actual abolition? You cannot without endorsing what you do not believe? Nobody requires this of you; nor would the most active co-operation make you responsible for any sentiments not your own.

11. *But the Jews waged war at God's command.*—True; and when he commands *us* to make war, we too may; but do those wars render the *custom* harmless, or its continuance desirable?

12. *But peace will paralyze the arm of law and good government.*—Just the reverse; for, as Cicero says, "laws are silent in the midst of arms." War is a temporary despotism or anarchy; it suspends every law but its own, and makes government itself a mere tool for its bloody purposes. It is the operations of war, not the principles of peace, that crush or cripple government, and introduce the reign of violence, terror and lawless crime. Is war necessary to government? Must nations butcher one another in order to govern themselves? If duelling should cease, would parents lose their authority over their own families? Should the whole war-system come to an end, would not every government still retain its right to control and punish its own subjects? Could it not, if it chose, continue to hang the murderer, to imprison the thief, and employ an armed police for the suppression of mobs, riots, and other popular outbreaks?

13. *But, without war, we could neither get nor keep our liberties.*—Yes we could; and *but* for war, how would any nation ever have lost them? War has ever been the chief enslaver of mankind. What gave rise to slavery and the slave-trade? What stabbed the liberties of Greece and Rome? What has proved the ruin of nearly all former republics? War. Our own case is a singular exception, from which no general inference can safely be drawn; and still it may well be doubted whether we do not owe our own freedom to other causes than the sword, and whether it would not in due time have come even in better form without the effusion of blood. Liberty, free institutions, popular rights, are the growth, not of war, but of peace; and one century of universal, unbroken peace, would do more for the world in these respects, than five thousand years of blood have done. Peace is the nurse of freedom, of all its glorious institutions; and, if we wish to diffuse and perpetuate its blessings over the whole earth, we must labor first for universal and permanent peace.

PEACE AND GOVERNMENT.

BY GEO. C. BECKWITH.

I REGARD civil government as lawful, expedient and necessary ; and for this belief I find ample reasons in the nature of man, in the condition and wants of society, in the past and present indications of providence, in the history of God's dealings with his ancient people, in the explicit, oft-repeated instructions of the Old Testament, and the incidental admissions of the New. Mankind are made for society ; society requires government ; and a government without penalties, or without the right and power to enforce its penalties, and coerce the obedience of its own subjects, would be not only a nullity in practice, but a contradiction in terms.

I also believe all war to be inconsistent with the gospel. Their spirit, their aims, their principles, the qualities they require, the deeds they enjoin, all their distinctive peculiarities are clearly antagonistic and incompatible. The gospel enforces the Decalogue anew ; war is a temporary repeal of all its commands. The gospel enjoins love, not hatred ; forgiveness, not revenge ; universal beneficence, not indiscriminate, wholesale mischief ; prayer for our enemies, not *against* them ; doing them good instead of evil ; not returning evil for evil, but overcoming it only with good. It condemns ALL THAT CONSTITUTES WAR. *Thou shalt not kill ; love thy neighbor as thyself ; whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them ; do good unto all men ; follow peace with all men ; love your enemies ; do good to them that hate you ; if thine enemy hunger, feed him ; whosoever smiteth thee on one cheek, turn to him the other also ; resist not evil, but overcome evil with good.* If such passages as these do not condemn all the moral elements of war, I can imagine no language that would. Every form of this custom is a direct violation of such precepts. It can exist only by the very feelings and deeds here prohibited in the plainest terms possible. Who ever heard of a war that *killed* nobody, that *overcame evil with good*, that *turned the other cheek to the smiter*, that *did good unto all men*, and was carried on in the spirit of love, forgiveness, and universal beneficence ?

The thing is plainly impossible ; and hence all war must be utterly unchristian, unless the New Testament permits it as an *exception*, and thus exempts government in this case from all obligation to obey such precepts as I have just quoted. Here is the only alternative ; for, since every species of war confessedly does what the Bible forbids, it can be justified only on the ground of an express exception like that of Abraham sacrificing Isaac, or the Jewish rulers taking life as a punishment for crime. Both these contradicted the prohibition, *thou shalt not kill*, and were justifiable only because the same Lawgiver of Sinai prescribed them as ex-

ceptions. Can you find in the New Testament a similar justification of war? Does Christ or his Apostles exempt nations, in their intercourse with each other, from obligation to obey the general precepts of his gospel, and expressly permit them, in palpable contradiction of those precepts, to wage war in any case? If so, show us the chapter and verse of such permission.

This theory of exceptions is indispensable to the vindication of civil government as an ordinance of God. It is quite in vain to think of reconciling *any* of its penalties with the letter or the real import of such passages as I have already quoted. They are clearly antipodal. A government, when punishing offenders either with death, imprisonment or fine, surely does not turn the other cheek to the smiter, nor overcome evil with good, nor forgive the transgressor, and give place unto wrath, that is, stand aside, and let God alone inflict vengeance. It takes his place, a temporary substitute for his government; and, armed with the sword as "the minister of God," it comes forth "a *revenger* to execute wrath (punishment) upon him that doeth evil." A thief or a murderer does an evil to individuals or society, perhaps to both; and government in turn inflicts upon him another evil in the form of a penalty for his crime. Neither the nature nor the degree of this penalty can alter the case; for, whether severe or mild, a halter or a prison, a pecuniary fine, or simple disgrace, you return one evil for another; not perhaps the same, yet still an evil, not a blessing or a pleasure. It is retribution. You do not forgive; you punish. The offender has done an evil, and you make him suffer for it. This I call retribution. It may be righteous, and even merciful; still it is retribution or retaliation, one evil returned in punishment for another. I take this to be the central idea of all punishment. It is plainly absurd to speak of *forgiving* any one that is *punished*. Forgiveness and punishment are antagonistic, incompatible ideas. A murderer pardoned, yet hung! A sinner forgiven, and then sent to hell!! The forgiveness of an offender is the remission of his punishment, and his restoration to the favor he has forfeited; and hence all penal acts are in plain, palpable contradiction of those precepts which require us to forgive, or to overcome evil with good, and can be justified only as exceptions made by the same authority that enjoined the latter. In his epistle to the Romans, Paul puts this exception by the side of the rule; for, after bidding us not avenge ourselves, but give place for God to repay vengeance, while *we* overcome evil only with good, he proceeds immediately to represent civil government as "the ordinance of God, a terror to evil works, bearing not the sword in vain; as the minister of God, a *revenger to execute wrath* upon him that doeth evil." (Rom. xii. 17, 21, and xiii. 1—7.) Thus does Paul expressly allow to government what he had repeatedly forbidden to individuals; and the former is consistent with the latter only as a special exception to a general rule. Peter also speaks (1 Pet. ii. 13—17) of governors as sent by *God* for the *punishment* of evil doers; and the New Testament, like the Old, distinctly recognizes the right of government to punish and coerce its own subjects.

The motive of punishment does not materially affect the argument. If evil is returned *for* evil, or attempted to be overcome *with* evil, the letter, the real import of the gospel is contravened, so far as this class of precepts is concerned, and can be justified only by producing counter instructions from the same authority. If you say you can chastise your child, and government can send a vagrant or a drunkard to the house of correction for their good, I grant it, but insist that such cases are remedial rather than punitive, and should be regarded as methods of discipline, and means of reformation. Do you deem it possible to punish without malice; to fine, imprison, and even hang an offender, from motives of benevolence? Be it so; but from motives of benevolence to whom? Surely not to the criminal, but to the individuals or the community whom he has injured. Both the motive and the deed may be right; but for neither of them can you get any authority from such passages as I have heretofore adduced. These forbid an eye for an eye, a stripe for a blow; one evil in the form of penalty, for another in the shape of crime. I fully believe that the gospel allows such retribution, such condign punishment even here; but our authority for this we must seek in a class of texts quite different from the former, and which restrict the application of these texts without altering their import. When God requires us not to resist evil, but overcome it with good, he means precisely what he says; and when he subsequently authorizes rulers to punish wrong doers, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, he introduces an exception to that general rule. I admit the exception to be as valid as the rule; but it is *only* an exception, not the rule, and cannot alter the meaning of the latter considered in itself. Should a legislature ordain, that every man shall be liable to military service, and afterwards exempt certain persons from such service, this exemption would of course be as valid as the general law; but it would still be a *mere* exception, and could neither alter the natural import of that law in itself considered, nor prove that, without such an exception, every citizen would not actually be required to do military duty.

This principle of exceptions is no novelty. The same God that proclaimed from Sinai, *thou shalt not KILL*, bade Joshua destroy the Canaanites, and required Jewish rulers to inflict the penalty of death for a variety of crimes; but it would be preposterous to adduce these exceptions as so many proofs that the sixth commandment does not mean just what it says. This is the rule, those the exceptions. The rule forbids *all taking of life*. Even Dr. Dwight, though a staunch advocate both of capital punishment and defensive war, still says of the prohibition, *thou shalt not kill*, "to *kill* is the thing here forbidden; and by the words it is forbidden *in all cases whatsoever*. Whenever we kill, therefore, we are guilty of transgressing this command, unless we are permitted to take away the life in question by *an exception which God himself has made to the rule.*" Here is the principle of reasoning, the law of exceptions, for which I contend. The sixth command, in itself considered, forbids the taking of life in any case; but it

surely does not follow, that the author of this prohibition might not himself require or permit the sacrifice of life, or that the infliction of capital punishment in such case would contravene his will. It would of course contravene the prohibition, *thou shalt not kill*, because life would actually be taken; but it would still be an act of obedience to what he subsequently enjoins as a modification of that commandment.

We need this law of exceptions to meet other difficulties in the Bible. It is as easy to reconcile civil government with the strictest principles of peace, as it is with other undeniable precepts of the gospel. Penalties of every kind and degree contradict many of these precepts, and can be justified only on the ground of their being permitted as exceptions; but war is *not* thus permitted, and therefore comes under the full condemnation of such precepts as I have briefly quoted on the subject.

I plead, then, both for peace and for government, nor deem them at all incompatible. I believe all war contrary to the gospel, yet regard government as an institution divinely appointed for the good of mankind, and authorized at discretion to punish and coerce its subjects. I wish at present to prove not the truth of these positions, but merely their consistency with each other. I suppose all peace-men, in distinction from those modern non-resistants who deny the right of man to punish or coerce his fellow-man in any case, believe in the lawfulness of government with all the penalties and powers requisite for the well-being of society. So William Penn himself thought. His peace principles did not allow him to use or prepare warlike means of defence against even the ferocious savages surrounding his colony; yet he incorporated in his code of laws the penalty of death for murder, and deemed it necessary to arm government with power to coerce the obedience of *its own subjects*.

I admit the difficulty to be a serious one, and wish to put it in the strongest light possible. 'If a government may punish its own subjects, why not wage war against foreigners? If it may put to death a crew of pirates, why not a hostile fleet bent on the same deeds of plunder and blood? If it may execute a gang of ten robbers, why not destroy an army of ten thousand marauders from another nation? If it may suppress a mob or an insurrection with bullets and bayonets, why not employ the same means to repel an invading army commissioned to butcher, and burn, and ravage? Does the distinction between a citizen and a foreigner, between a mob and an army, each committing or threatening the same outrages, make any real difference? If it does, ought we not to spare the domestic rather than the foreign offender?'

Here is the difficulty in all its force; and I meet it at once by saying, *God permits the taking of life in one case, but not in the other*. He authorizes rulers to govern, but not to fight; to punish, but not to quarrel. Such acts, even if they were physically the same, would be morally different; and hence one *may* be permitted, while the other is forbidden. Such I take to be the fact; for God allows government, as I have shown, to punish *its own subjects* at

discretion, and to use all the force necessary to insure their obedience, but gives no government the right to wage war with another government, or to take the life of any persons not under its own jurisdiction. It has the power of life and death over its own citizens, but not over those of any other country. If they come as individuals within its limits, they become, while there, subject to its authority, amenable to its laws, and liable to its penalties. They are temporary citizens, and must for the time be treated as such. They are only private persons, not the avowed and recognized representatives of another government; and the treatment due to them as individuals, determines nothing in respect to the mutual rights and obligations of the two governments. These stand to each other in the relation of moral agents subject to the general principles of the gospel; and hence the pacific precepts I have quoted as applicable to the intercourse of individuals, apply with equal force to governments in their intercourse, unless an exception is expressly made in favor of the latter. No such exception can I find in the New Testament, and thus am forced to the conclusion, that governments are no more at liberty than individuals, to fight each other in any case.

On this point the burden of proof lies with the advocates of war. The deeds of violence and blood inseparable from every kind of warfare, are confessedly contrary to those precepts of the gospel which require us not to resist evil, but overcome it with good; to do good unto all men; to love, forgive and bless even our enemies; and, unless you can bring from the New Testament some passage which clearly permits what is so plainly forbidden in such precepts as these, we have no more right to kill an army of invaders in self-defence, than we have to renounce our religion, and turn Mohammedans or Pagans, for the preservation of liberty and life. No form of idolatry is more explicitly forbidden than are such deeds of vengeance; and, if you can get no exception in their favor from God himself, the prohibition remains in all its force, and binds us to obey, and abide the consequences.

Such an exception cannot be found in the New Testament; but do you still insist that it is implied in the admitted right of government to take the life of its own subjects? I deny the implication, and demand the proof. Can you find it in any passage which gives to government its power over its own subjects? The thirteenth chapter of Romans, almost the only reliance for such a purpose, contains not a word to justify the inference, that one government may at will butcher the subjects of another for any purpose whatever. It was written, not to define the powers of government, but to inculcate submission to government, even though administered by Nero himself, then on the throne. Such was the chief, if not the sole design of Paul; and the powers of government as "the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath," are but incidentally recognized merely for the purpose of enforcing the duty of implicit subjection. Paul here makes not the slightest allusion to the intercourse of one government with another.

But do you aver that the very idea of a government with discre

tionary penalties, or the admission of its right to coerce its own subjects at pleasure, covers the whole ground of defensive war? So reason all apologists for this custom; but the assumption overlooks the fundamental principle, that our duties spring from our relations, and involves the absurd dogma, that individuals when alone have the same rights, and lie under the same obligations, as when members of a social organization. Such an organization, giving rise to new relations, creates corresponding rights and duties. Has a man no more right to the person of his wife, or the service of his child, than he has to any woman or child he meets in the street? Does he, on becoming a father or a husband, a teacher or a ruler, acquire no new rights, and assume no additional responsibilities? Is he required or permitted, as an isolated individual, to do what he may and should do in relations like these? Such questions answer themselves, and disclose a very essential difference between a government taking in a legal way the life of its own subjects as a penalty for crime, and the same government killing without any form of trial, or the least pretension to individual justice, an army of invaders from another country. They act not for themselves, but for their rulers; and, if taken as prisoners, not one of them could be tried for murder. Their government alone is responsible; ours has no jurisdiction in the case; and the laws of war discard the idea of their being held to any responsibility as individuals.

Let us trace the limits of authority and obligation. I see a man committing theft or murder; but am I bound or permitted to punish him? I should be if I were the government, or an officer invested with the requisite power; but am I as an individual? A teacher may see in the street scores of mischievous boys; but does his right to govern his school, involve the right to punish these foreigners even when acting worse than any of his own pupils?—‘Certainly not; but he would have a right to restrain them even by violence, if they invaded his school.’ True, he would, if the civil government *gave* him the right; and so would a nation be at liberty to destroy their invaders, *if God permitted it*; but, since he has given no such permission, I contend that it is not involved in the right of a government to coerce *its own subjects*. The cases are so distinct, that you cannot argue from one to the other. The point just now in dispute is, not whether government has the right of war from *any* source, but whether such a right is implied in that of controlling its own subjects. Because a parent may punish his own children, does it follow that he may punish his neighbor’s children?—‘But what if they trespass upon his premises?’ Then he may restrain them by force, and even punish them, *if the law allows it*, just as a government may resist unto death an army of invaders, *if God allows it*; but, if he does not, the right to do so cannot be found in any power it has over its own subjects. Because the head of every family in a neighborhood may and should govern his own children, you surely would not infer the right of these families to fight one another; yet from the conceded right of a government to restrain and punish its own subjects, you argue its authority to wage war against other governments!

But are you unable to understand *why* God should make such a difference? Be it so; still our ignorance of the reasons cannot alter the fact, nor absolve us from the duty of acquiescing in such clear expressions of his will as he has given in the pacific precepts of his gospel. Abraham may have seen a variety of very cogent reasons why he should not slay his son; yet were they all overruled by the simple fact of God's requiring the strange sacrifice. We have no right to ask his reasons. If he gives them, it is well; but, if not, we should still submit without a murmur or a doubt; and, if he has given precepts which condemn all the moral ingredients of war, nor made any exceptions which exempt nations in their intercourse with each other from obligation to obey them, then no ignorance, no doubts, no difficulties on our part, can excuse us from taking those precepts as the rule of our duty.

But, however unable to discover *all* the reasons for such a difference, I find enough for my own satisfaction. I see them in the relation between rulers and subjects;—in the very ends of civil government;—in its legitimate, well defined powers;—in the necessity of their faithful exercise to the welfare of society;—in their wise and obvious adaptation to the wants of mankind;—in the possibility of thus insuring justice, safety and happiness to the community, without the evils inseparable from the conflict of nations. None of these reasons apply to war. I find no license from a God of peace for its atrocities and horrors. No relation between one government and another, gives either a right to kill or coerce the subjects of the other. Nor is war a sure or a safe remedy for the evils incident to the intercourse of nations. It gives no assurance of justice, and contains not the slightest resemblance to a judicial process. There is no common code or tribunal, no form of trial, no charges duly tabled, no witnesses fairly confronted, no common judge or jury, no power above them both to punish the criminal, not a solitary element essential to a process of justice. One person offends, and a whole nation is doomed to vengeance. Each party makes its own law in the case, and acts as accuser and witness, as judge, jury and executioner. This a judicial process, a method of justice? No more than a rencounter between tigers.

Do you still insist, however, that government, appointed for the protection of its subjects, is even required, if necessary for this purpose, to wage war against invaders? There are better means for this than the sword; and, if government did its whole duty, there would be no need of appealing to arms for the defence of its subjects. I grant that it may and should protect them as far as it can without violating the commands of God; but it has no right, for this or any other purpose, to contravene his revealed will. The question here is not whether government shall defend its own subjects by *proper*, CHRISTIAN *means*, but whether it may for this end perpetrate all the enormities of war. May it reverse or suspend the whole Decalogue, and trample under foot Christ's sermon on the mount, and the plainest teachings of his Apostles? Does God authorize government to do *such* things? If not, then no plea of protection can justify war in any case.

Here, then, is the sum of my argument. The precepts of the gospel forbid what is essential alike to war and to government; but the penal and coercive measures of the latter, being clearly permitted by God himself as exceptions, are admissible on the same principle with the sacrifice of Isaac, and the penal enactments of the Jewish code, though each contrary to the letter of the sixth commandment; while war, not being thus permitted, remains in every one of its forms under the full force of those precepts which condemn all its moral elements, and require the opposite virtues of love, forgiveness and universal beneficence. Thus may we discard all war, and still believe in the right of government, if necessary, to hang the murderer, and employ force to arrest pirates, and to suppress mobs, riots and insurrections.

These views are obviously the reverse of non-government. It is one thing for a father to rule his family, and quite a different thing for that family to fight another; one thing to say that a parent may not forcibly resist the wrong doing of his child, and another to hold that the child must never thus resist the authority of his parent; one thing to deny the right of government to punish or coerce its subjects, and a very different thing to insist that subjects shall never oppose force to their government. The former I discard, the latter I fully believe; and while one leaves to government no power but that of moral suasion, the other obviously makes it stronger and perfectly secure. By teaching that children may never resist their parents, should I cut the sinews of parental authority? By denying the right of *forcible* resistance in any case to civil government, should I strip the magistrate of all power? Could such a doctrine lead to treason, to insurrection, to rebellion? Did our revolutionary fathers preach it? Was it ever a watchword with rebels or mobocrats? The objector shoots at the wrong target; he should change his ground, and accuse us, not of weakening government, but of arming it with too much power.

After all, however, what danger can ensue from peace? Suppose war brought every where to a perpetual end, can the wildest dreamer imagine, that such a result would crush or paralyze all government, and flood the world with anarchy, violence and crime? Impossible; peace is the nurse of every virtue, the medium of nearly all our blessings; and, if we would insure happiness to individuals, prosperity to nations, and the greatest possible amount of good to the whole world, we surely ought to labor for universal and permanent peace.

P. S.—I am well aware that there are other ways of reconciling with civil government the belief of all war contrary to the gospel, nor would I disparage any of them; but I state my own method, and leave others to explain and vindicate theirs. The cause of peace is not fairly responsible for the modes of reasoning adopted on this point; it has nothing to do with the government question, but permits its friends to treat the subject each in his own way.

CRIMINALITY OF WAR.

BY HOWARD MALCOM, D. D.,

PRESIDENT OF GEORGETOWN COLLEGE, KY.

THAT man is a fallen and depraved creature, is every where apparent in the ferocious dispositions of his nature. Hence, to speak of him as in "a state of nature," has been to speak of him as "a savage." A savage finds in war and bloodshed his only means of honor and fame, and he becomes, both in the chase and the camp, *a beast of prey*.

In proportion as war prevails among civilized nations, it banishes whatever tends to refine and elevate, suspends the pursuits of industry, destroys the works of art, and sets them back towards barbarism. Wherever it comes, cities smoke in ruins, and fields are trodden under foot. The husband is torn from his wife, the father from his children, the aged lose their prop, and woman is consigned to unwonted toils and perpetual alarms. As it passes, the halls of science grow lonely, improvements pause, benevolence is fettered, violence supercedes law, and even the sanctuary of God is deserted, or becomes a manger, a hospital, or a fortress. In its actual encounters, every movement is immeasurably horrid, with wounds, anguish, and death; while amid the din of wrath and strife, a stream of immortal souls is hurried, unprepared, to their final audit.

That tyrants should lead men into wars of pride and conquest, is not strange. But that *the people*, in governments comparatively free, should so readily lend themselves to a business in which they bear all the sufferings, can gain nothing, and may lose all, is matter of astonishment indeed.

But the chief wonder is that CHRISTIANS, followers of the Prince of Peace, should have concurred in this mad idolatry of strife, and thus been inconsistent not only with themselves, but with the very genius of their system. Behold a man going from the Lord's Supper, fantastically robed and plumed, drilling himself into skilful modes of butchery, and studying the tactics of death! Behold him murdering his fellow Christians, and praying to his Divine Master for success in the endeavor! Behold processions marching to the house of God to celebrate bloody victories, and give thanks for having been able to send thousands and tens of thousands to their last account with all their sins upon their heads! Stupendous inconsistency!

Surely this matter should remain no longer unexamined. It *cannot*. In this age of light, when every form of vice and error is discussed and resisted, this great evil, the prolific parent of unnumbered abominations, must be attacked also. Christians are waking up to see and do their duty to one another, to their neigh

bors, and to the distant heathen. They cannot continue to overlook *war*. I persuade myself that there are few, even now, who object to its being discussed.

I propose not to discuss the whole subject of war;—a vast theme. I shall abstain from presenting it in the light of philosophy, politics, or patriotism; in each of which points of light I have studied it, and feel that it demands most serious attention. In the following observations, war will be discussed only as it concerns a *Christian*.

Happily, there are few who would oppose the prevalence and perpetuity of peace. The need of discussion lies not in the blood-thirsty character of our countrymen, nor in the existence of active efforts to propagate and prolong the miseries of war; but in the *apathy* that prevails on this subject, and the almost total want of reflection in regard to it. A military spirit is so wrought into the habits of national thinking, and into all our patriotic pomps and festivals, that the occasional occurrence of war is deemed a matter of course. Even the fervent friends of man's highest welfare seem to regard a general pacification of the world, and the disuse of fleets and armies, as a mere Utopian scheme, and chose to give their money and prayers to objects which seem of more probable attainment. This apathy and incredulity are to be overcome only by discussion.

The following observations will be confined to two points.

- I. *War is criminal because inconsistent with Christianity.*
- II. *This criminality is enormous.*

I. ITS INCONSISTENCY WITH CHRISTIANITY.

1. *It contradicts the entire genius and intention of Christianity.*

Christianity requires us to seek to amend the condition of man. War always deteriorates and destroys. The world is at this moment not one whit better, in any respect, for all the wars of five thousand years. If here and there some good may be traced to war, the amount of evil, on the whole, is immeasurably greater. Christianity, if it prevailed, would make earth once more a paradise. War makes it a slaughter house, a desert, a den of thieves and murderers, a hell. Christianity cancels and condemns the law of retaliation. War is based upon that very principle. Christianity remedies all human woes. War makes them.

The *causes* of war are as inconsistent with Christianity as its effects. It originates in the worst passions, and the worst crimes, James iv., 1, 2. We may *always* trace it to the thirst of revenge, the acquisition of territory, the monopoly of commerce, the quarrels of kings, the coercion of religious opinions, or some such unholy source. There *never was* a war, devised by man, founded on holy tempers, and Christian principles.

All the features, all the concomitants, all the results of war, are opposed to the features, the concomitants, the results of Chris-

tianity. The two systems conflict in every point, irreconcilably and forever.

2. *War sets at naught the entire example of Jesus.*

"Learn of me," says the Divine Exemplar. And can we learn fighting from him? His conduct was always pacific. He became invisible when the Nazarites sought to cast him from their precipice. The troops that came to arrest him in the garden, he struck down, but not dead. His constant declaration was, that he "came not to destroy men's lives, but to save."

True, he once instructed his disciples to buy swords, telling them that they were going forth as sheep among wolves. But the whole passage shows he was speaking by parable, as he generally did. The disciples answered, "here are two swords." He instantly replies, "it is enough." If he had spoken literally, how could two swords suffice for twelve Apostles? Nay, when Peter used one of these, it was too much. Christ reproved him, and healed the wound. He meant to teach them their danger, not their refuge. His metaphor was misunderstood, just as it was when he said, "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," and they thought he meant bread.

Once he drove men from the temple. But it was with "a whip of small cords." *Moral* influence drove them. A crowd of such fellows was not to be overcome by one man with a whip. He expressly declared that his servants *should not* fight, for his kingdom was not of this world. His whole life was the sublime personification of benevolence. He was the **PRINCE OF PEACE**.

Do we forget that Christ is our example? Whatever is right for us to do, would in general have been right for him to do. Imagine the Savior robed in the trappings of a man of blood, leading columns to slaughter, setting fire to cities, laying waste the country, storming fortresses, and consigning thousands to wounds, anguish and death, just to define a boundary, settle a point of policy, or decide some kingly quarrel. Could "meekness and lowliness of heart" be learned from him thus engaged?

There is no rank or station in an army that would become the character of Christ. Nor can any man who makes arms a profession find a pattern in Christ our Lord. But he *ought* to be every man's pattern.

I need not enlarge on this point. It is conceded; for no warrior thinks of making Christ his pattern. How then can a genuine imitator of Christ, consistently be a warrior?

3. *War is inconsistent not only with the NATURE of Christianity, and the EXAMPLE OF JESUS, but it violates all the EXPRESS PRECEPTS of Scripture.*

Even the Old Testament does not sanction war *as a custom*. In each case, there mentioned, of lawful war, it was entered upon by the express command of God. If *such* authority were now given, we might worthily resort to arms. But without such authority,

how dare we violate the genius of Christianity, and set at naught the example of Christ? The wars sanctioned in olden times were not appointed to decide doubtful questions, or to settle quarrels. They were to inflict national punishment, and were intended, as are pestilence and famine, to chastise guilty nations.

As to the New Testament, a multitude of its precepts might be quoted, expressly against all fighting. "Ye have heard, &c., an eye for an eye, but I say unto you *resist not evil.*" "Follow peace with all men." "Love one another." "Do justice, love mercy." "Love your enemies." "Follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace." "Return good for evil." "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from you, and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight," etc. "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither," &c. "Be ye not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." "If thine enemy hunger, feed him, if he thirst, give him drink." "Render not evil for evil, but contrariwise blessing." Such passages might be indefinitely multiplied. They abound in the New Testament. How shall they be disposed of? No interpretation can nullify their force, or change their application. Take *any* sense the words will bear, and they forbid war. They especially forbid *retaliation*, which is always advanced as the best pretext for war.

Such texts as have been just quoted, relate to the single matter of retaliation and fighting. But belligerent nations violate *every* precept of the gospel. It enjoins every man to be meek, lowly, peaceable, easy to be entreated, gentle, thinking no evil, merciful, slow to anger, quiet, studious, patient, temperate, &c. Let a man rehearse, one by one, the whole catalogue of Christian graces, and he will see that war repudiates them all.

Examine that superlative epitome of Christianity, our Lord's sermon on the mount. Its nine benedictions are upon so many classes of persons; the poor in spirit, mourners, the meek, the merciful, the peace-makers, the persecuted, the reviled, those who hunger after righteousness, and the pure in heart. In which of these classes can the professed warrior place himself? Alas, he shuts himself out from all the benedictions of heaven.

The discourse proceeds to teach, that not only killing, but anger is murder. It expressly rebukes the law of retaliation; and exploding the traditionary rule of loving our neighbor, and hating our enemy, it requires us to love our enemies, and do good to those that despitefully use us. Afterward, in presenting a form of prayer, it not only teaches us to say, "Forgive our trespasses *as* we forgive those that trespass against us," but adds, "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Heavenly Father forgive you." What a peace sermon is here! What modern peace society goes further, or could be more explicit?

But let us take a few of the Christian graces more in detail. The Christian is required to cherish a sense of direct and supreme

responsibility to God. The *irresponsible* feelings of a soldier are a necessary part of his profession, as Lord Wellington said recently, 'A man who has a nice sense of religion, should not be a soldier.' The soldier makes war a *profession*, and must be ready to fight any nation, or any part of his own nation, as he is ordered. He must have no mind of his own. He must march, wheel, load, fire, charge, or retreat, as he is bidden, and because he is bidden. In the language of THOMAS JEFFERSON, "The breaking of men to military discipline, is breaking their spirits to principles of passive obedience."* The nearer a soldier comes to a mere machine, the better soldier he makes. Is this right for a Christian? Is it compatible with his duty to "examine all things, and hold fast that which is good?"

The *contempt of life* which is so necessary in a soldier, is a great sin. He must walk up to the deadly breach, and maintain his ground before the cannon's mouth. But life is inestimable, and belongs to God. He who masters the fear of death, does it either by religious influence, or quenching the fear of God, and all concern about a future state. There is not a gospel precept, which he who makes arms a profession, is not at times compelled to violate.

Nor is there a Christian grace which does not tend to diminish the value of a professed soldier. Some graces are, it is true, useful in camp; where a man may be called to act as a servant, or laborer. It is then desirable that he be honest, meek, faithful, that he may properly attend to a horse, or a wardrobe. But such qualities spoil him for the field. He must there cast away meekness, and fight; he must cast away honesty, and forage; he must cast away forgiveness, and revenge his country; he must not return good for evil, but two blows for one.

Survey an army prepared for battle; see a throng, busy with cannons, muskets, mortars, swords, drums, trumpets, and banners. Do these men look like Christians? Do they talk like followers of the meek and lowly Jesus? Do they act like friends and benefactors of the whole human race? Are the lessons they learn in daily drill, such as will help them in a life of faith?

Mark this army in the hour of battle. See attacks and retreats, battalions annihilated, commanders falling, shouts of onset, groans of death, horses trampling the fallen, limbs flying in the air, suffocating smoke, and thousands smarting in the agony of death, without a cup of water to quench their intolerable thirst! Do the principles of Christianity authorize such a scene? Are such horrors its fruits?

Inspect the field when all is over. The fair harvest trampled and destroyed, houses and batteries smoking in ruin, the mangled and suffering strewn among dead comrades, and dead horses, and broken gun-carriages. Prowlers strip the booty even from the warm bodies of the dying, jackals howl around, and disgusting

* See Letter to John Jay, May 23, 1783.

birds are wheeling in the air; while the miserable wife seeks her loved one among the general carnage. Does all this look as if Christians had been there, serving the God of mercy? Could such works grow out of the system, heralded as bringing "*Peace on earth?*"

Turn your eyes to the ocean. A huge ship, bristling with implements of death, glides quietly along. Presently "a sail!" is called from sentinel to sentinel. All on board catch the sound, and gaze on the dim and distant outline. At length she is discovered to be a ship of war, and all strain their eyes to see her flag. On that little token hangs the important issue; for no feud, no jealousy exists between the crews. They do not even know each other. At length the signal is discerned to be that of a foe. Immediately what a scene ensues! Decks cleared and sanded, ports opened, guns run out, matches lighted, and every preparation made for bloody work. While waiting for the moment to engage, the worst passions of the men are appealed to to make them fight with fury; and they are inspired with all possible pride, hatred, revenge or ambition.

The fight begins! Death flies with every shot. Blood and carnage cover the decks. The rigging is cut to pieces; the hull bored with hot shot. The smoke, the confusion, the orders of officers, the yells of the wounded, the crash of timbers, the horrors of the cockpit, make a scene at which infernal fiends feel their malignity sated. At length one party strikes, and the strife is stayed. The conquered ship, ere her wounded can be removed, sinks into the deep. The victor, herself almost a wreck, throws overboard the slain, washes her decks, and turns toward her port, carrying the crippled, the agonized, and the dying of both ships! What anguish is there in that ship! What empty berths, late filled with the gay-hearted and the profane! What tidings does she carry, to spread lamentation and misery over hundreds of families!

Yet in all this, there was no personal feud or malice, no private wrong or offence. All was the mere result of some cabinet council, some kingly caprice. Could any enormity be more cold-blooded and diabolical?

But no where does war wear such horrors as in a siege. The inhabitants are shut up; business, pleasure, education, intercourse are all checked; sorrow, terror, and distress prevail. Bombs fall and explode in the streets; citizens are killed in their houses, and soldiers on the ramparts. Women and children retreat to the cellars, and live there cold, dark, comfortless, terrified. Day after day, and month after month, roll tediously on, while the gloom constantly thickens, and the only news is of houses crushed, acquaintances killed, prices raised, and scarcity increased. Gladly would the citizens surrender, but the governor is inexorable. At length, to all the horrors *famine* is added. The poor man, out of employ, cannot purchase customary comforts at the increased prices. His poverty becomes deeper, his sacrifices greater. But the siege

continues. The middle classes sink to beggary, the poorer class to starvation. Anon, breaches are made in the wall; and all must work amid galling fire to repair them. Mines are sprung, blowing houses and occupants into the air. Still no relief comes. Dead animals, offal, skins, the very carcass of the slain, are eaten. The lone widow, the bereft mother, the disappointed bride, the despairing father, and the tender babe, mourn continually. Then comes *pestilence*, the necessary consequence of unburied dead, and unwonted hardships, and intolerable wo. At length, the city yields; or is taken by storm, and scenes even more horrid ensue. A brutal soldiery give loose to lust, and rapine, and destruction; and the indescribable scene closes with deserted streets, general ruin, and lasting lamentation.

This picture is far from being overwrought. The history of sieges furnish realities of deeper horror. Take for instance the second siege of Saragossa in 1814, or almost any other.

Now is this Christianity? Is it *like* it? Christianity cannot alter. If it will necessarily abolish *all* war, when the millennium shall give it *universal* influence, then it will abolish war now, *so far as it has influence*; and every man who receives it *fully* will be a man of peace. If religious persons may make fighting a trade on earth, they may fight in heaven. If we may lawfully cherish a war spirit here, we may cherish it there!

I close by quoting the words of the great Jeremy Taylor. "As contrary as cruelty is to mercy, and tyranny to charity, so contrary is war to the meekness and gentleness of the Christian religion."

II. WAR IS ONE OF THE MOST AWFUL AND COMPREHENSIVE FORMS OF WICKEDNESS.

What has been said, has gone to show how inconsistent, *in principle*, are war and Christianity. A few considerations will now be offered, illustrative of the *practices* of war. We shall be thus led to see, not only that it contradicts the genius, and violates the precepts of Christianity, but that it does so in the most gross and gigantic manner.

1. *It is the worst form of robbery.*

Common robberies are induced by want; but war commits them by choice, and often robs only to ravage. A man who rushes to the highway to rob, maddened by the sight of a famished family, may plead powerful temptation. But armies rob, burn, and destroy, in the coolest malice. See a file of men, well fed and well clothed by a great and powerful nation, proceed on a foraging party. They enter a retired vale, where a peaceful old man by hard handed toil supports his humble family. The officer coolly points with his sword to the few stacks of hay and grain, laid up for winter. Remonstrances are vain—tears are vain. They bear off his only supply, take his cow, his pet lamb; add insult to oppression, and leave the ruined family to an almshouse or starvation. Aye, but

the poor old man was an *enemy*, as the war phrase is, and the haughty soldiery claim merit for forbearance, because they did not conclude with burning down his house.

The seizure or destruction of public stores, is not less robbery. A nation has no more right to steal from a nation, than an individual has to steal from an individual. In principle, the act is the same; in magnitude, the sin is greater. All the private robberies in a thousand years, are not a tithe of the robberies of one war. Next to killing, it is the very object of each party to burn and destroy by sea, and ravage and lay waste on land. It is a malign and inexcusable barbarity, and constitutes a stupendous mass of theft.

In one of the Punic wars, Carthage, with 100,000 houses, was burnt and destroyed, so that not a house remained. The plunder carried away by the Romans, in precious metals and jewels alone, is reported to have been equal to *five millions of pounds of silver*. Who can compute the number of similar events, from the destruction of Jerusalem to that of Moscow? Arson, that is, the setting fire to an inhabited dwelling, is, in most countries, punishable by death. But more of this has been done in some single wars, than has been committed privately, since the world began. When some villain sets fire to a house and consumes it, what public indignation! What zeal to bring to justice! If, for a succession of nights, buildings are fired, what general panic! Yet how small the distress, compared to that which follows the burning of an entire city. In one case, the houseless still find shelter, the laborer obtains work, the children have food. But oh, the horrors of a general ruin! Earthquake is no worse.

It should not be overlooked, that a great part of the private robberies in Christendom, may be traced to the deterioration of morals, caused by war. Thousands of pirates, received their infamous education in national ships. Thousands of thieves, were disbanded soldiers. War taught these men to disregard the rights of property, to trample upon justice, and refuse mercy. Even if disposed to honest labor, which a military life always tends to render unpalatable, the disbanded soldier often finds himself unable to obtain employment. The industry of his country has been paralysed by the war; and the demand for labor slowly recurs. The discharged veteran therefore is often compelled to steal or starve.

Thus war, by its own operations, involves continual and stupendous thefts, and by its unavoidable tendencies, multiplies offenders, who in time of peace prey upon community.

2. *It involves the most enormous Sabbath breaking.*

The Sabbath *cannot* be observed by armies. Common camp duty forbids it. Extra duties are generally assigned to Sunday—such as parades, drill, inspections, and reviews. Seldom is any effort made to avoid marches, or even battles, on Sunday. I have been able to find, in all history, but *one* battle postponed on account

of the Sabbath. In thousands of instances, as in the case of Waterloo, it has been the chosen day for conflict.

War tends to abolish the Sabbath, even when the army is not present. The heavy trains of the commissary must move on. The arsenal and the ship yard must maintain their activity. Innumerable mechanics, watermen, and laborers, must be kept busy. During our late war with England, who did not witness on all our frontiers, even in the States of New England, the general desecration of the holy day? Men swarmed like ants on a mole hill, to throw up entrenchments; the wharves resounded with din of business; and idlers forsook the house of God to gaze upon the scenes of preparation.

Do Christians consider these unavoidable results, when they give their voice for war? No. The calm consideration of such concomitants, would make it impossible for them to advise or sanction the profane and abominable thing.

3. *War produces a wicked waste of national wealth.*

The disbursements of a belligerent government, drawn of course by taxation from the laboring community, form an incalculable amount. Our last war with England cost us more than a hundred millions of dollars per annum. During the last 175 years, ENGLAND has had *twenty-four* wars with France, *twelve* with Scotland, *eight* with Spain, and *two* with America, besides all her other wars in India and elsewhere. These have cost her government, according to official returns, *three thousand millions* of pounds sterling, or FIFTEEN THOUSAND MILLIONS OF DOLLARS! The war which ended at Waterloo, cost France £700,000,000, and Austria £300,000,000, or five thousand millions of dollars! How much it cost Spain, Sweden, Holland, Germany, Prussia and Russia, I have no means of knowing, but at least an equal sum. Thus one long war cost Europe at least forty thousand millions! The annual interest of this sum, at five per cent., is two thousand millions of dollars,—enough almost to banish suffering poverty from Europe! For all this, NOTHING has been gained. Nay, the spending of it thus has produced an aggregate of vice and poverty, pain and bereavement, more than, without war, would have come upon the whole human family since the flood! Who then can begin to compute the cost of *all* the wars even in Europe alone?

We often hear much railing against useless expenditure, and proposals for economy in dress, furniture, &c., and it is well. But those who insist on these modes of frugality should be consistent. Let them remember that all the retrenchments they recommend are but as the dust of the balance compared to the expenditures of a war. But vast as are the expenses of belligerent governments, they do not constitute a tenth of the true expenses of war! We must reckon the destruction of property, private and public—the ruin of trade and commerce—the suspension of manufactories—the loss of the productive labor of soldiers and camp followers. But who can reckon such amounts?

Further, let it be considered that all these items must be doubled and trebled in cases of *civil* wars, and that such form a large part of the catalogue.

Further still, war causes the great bulk of taxation even in time of peace! Witness the annual appropriations for fleets and standing armies, forts, arsenals, weapons, pensions, &c. Even since our last war with England, we have been paying *annually*, for the above objects, about *ten* times as much as for the support of our civil government!! "The war spirit" is taxing our people to the amount of unnumbered millions, *now* in time of profound peace. A single 74 gun ship, beside all her cost of construction and equipment, costs in time of peace, while afloat, \$200,000 per annum—eight times the salary of the President of the United States. *Nearly all the taxes paid by civilized nations, go in some form or other to the support of war!* All the British debt which is grinding her people into the dust, was created by war. The cost of the wars of Europe alone, in only the last century, would have built all the canals, railroads, and churches, and established all the schools, colleges, and hospitals, wanted on the whole globe!

4. *War is the grossest form of murder.*

Private murders are atrocious—those of war far more so. But the contrary opinion prevails; and we adduce proofs. War enhances the crime of murder on the following accounts:

(1.) It is more cold-blooded and cruel. Malice prompts private murder, and the proof of it is necessary to conviction by a jury; and the more cool and calculating, the more guilt. But murder in war is more cool and calculating, than even in a duel. The question of war or peace is calmly debated, deliberately resolved upon, and proclaimed in form. Armies are raised, and drilled, and marched, and engaged, with all coolness and calculation. The contending hosts know not each other, cherish no personal hate, and seldom know the true grounds of the contest. All is done with whatever of aggravation attends deliberate homicide.

(2.) It is more vast in amount.

Computation falters when we estimate the numbers slain in war or by reason of it. Three hundred thousand men fell in one battle, when Attila, king of the Huns, was defeated at Chalons. Nearly the entire army of Xerxes, consisting of four millions of persons, perished. Julius Cæsar, in one campaign in Germany, destroyed half a million. More than half a million perished in one campaign of Napoleon, averaging 3000 men a day. Paying no attention to the innumerable wars among Pagans before and since the birth of Christ, nor to all the wasting wars of the past seventeen centuries, it is matter of distinct calculation that about five millions of nominal Christians, have been butchered by nominal Christians, *within the last half century!* What then has been the total of war-murders since creation?

Nor is the number of the *slain* the real total. Multitudes of "the wounded and missing" die; multitudes perish out of armies

and fleets without battle, by hardships, exposure, vice, contagion, and climate. We ought, therefore, at least to double the number slain in engagements, to arrive at the true sum; and make *ten millions of men* destroyed within half a century by Christian nations' quarrels!

(3.) Deaths caused by war, are accompanied by horrid aggravations of suffering.

The wretches die, not on beds of down, surrounded by all that can relieve or palliate suffering. No soft hand smooths the couch, or wipes the brow. No skilful physician stands watching every symptom. The silence, the quiet, the cleanliness, the sympathy, the love, the skill, that divest the chamber of death of all its horror, and half its anguish, are not for the poor soldier. Private murder is always done in haste, and the sufferer is often dismissed from life in a moment. Not so in war. Few are killed outright. The victim dies slowly of unmedicated wounds. Prostrate amid the trampling of columns and of horses which have lost their riders, or in a trench, amid heaps of killed and wounded, he dies a hundred deaths. If, mangled and miserable, he finds himself still alive, when the tide of battle has passed, how forlorn his condition! Unable to drag himself from the ghastly scene, his gory limbs chilled with the damps of night, tortured with thirst, and quivering with pain, his heart sickened with the remembrance of home, and his soul dismayed at the approach of eternal retributions, he meets death with all that can make it terrific.

(4.) The multitudes murdered in war, are generally sent to hell.

The thought is too horrible for steady contemplation; but we are bound to consider it. "No murderer hath eternal life." Soldiers are murderers in intent and profession, and die in the act of killing others, and with implements of murder in their hands. Without space for repentance, they are hurried to the bar of God. On what grounds may we affirm their salvation? O that those that know the worth of souls, would dwell on this feature of the dreadful custom!

(5.) War first corrupts those whom it destroys, and thus aggravates damnation itself.

Bad as are most men who enlist in standing armies, war makes them worse. They might at any rate be lost, but their vocation sends them to a more dreadful doom. The recruit begins his degradation, even in the rendezvous, ere he has lodged a week within its walls. He grows still worse in camp.

In the army, vice becomes his occupation. His worst passions are fostered. His Sabbaths are necessarily profaned. He becomes ashamed of tender feelings, and conscientious scruples. Thus an old soldier is generally a hardened offender; and the shot that terminates his life, consigns him to a destiny rendered more terrible by his profession. Had the money and time, which has been lavished to equip and drill and support him as a soldier, been spent

for his intellectual and moral improvement, he might have been an ornament to society, and a pillar in the church.

Mark his grim corpse as men bear it to the gaping pit into which whole cart-loads of bodies are thrown. The property, nay the liberty of a whole nation is not a price for his soul! How then can Christians with one hand give to the support of missions, and with the other uphold a custom which counteracts every good enterprise?

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

How strange, how awful, that to such a trade as war, mankind has, in all ages, lifted up its admiration! Poetry lends its fascinations, and philosophy its inventions. Eloquence, in forum and field, has wrought up the war spirit to fanaticism and frenzy. Even the pulpit, whose legitimate and glorious theme is "PEACE ON EARTH," has not withheld its solemn sanctions. The tender sex, with strange infatuation, have admired the tinselled trappings of him whose trade is to make widows and orphans. Their hands have been withdrawn from the distaff, to embroider warrior's ensigns. The young mother has arrayed her proud boy with cap and feather, toyed him with drum and sword, and trained him, unconsciously, to love and admire the profession of a man-killer.

The universal maxim has been, "in peace prepare for war;" and men are all their days contributing and taxing themselves to defray the expenses of killing each other.

Scarcely has a voice been lifted up to spread the principles of peace. Every other principle of Christianity has had its apostles. Howard reformed prisons; Sharp, and Clarkson, and Wilberforce arrested the slave-trade. Carey carried the gospel to India. Every form of vice has its antagonists, and every class of sufferers find philanthropists. But who stands forth to urge the law of love? Who attacks this monster WAR? We have not waited for the millennium to abolish intemperance, or Sabbath breaking; but we wait for it to abolish war. It is certain that the millennium cannot come, till war expires.

Shall it so remain? Shall this gorgon of pride, corruption, destructiveness, misery and murder, be still admired and fed, while it is turning men's hearts to stone, and the garden of the Lord into the desolation of death? Let every heart say *no*. Let Christians shine before men as sons of peace, not less than as sons of justice and truth. If wars and rumors of wars continue, let the church stand aloof. It is time she was purged of this stain. Her brotherhood embraces all nations. Earthly rulers may tell us we have enemies; but our heavenly King commands us to return them good for evil; if they hunger, to feed them; if they thirst, to give them drink.

Rise then, Christians, to noble resolution and vigorous endeavors! Retire from military trainings, and spurn the thought of being hired by the month to rob and kill. Refuse to study the

tactics, or practice the handicraft of death; and with "a hope that maketh not ashamed," proclaim the principles of *universal peace*, as part and parcel of eternal truth.

A portion of our missionary spirit should be expended in this department. Shall we pour out our money and our prayers, when we hear of a widow burnt on her husband's funeral pile, or deluded wretches crushed beneath the wheels of Juggernaut, but do nothing to dethrone this *Moloch* to whom hundreds of millions of Christians have been sacrificed? Among the fifty millions of the Presidency of Bengal, the average number of suttees (widows burned, &c.) has for twenty years been less than 500, or in the proportion of one death in a year for such a population as Philadelphia. What is this to war? Every *day* of some campaigns has cost more lives!

We must not abstain from effort, because of apparent obstacles. What great reform does not meet obstructions? The overthrow of Papal supremacy by Luther, the temperance movement, and a host of similar historic facts, show that truth is mighty, and when fairly and perseveringly exhibited, will prevail. It can be shown, that in attempting to abolish all war, we encounter fewer impediments than have attended various other great changes. Even if it were not so, we have a duty to discharge whether we prevail or not. Moral obligation does not rest on the chance of success.

Our obstacles are neither numerous nor formidable. No classes of men *love* war for its own sake. If it were abolished, those who now make it a profession, could all find profitable and pleasanter employment in peaceful pursuits. Men's *interests* are not against us; but the contrary. The people are not *blood-thirsty*. What serious impediment is there to obstruct the diffusion of peace principles? None more than beset even the most popular enterprise of literature or benevolence. Our only obstruction is apathy, and the unfortunate sentiment that the millennium is to do it away, we know not how. But we might as well do nothing against intemperance, or Sabbath-breaking, or heresy; and wait for the millennium to do them away. Nothing will be done in this world without means, even when the millennium shall have come.

Do you ask what *you* can do? Much, very much, whoever you are. Cherish in yourself the true peace-spirit. Try to diffuse it. Assist in enlightening your neighbors. Talk of the horrors of war, its impolicy, its cost, its depravity, its utter uselessness in adjusting national disputes. Teach children correctly on this point, and show them the true character of war, stripped of its music and mock splendor. Banish drums and swords from among their toys. Proclaim aloud the Divine government, and teach men how vain it is, even in a righteous cause, to trust an arm of flesh. Insist that patriotism, in its common acceptation, is not a virtue; for it limits us to love *our country*, and allows us to hate and injure other nations. Thus if Canada were annexed to our Union, we must, *on that account*, love Canadians. But if South Carolina should secede, we must withdraw part of our love, or perhaps go

to war and kill as many as possible. O how absurd to act thus, as though God's immutable law of love was to be obeyed or not as our boundaries may be.

“Lands intersected by a narrow sea,
Abhor each other. Mountains interposed,
Make enemies of nations who had else,
Like kindred drops, been mingled into one.”

Let us feel and disseminate the sentiment that *true* patriotism is shown only by *the good*. A man may claim to be a patriot, and love “his country,” whose feelings are so vague and worthless that he loves no one in it! He loves a mere name! or rather, his patriotism is a mere name. Whole classes of his fellow-citizens may remain in vice, ignorance, slavery, poverty, and yet he feels no sympathy, offers no aid. Sodom would have been saved, had there been in it ten righteous. These then would have been patriots. These would have saved their country. We have in our land many righteous. These are our security. These save the land from a curse. These therefore are the only true patriots.

Let us unite in “showing up” military glory. What is it? Grant that it is all that it has ever passed for, and it still seems superlatively worthless. The wreaths of conquerors fade daily. We give their names to dogs and slaves. The smallest useful volume gives its author a better and more lasting name. And how absurd, too, is it to talk to common soldiers and under officers about military glory! Among the many millions who have toiled and died for love of glory, scarcely a score are remembered among men! Who of our revolutionary heroes but Washington and Lafayette are known in the opposite hemisphere? Who of our own citizens can tell over a half dozen distinguished soldiers in our struggle for independence? Yet that war is of late date. Of the men of former wars we know almost nothing. Essentially stupid then is the love of military renown in petty officers and the common private. They stake their lives in a lottery where there is hardly a prize in five hundred years!

Let us print and propagate peace principles. Public opinion has been changed on many points by a few resolute men. Let us keep the subject before the people till every man forms a deliberate opinion, whether Christianity allows or forbids war. Let us at least do so much that if ever our country engages in another war, we shall feel no share of the guilt. Let us each do so much that if we should ever walk over a battle-field, stunned with the groans and curses of the wounded, and horror-struck at the infernal spectacle, we can feel that we did *all we could* to avert such an evil. Let us clear *ourselves* of blame. No one of us can put a stop to war. But we can *help* stop it—and combined and persevering effort *will* stop it.

I will offer but one consideration more; viz., the

FEASIBILITY OF A COURT OF NATIONS.

The friends of this cause place before the world a *distinct plan* for the establishment and preservation of universal peace. We propose that five or six of the great nations of the earth, elect each an able lawyer or statesman, to meet as a "CONGRESS OF NATIONS" somewhere in Europe, and spend a few years in digesting a code of international law. We now refer to Vattel, or Montesquieu, or Grotius; but these men have no other authority than as great writers. We want an admitted, authoritative and detailed *code* for the regulation of nations in their intercourse with each other. Such a code once formed and ratified by the few high powers of earth, would be, what as yet does not exist, a *system* of international law.

The decision of disputes according to this code would belong to a permanent body of judges, elected like the members of the Congress, and forming a "COURT OF NATIONS." These might either meet as occasion required, or sit stately. What an august tribunal! How would our own CLAY shine there by the side of Brougham and Guizot! How much more probably would justice be obtained there by a wronged nation, than if the decision were made to result from a pitched battle!

I see no objection to the plan, as an abstract question of debate; none as to its practical workings. We have much history, much experience to encourage the attempt. The Amphictyonic Council preserved peace to the states of Greece. The Germanic Diet was a court of nations to more than thirty free states and cities. The Cantons of Switzerland, though differing in language, religion and intelligence, live peaceably under a similar compact. The united provinces of Holland maintained entire peace by such an arrangement for two hundred years. These United States, free and sovereign, have agreed to settle their disputes before a Supreme Court, and have forever renounced the right to go to war with each other. Who then will say that a plan which has worked well in so many instances, may not be successful on a larger scale?

The plan of referring disputes between nations to the arbitration of a neutral power, is found to produce the happiest results, and is very often tried. Yet how inferior to this plan! The monarch who arbitrates, may not have time or inclination to examine details. Or he may have selfish inducements to lean to one side. And at best he has not, as our court would have, an *admitted* code to govern his decision.

I love to anticipate the formation of a court of nations. Round such a tribunal would shine a splendor, resembling, more than aught earth ever saw before, the glory of the throne of God! There would sit a bench of peace-makers, dispensing tranquillity, confidence, and safety, not to cities only, or to nations, but to the

world! From them would go forth, under God, unnumbered blessings to the whole family of man. Before them, petty despots, and blood-thirsty aspirants, would be crushed in their beginnings. Earth would no more be stained with the blood of the brave. The horrors of the conscription and the press-gang would cease. Commerce would spread her free and fearless sails on every sea, and navies would dwindle to a mere police.

What can be said why such a court should not be established? I know of only this—such a court could not enforce its decisions. But this is not so. What enforces law in Kentucky? Not an army, but *public opinion*. No military force can coerce a nation or community contrary to public opinion. This is a new element in political economy not known in former ages, but now omnipotent. No king can now wage a war if public opinion be against him. When we get our court of nations, public opinion as to war will be *right*, and the spirit that creates the tribunal, will carry out its decisions. We have laws now which lie dormant—a dead letter—just because public opinion is against them now. But when the people are earnest in favor of a law, they want no army to dragoon them into obedience.

Total non-intercourse with a refractory nation would soon reduce it to submission. Civilization now makes all nations dependent on each other for absolute necessities. But what nation would refuse the reparation which such a court ordered? None would be so mad. No award would tax it so heavily as a year's war. Public opinion, once formed on peace principles, would render war as impossible as it is unnecessary. The case would be the same as in regard to duelling and profane swearing, which authority never could abolish, but which are being abolished by public opinion. It is far from being difficult to affect public opinion. See the effects of a few abolitionists constantly declaiming against slavery. A hundred such cases may be named. We have only to argue and exhort a few years, and earth will enjoy the incalculable blessings of a COURT OF NATIONS.

FRANKLIN.—We daily make great improvements in natural philosophy, there is one I wish to see in moral,—the discovery of a plan that would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats. When will human nature be sufficiently improved to see the advantage of this?

JEFFERSON.—Wonderful has been the progress of human improvement in other respects. Let us hope then that the law of nature will in time influence the proceedings of nations as well as individuals; that we shall at length be sensible, that war is an instrument entirely inefficient toward redressing wrong, and multiplies instead of indemnifying losses.

WAR A DESTROYER OF SOULS.

THE soul is man's great interest; and its ruin involves the heaviest loss, and the deepest guilt. It mars forever the noblest work of God; it defeats the main object of man's creation; it thwarts the leading design of providence; it poisons the purest, sweetest joys of this life; it blasts the bright and cheering hopes of heaven; it entails the unutterable woes of hell, and pours upon the universe a stream of unholy, baleful influences that are destined never to cease.

I cannot now dwell on these topics of vast and thrilling interest; but would you faintly conceive how much is lost by the ruin of a single soul? Ask not the worldling; he has no conception of its value, no arithmetic for calculations like these. Ask Him who made the soul for his own high, immortal service; Him who came down from the bosom of his Father, and took upon himself the form of a servant, to redeem the soul by his own blood on the cross; or the Holy Spirit, who is now at work amid the ruins of the fall to renew the soul, and thus render it meet for the pure, exalted, endless joys of heaven. Go, ask the saint, as he bows, and sings, and rejoices with joy unspeakable before the throne of God and the Lamb; or the lost sinner, as he writhes in the agonies of that world 'where the worm dieth not, and the fire is never to be quenched, but sendeth up the smoke of its torment forever and ever.' Push your thoughts as far into a coming eternity as you can; and, when myriads after myriads of ages beyond your utmost power to conceive, shall have passed away, pause there, and ask the glorified spirits of heaven, ask the hopeless sufferers in hell, ask the omniscient God himself, to tell you how much is lost, forever lost, by the ruin of but one soul created in the image of its Maker, and bound to a blissful or a miserable immortality!

Alas! that the world should be so full of influences fatal or dangerous to the soul! Business and pleasure, avarice and ambition, intemperance and licentiousness, infidelity, atheism and paganism, a thousand forms of error and sin are every where conspiring to put in jeopardy the immortal interests of mankind; but, passing over all the rest, let us now inquire IN HOW MANY WAYS THE CUSTOM OF WAR RUINS THE SOUL.

It turns the attention of men away from their spiritual concerns. A war in actual progress becomes of course the standing theme in halls of legislation; it fills every newspaper, and forms the leading topic of conversation through the community; it obtrudes itself into the family and the social circle, into the field, the shop and the counting-room. The whole land is full of it; the public mind is saturated with it; and such an absorption of high and low,

old and young, saints and sinners, on any other subject than that of vital godliness, cannot fail to obstruct their salvation. Such a result is inevitable; and all history proves it so. If the rage of eager, gainful speculation, or a tale of village slander, or the strife of a warmly contested election, or even contention about the settlement of a pastor, or the location of a church, will sometimes blast in its very bud the most promising revival of religion, how fatal must a state of national warfare be! Engrossed with the intense, all-pervading excitement, the mass of society find no time, and feel no disposition to seek the "one thing needful."

But war, also, *disqualifies men for a saving reception of the gospel*. For this there must be a kind and a degree of moral preparation quite incompatible with a state of actual warfare. Of what use to sow grain upon a rock, or amid thorns and thistles? Metals must be melted before you can cast them; you must heat iron nearly to the point of fusion, before you can weld it; and upon a community of minds impregnated with war-passions, the strongest truths of God's word would fall powerless as moon-beams on a mountain of ice. Wherever the war-spirit prevails, there would you labor in vain for the conversion of sinners, or the sanctification of Christians. So will you find it alike on a large and a small scale. Let a family or a neighborhood be filled week after week with such a spirit,—with jealousy and anger, with hatred, wrath and revenge, the grand moral elements of war;—and could the gospel reach them in such a state of mind with its redeeming influences? Should any church be pervaded with the mildest form of the war-spirit, alienating its members from each other, distracting their councils, and holding them back from prayer and effort for the salvation of men, could they in such circumstances expect a revival of religion to commence or continue?

But war throws millions of minds into a state even worse than this. It fills whole empires with animosity, malevolence, revenge. It makes the public heart a cauldron of seething, boiling passions. It blinds the mind to God's truth; it sears or perverts the conscience; it hardens or exasperates the heart; it renders the whole soul well nigh impenetrable for the time to any arrows even from the quiver of the Almighty. Can you bring the truth of God into saving contact with minds thus affected? Can you, with any hope of success, preach the gospel to an army on tiptoe for battle, or to a community roused and convulsed with the fierce, vindictive passions of war? As well might you sow grain upon the rapids of Niagara, into the burning crater of Etna, and hope for a harvest. Breathe the genuine war-spirit into every bosom on earth; and from that moment must the work of conversion and sanctification cease every where.

But war, moreover, *prevents the use of means for the salvation of men*. The three millions of standing warriors now (1845) in Christendom, it deprives even in peace of nearly all religious privileges, and thus exposes them to almost certain perdition. No class of men, not even seamen, are so poorly provided with the means of grace. Next to nothing is done for their salvation. There is no

pastor, no missionary among them to care for their souls; and, if there were, his labors, subject to the dictation of an ungodly commander, would probably be, like those of Baxter himself even in a Puritan camp, well nigh useless. No Sabbath dawns upon them; no sanctuary opens its doors to them; no Sabbath-school, no prayer-meeting, no family altar, scarce a Bible or a tract can be found among the mass of men trained to the work of human butchery for a livelihood.

So it *must* be. Look at the very nature of war; and tell us what can be done for the souls of men cast in its own mould, imbued with its spirit, and steeped in its vices and crimes. Review the history of war; and tell us what *has* been done or attempted for the salvation of warriors. Among the millions that fought, and the millions that fell, during the late wars of Europe, did one in ten or a hundred enjoy the ordinary means of grace?

I grant that much more is now done in a few Christian countries for the spiritual benefit of warriors; but how very little, and with results how meagre and miserable! We hear indeed of chaplains in the army and the navy; but what do they do for their spiritual charge? What *can* they do? Suppose a minister of Christ were employed in a brothel or a grog-shop to pray and preach in a way to sanction the deeds done there, would he be likely by such a course to reclaim the frequenters of those gate-ways to hell, and train them up for heaven? I mean no personal disrespect; but I am constrained to regard the whole business of war-chaplaincies as a piece of solemn mockery, an attempt to blend Christ with Belial, to make Christianity bow in homage before the altar of Moloch.

I could easily quote facts to prove the general futility of such chaplaincies. On this point I have myself heard from eye-witnesses, statements which would startle the Christian community; but I will give only a few extracts from the report of a Mr. Smith in 1828, then a Christian minister, but once a naval officer, "on the religious state of the British navy." Devoting himself to the religious welfare of seamen, he went, by permission of the lieutenant, on board a man-of-war, to distribute some religious tracts, but was rudely expelled by the captain. "I begged," says he, "to speak with the captain, and said, I presume, sir, you have been misinformed; I am not aware of having done any thing to incur your displeasure.—'Yes, sir, you have by dispersing religious tracts.'—You are mistaken, sir; I have not given one.—'Then you had no business to go below.'—I asked permission of your commanding officer, sir.—'I am myself commanding officer of this ship, sir.'—I know you are; but when you were not on quarter-deck, I conceived your first lieutenant acted for you.—'I will not have my men visited by *any* one without *my* permission.'—Sir, I could do them no possible injury; I am a minister of the gospel, and wish to do them all the good I can. I have myself been in the navy, and therefore know well the rules of the service, and should be the last to disobey, or lead others to act contrary to the due subordination and routine of the profession.—'Still you had no right down below in my ship.'—Why, sir, I found many of the vilest unmarried

females below, teaching the men all sorts of obscenity and abomination. Surely, if these were allowed to crowd the ship, a minister of the gospel might be permitted also.—‘No, sir, *they* come to the men by *my* permission ; *you* do not.’—I am truly sorry for it, sir ; for they will corrupt and ruin the whole crew.—‘Never mind that, sir ; mind your own business ;—I’ll have no religious tracts distributed in my ship.’” To such men does every chaplain swear obedience ; nor can he, without their permission, attempt any thing for the salvation of seamen or soldiers. Thus manacled and thwarted, what could even a Payson or a Baxter accomplish ?

I fear that the war-system makes fearful havoc of souls among its own agents, even in a time of peace. Every one, acquainted with its practical operation, knows it to be a school of irreligion, vice and profligacy ; nor could you well select a surer way to perdition than the army or the navy, each worse in this respect than a state-prison ! How few in either give the slightest evidence of their being prepared for heaven ! Yet are there in Christendom itself three millions or more, even in peace, training in this school of error and sin for a miserable eternity. No stretch of charity can believe a tenth, if a hundredth, part of them fit for heaven ; and if these three millions die off on an average in twenty years, there would annually go into the world of spirits 150,000 souls, and more than nine-tenths of them unprepared for their last account ! With this number compare the sum total of church-members at all the missionary stations among the heathen in 1844, when they amounted to 172,233, or a little more, as the result of half a century’s labors by the whole church, than the *annual* sacrifice of souls in Christendom itself at the shrine of the war-demon even in peace !!

I cannot, however, pause here to glance at the far greater mischief occasioned by war to the community at large. The Sabbath, that sheet-anchor of religion, that main-spring of God’s moral government over our world, the pivot of nearly all the instrumentalities appointed for the recovery of mankind from sin, it tends, if it does not seek, to destroy. It knows, it admits no Sabbath. Its battles are fought, its marches continued, its fortifications constructed, its drills performed, all its labors exacted, all its recreations indulged on this even more than any other day of the week. The battle of Waterloo, like a multitude of others, was fought without scruple on the Sabbath ; and even officers of a Christian church among ourselves have been heard to say, ‘there is no Sabbath in times of war and revolution.’ Nor indeed is there any Sabbath for soldiers even in a time of peace ; for all over Europe, even in our own army, is the Sabbath the chosen time for special and splendid reviews. Soldiers are absolutely compelled to trample under foot this day of God ; and their example, backed by men in power, and justified by the best members of society as the necessary privilege of war, must ere-long unclinch the hold of the Sabbath upon the conscience, heart and habits of any community. Even the sons of the Puritans are not proof against influences like these ; for the Sabbath of New England itself has received from

three wars,—the French, the Revolutionary and the last,—a shock from which only the millennium can ever restore it to the sanctity and moral power which it had in the halcyon days of our fathers.

War, also, *stifles the very disposition to use the means of grace.* Breathe its spirit of anger, hatred and revenge into any circle of families; and would the Christians in that circle be intent on the salvation of its impenitent members? Let the same war-passions pervade and convulse a whole congregation; would their pastor be able, or his church inclined, to use the means indispensable to a general revival of religion?

Take an example or two. A slave-holder in Virginia, extremely irascible and severe, found at length a slave as bad-tempered as himself. No severity of punishment could subdue or bow his stern, indomitable spirit; and, even when smarting under the lash, and reeking with blood from head to foot, he would still defy that master to his face, and pour upon him a torrent of bold, fierce, withering imprecations. It was Turk meeting Turk. But the gospel came ere-long to that negro's heart; it tamed the tiger into a lamb; and then did that very slave, once so full only of wrath and revenge, make it the burden of his daily prayers, that God would have mercy on his cruel, relentless oppressor. His infidel master, doubting his sincerity, and an utter stranger to his present spirit, treated him with greater severity than ever, and fiercely swore 'he'd whip the devil out of the villain;' but the poor slave, even while smarting, and writhing, and bleeding under the lash, would fall on his knees, and pray so much the more, 'God bless massa! God bless my *dear* massa!' This was too much even for depravity like his to bear long; and that very master, under the blessing of God upon such an exhibition of the Christian spirit, good returned for evil, love for hatred, prayers for bloody stripes, at length came himself to pray, and weep, and rejoice in Christ with his much abused, yet still affectionate and devoted, solely because regenerated slave. And when the time came for a public profession of their faith in their common Savior, you might have seen that master and his slave going hand in hand down into the water, there to seal the consecration of themselves to Him whose matchless love it is, rather than his almighty wrath, that subdues rebellious hearts to his sceptre.

Akin to this was the spirit of the martyr's mother. Some natives of an island in the East Indian ocean, exasperated by frequent acts of fraud and abuse, seized at length an American vessel, and committed outrages upon her crew. The insult was trumpeted through the world; and one of our war-ships (Potomac, 1832) was sent half way round the globe just to seek revenge, in the name of a Christian people, by burning a whole village, (Qualia Battoo,) and putting its inhabitants, men, women and children, to the sword. On the same island, two missionaries of the cross, (Munson and Lyman,) mistaken by the cannibals there,—only because mistaken,—for men of plunder and blood, were put to death, probably devoured for food; and, when the report of her son's untimely fate was carried by a venerable man of God to the

widowed mother of the fallen Lyman, she lifted her eyes to heaven streaming with tears, and said, 'I thank God for giving me a son to die in such a service, even by such a death; and Oh that I had another son to go, and preach the gospel to his murderers.' Not to carry, as we had sent, the death-dealing cannon, and hurl them by scores into a ruined eternity; but to bear, as Christ brought from heaven, offers of pardon and salvation as the only requital that her Christian spirit could desire even for the murder of her favorite, much-loved son. Here is the spirit of the gospel, the only spirit that ever did, or ever can use the means requisite for this world's conversion; and were it possible for the malignant, vindictive spirit of war to gangrene the bosom of every Christian on earth, not another missionary, not even another Bible or tract would ever go from Christian shores to light the lamp of life everlasting amid the six or eight hundred millions of our race now groping their way to eternity beneath the death-shades of paganism.

But war, likewise, tends in many ways to *neutralize the means of grace*. It shuts or steels the minds of men against their power. Were two professors of religion embroiled in a well-known disgraceful feud, would their impenitent neighbors be disposed to receive religious instruction from *their* lips? Should the members of a church come before the public in the fierce, shameful bickerings of an ecclesiastical warfare, would not the mass of irreligious minds be closed against their influence for good? Should a preacher of the gospel, stained with the blood of an enemy slain in duel or battle, enter the pulpit of your own church, would you not instantly shut against him every avenue to your heart? Yet such is the attitude in which the church of Christ has for centuries stood before the whole world. I know too well the power of depravity; but it was mainly the war-system of nations reputedly Christian that shut up China, Japan, and the countries round the Mediterranean, against the heralds of the cross. And can we wonder at their dread of a religion so strangely belied for ages by its warring votaries? What drew down the wrath of Burmah upon Judson and his co-workers? Not so much hatred of the gospel, as the dread of baptised warriors from England carrying, or threatening to carry fire and sword into the heart of her dominions.

Have Christians at length escaped the contaminations of war? Alas! the church is still pervaded more or less with the war-spirit, and continues her patronage of the war-system. Ministers of the Prince of Peace still apologize for its abominations, and children of the God of Peace still pray for his smiles upon its work of death, and pious parents still train some of their own sons to its trade of human butchery as the business of their life, and temples of Jehovah still ring, as they have for ages rung, with praises to his name for fleets sunk, for cities burnt to ashes, for empires covered with carnage and devastation, for thousands upon thousands of immortal souls hurried to their last account in guilt and blood! Such a spirit, essential to the very existence of the war-system, must tend greatly to neutralize the saving power of the gospel.

Few suspect how far the gospel is neutralized by the incidental

influences of war. In 1841 I visited a retired town in Massachusetts, and examined the records of its only church for more than a century previous. No battle had been fought there; no army, scarce a recruiting officer had prowled over or near it; nor had the ordinary means of grace been interrupted more than is common even in a time of peace. Yet mark the result. From 1729 to 1744, fourteen years of peace, 149 were added to the church; an average of nearly eleven a year. From the beginning of the old French war to the close of our Revolution in 1783, some forty years of military excitement, there were only 77 additions; less than two a year, or a diminution of more than five hundred per cent. from the previous period of peace. From 1810 to 1815, the time of our last war with two years of antecedent exasperation, only three persons were received into the church; one in a little less than two years! From 1830 to 1839 there were 183 additions; about nineteen a year, or an increase upon the last case of nearly four thousand per cent.! Thus we find the mere excitements of war diminishing the efficacy of essentially the same means, first more than 500 per cent., next some 2000 per cent., and finally almost 4000 per cent.; nor is it any exaggeration to say that war probably neutralizes four-fifths, if not nine-tenths of the saving power of the gospel!

How fearfully then must war tend to prevent *the indispensable influences of God's Spirit*. Vain without his blessing would be the labors of Paul or Gabriel; but will he succeed the instrumentality of those who breathe a war-spirit? Should all the churches in our land catch such a spirit, and cherish hatred instead of love, revenge in place of forgiveness, the entire cluster of war-passions, could they expect seasons of refreshing from the "presence of the Lord?" Let the war-mania pervade this whole nation; let the fierce, reckless strife of war-parties exasperate and convulse our entire population; let every city, every considerable village become a recruiting rendezvous with its riot, and revelry, and lust; let soldiers be quartered all over the country to trample on the Sabbath, indulge in drunkenness, debauchery, and every species of vice and villany; let our hills and valleys resound with the uproar of battle after battle, and twenty millions of people be lashed, like the chafed and wounded tiger, into rage and desperation; let ministers in the sanctuary, and pious women in their closets, while husbands and sons, fathers and brothers are far away on the battle-field hewing down the victims of their vengeance, beseech the Father of all to nerve the warrior's death-dealing arm, and give the weapons of blood their fullest effect in the slaughter of thousands upon thousands; and then, as reports of victory come, let shouts, and bonfires, and merry bells, and solemn processions, and fulsome eulogies, and songs of praise to the God of Peace, proclaim the wild outburst of joy from a whole people at a result so full of lamentation and wo for two worlds! Would the Spirit of God come to dwell amid such scenes?

But I cannot linger on a point so revolting; nor will I attempt to tell how this custom fosters ignorance, vice and crime;—how it

debases the understanding, and brutalizes more or less the whole inner man;—how it blinds or steels the mind to the truth of God;—how it sears or benumbs the conscience;—how it turns the heart into adamant;—how it makes the soul proof against the best means of grace;—how it gives rise or support to despotism, and slavery, and the slave-trade, and piracy, and robbery, and theft, and intemperance, and brutal licentiousness, and almost every form of sin you can well conceive.

How fast, then, must *war ripen souls for perdition*. It is a hot-bed of wickedness, a vast, prolific nursery of hell. It is Satan's master-device for the ruin of immortal souls. It sweeps them into the bottomless pit by wholesale, by thousands and millions! It has, at one time or another, made the whole earth one vast slaughter-yard of souls!

On this point I wish there were more room for doubt; but if our Savior meant what he said in telling us 'we must repent or perish, must be born again, or never see the kingdom of God;' if Paul was right in his solemn assurance, that "neither fornicators, nor adulterers, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God," how impossible to suppose that any considerable number of warriors, the great mass of whom answer so notoriously to the characters here given, can ever enter the world of glory!

How vast, then, the immediate ruin of souls by war! Shall I remind you of 200,000 lives lost by England alone in our Revolutionary war; of 70,000 at Waterloo and Quatre Bras; of 80,000 at Borodino; of 300,000 at Arbela; of 400,000 by Julius Cæsar in a single engagement: of no less than 15,000,000 Goths destroyed by Justinian in twenty years; of 32,000,000 slain by Jenghiz-khan alone in forty-one years; in the wars of the Turks, 60,000,000; in those of the Tartars, 80,000,000! God only knows—I dare not conjecture—how many souls this custom may, in all past time, have sent into eternity, reeking with unforgiven guilt; for the estimate of Dr. Dick, the lowest I have ever seen, puts the sum total of its victims at 14,000,000,000, eighteen times as many as all the present population of our globe!

Disciples of the Prince of Peace, has this cause no special claims on *you*? If peace is as truly a part of your religion as repentance or faith; if it must prevail over the whole earth before the millennium can ever come; if it is so essential to the success of the gospel in Christian lands, and to its spread and triumph through the world; if the salvation of souls is an object for which God gave up his own Son to the manger and the cross, provided all the means of grace, and required his people to pray, and toil, and be willing even to suffer and die; if war has ever been such a wholesale destroyer of souls, and done so much to prevent their conversion both at home and abroad; will the sons and daughters of the God of Peace, can *you* refuse to such a cause as this your cheerful, zealous, efficient support?

WAR AND THE HEARTH,

OR

THE INFLUENCE OF WAR ON DOMESTIC HAPPINESS.

THE custom of war, hostile to all the interests of mankind, is peculiarly fatal to domestic happiness. It forbids marriage to its agents, and thus prevents the rise of families among them, as incompatible with their vagrant trade of blood. It disregards and rudely sunders the bonds of home. To raise its armies, and man its fleets, it takes the brother from his sisters, and the son from his parents, the husband from his wife, and the father from his children; nor can its operations be carried on without a wide and fearful amount of misery not only to families residing in the midst of its ravages, but to a still greater number connected with its victims by ties of kindred or affection. The single battle of Waterloo called forth wailings of domestic grief from a whole continent; nor can the slightest victory be won without sending a thrill of anguish unknown through the heart of two nations.

Just imagine the process of manning a fleet or an army. It is indispensable to the war-system, that rulers should have authority to force into their service as many of their subjects as they please, by any process which they may deem necessary or expedient. In some countries, they call first for volunteers; yet most of these are obtained by false representations, or the use of intoxicating drinks. The beardless boy, the thriftless husband, the reckless, desperate adventurer, bereft of reason by the maddening bowl, are coaxed to the fatal pledge, and then hurried away from home and friends to the camp or the war-ship, and forced into the work of human butchery as the business of their life. Most commonly, however, the ranks of war are filled by some species of compulsion. In England press-gangs, in a time of war, prowl around every seaport, to seize on any seaman, if not upon any landsman, they may chance to find, and drag him, hand-cuffed and manacled, on board some war-ship. Not a poor man in the British empire is safe from this species of outrageous oppression; and yet has the practice been continued for so many ages as now to form a part of the common law of the land, and to be justified not only by popular leaders in Parliament, but by grave, upright judges, the brightest luminaries of English law, as indispensable to her war-system!

Nor is the process of procuring recruits on the continent of Europe less fatal to the peace and happiness of families. Its vast armies are raised mainly by conscription; a species of compulsion the practical workings of which are truly and touchingly sketched

by an English poet in the following tale of a French prisoner who fell under his notice :

“ Once I beheld a captive, whom the wars
 Had made an inmate of the prison-house,
 Cheering with wicker-work his dreary hours.
 I asked his story. In my native tongue,
 (Long use had made it easy as his own,)
 He answered thus : Before these wars began,
 I dwelt upon the willow banks of Loire.
 I married one who from my boyish days
 Had been my playmate. One morn, I'll ne'er forget,
 While choosing out the fairest little twigs,
 To warp a cradle for our child unborn,
 We heard the tidings, that the conscript-lot
 Had fallen on me. It came like a death-knell.
 The mother perished ; but the babe survived ;
 And, ere my parting day, his rocking couch
 I made complete, and saw him sleeping smile—
 The smile that played erst on the cheek of her,
 Who lay clay cold. Alas ! the hour soon came,
 That forced my fettered arms to quit my child.
 And whether now he lives to deck with flowers
 The sod upon his mother's grave, or lies
 Beneath it by her side, I ne'er could learn.
 I think he's gone ; and now I only wish
 For liberty and home, that I may see,
 And stretch myself, and die upon their grave.”

Of the heart-rending miseries incident to families from the progress of war, I hardly know where to begin, or where to end the illustrations furnished in all ages. Think of a siege or a battle, of a party of lawless, ruthless marauders, or the march of a brutal, exasperated army through a hostile or even a friendly country. ‘It is difficult,’ says an eye-witness, ‘for the inhabitants of a peaceful territory to conceive the miseries incident to the theatre of such a sanguinary contest as that between the French and the allied forces. While Napoleon, hemmed in on all sides, now menaced one of his foes, and now sprang furiously upon another, the scene of this desultory warfare was laid waste in the most merciless manner. The soldiers on both parts, driven to desperation, became reckless and pitiless ; and, straggling from their columns in all directions, they committed every species of excess upon the people. The peasants, with their wives and children, fled to caves, quarries and woods, where the latter were starved to death, and the former, collecting into small bodies, increased the terrors of war by pillaging the convoys of both armies, attacking small parties of all nations, and cutting off the sick, the wounded, and the stragglers. The repeated advance and retreat of the contending armies exasperated these evils ; for every fresh band of plunderers that arrived, was savagely eager after spoil in proportion as the gleaning became scarce. In the words of Scripture, ‘what the locust left, was devoured by the palmer-worm ;’ what escaped the Baskirs, and Kirgas, and Croats of the Wolga, the Caspian, and Turkish frontier, was seized by the half-starved conscripts of Napoleon, whom want, hardship, and an embittered

spirit rendered as careless of the ties of country as the others were indifferent to the general claims of humanity. The towns and villages that were the scenes of actual conflict, were frequently burnt to the ground; and thus was the distress of the people vastly increased by extending the terrors of battle, with its accompaniments of slaughter, fire and famine, into the most remote and sequestered districts. Even the woods afforded no concealment, the churches no sanctuary; nor did the grave itself protect the relics of mortality. The villages were every where burnt, the farms wasted and pillaged, the abodes of man, and all that belongs to peaceful industry and domestic comfort, desolated and destroyed to such a degree, that wolves and other savage animals increased fearfully in the districts thus laid waste by human hands, ferocious as their own.'

Let me quote a few facts from the late wars of Europe. Every reader of history is familiar with the terrible assault of the republican forces upon Toulon. From the heights of Pharan they at length poured down such volleys of musketry and grape-shot, that the English and Spaniards who had come to the relief of the place, were compelled to retreat, and seek refuge in their ships. And now ensued a scene of overwhelming confusion and distress. The wretched inhabitants followed them in crowds to the beach, and implored their protection. Great efforts were made to convey as many as possible on board the ships; numbers of miserable wretches vainly plunged for this purpose into the sea; and others still left behind, shot themselves to avoid a more terrible death from their enraged assailants. Thus were the ships loaded with a heterogeneous mixture of different nations, with men, women and infants, with the sick of the hospitals, and mangled soldiers from their posts with their wounds undressed; while the whole harbor resounded with the cries of distraction and agony for husbands, wives and children left on shore. The scene was horrible beyond description, and rendered still more so by the flames of the city rapidly spreading in every direction, and blazing ships threatening every moment to explode, and blow all around into the air.

Glance at a specimen or two of the miseries inflicted by a retreating army. 'Murder and devastation,' says an eye-witness, 'marked the footsteps of the French in their retreat from Portugal; every house was a sepulchre, a cabin of horrors! In one small village, I counted seventeen dead bodies of men, women and children; and most of the houses were burnt to the ground. In a small town called Safrea, I saw twelve dead bodies lying in one house upon the floor; and every house contained traces of their wanton barbarity.'—'Often were the ditches,' says another, 'literally filled with clotted, coagulated blood, as with mire; the bodies of peasants, put to death like dogs, were lying there horribly mangled; little naked infants, only a year old or less, were found besmeared in the mud of the road, transfixed with bayonet wounds; and in one instance I myself saw a babe, not more than a month old, with the bayonet left still sticking in its neck!'

Let us listen to the tale of an English officer on the same ill-

fated field. "Immediately after the capture of Ciudad Rodrigo, our soldiers, setting all restraint at defiance, and impelled by a brutish frenzy, gave loose to the foulest passions. Dispersed in parties of from four to thirty, they butchered the stragglers of the flying garrison, plundered the houses of the citizens, ransacked their cellars for liquor, and, brutalized by intoxication, sallied forth, yelling, and holding an infernal carnival of riot and burning, violation and massacre.

"Passing through a narrow street with two Scottish sergeants, I heard the shriek of a female; and, looking up, we saw at an open lattice, by the light of the lamp she bore, a girl about sixteen, her hair and dress disordered, and the expression of her olive countenance marked with anguish and extreme terror. A savage in scarlet uniform dragged her backward, accompanying the act with the vilest execrations in English. We entered the court-yard, where the hand of rapine had spared us the necessity of forcing a passage; and my companions, armed for whatever might ensue, kept steadily by me until we arrived at a sort of corridor, from the extremity of which issued the tones of the same feminine voice imploring mercy in the Spanish tongue. Springing forward, my foot slipped in a pool of blood; and, before I could recover, the door of the apartment whither we were hurrying, opened, and two soldiers of my own company discharged their muskets at us, slightly wounding one of the gallant Scots. Intemperance had blinded the ruffians, and frustrated their murderous intentions. We felled them to the ground, and penetrated into the chamber, where I had a hair-breadth escape from falling by the fury of another of the desperadoes. Parrying his bayonet which he aimed at my breast, I could not prevent its taking a less dangerous course, and lacerating my left cheek nearly from the lip to the eye; a frightful gash, but a light matter in comparison with the wretchedness visible around me.

"The room wherein we stood, contained the remnants of those decent elegancies which belong to the stranger's apartment in a dwelling of the middle class. Mutilated pictures, and fragments of expensive mirrors strewed the floor, which was uncarpeted, and formed of different kinds of wood curiously tessellated. An ebony cabinet, doubtless a venerable heir-loom, had suffered as if from the stroke of a sledge. Its contents, consisting of household documents, and touching domestic memorials, were scattered about at random. An antique sideboard lay overturned, and a torn mantilla on a sofa ripped, and stained with wine. The white drapery, on which fingers steeped in gore had left their traces, hung raggedly from the walls.

"Pinioning our prisoners, we barricaded the doors against intrusion, and proceeded to offer all the assistance and consolation in our power to the inmates of the desecrated mansion. On investigation, the sergeants found the dead body of a domestic whose fusil and dagger showed that he had fought for the roof which covered him. His beard had been burned in derision with gunpowder, and one of his ears was cut off, and thrust into his mouth!

In a garret recess for the storage of fruit, two female servants were hidden, who could scarcely be persuaded that they had nothing to fear. Having fled thither at the approach of their ferocious intruders, they had suffered neither injury nor insult. They came to the room where I lingered over an object unconscious, alas! of my commiseration, and calling, in accents half choked by sobs, upon Donna Clara! I pointed to the alcove where the heart-broken lady had flung herself on the bleeding corpse of her gray-haired father. She too might have had a sheltering place, could her filial piety have permitted her to remain there when her high-spirited sire feebly strove to repel the violaters of his hearth. Master of a few Spanish phrases, I used them in addressing some words of comfort to the ill-starred girl. They were to her as the song of the summer-bird carolled to despair. Her sole return was a faintly recurring plaint which seemed to say, 'let my soul depart in peace!' I motioned to her attendants to separate her from her father's corpse; but they could not do it without a degree of force bordering on violence. Bidding them desist, I signified a desire that they should procure some animating restorative. A flask of wine was brought. The sergeants withdrew. One of the women held the lamp, while the other gently raised the head of her mistress. Kneeling by the couch in the alcove, I poured a little of the liquor into a glass, applied it to her lips, and then took it away, until I had concealed my uniform beneath the torn mantilla.

"I bless an all-merciful God that I have not a second time been doomed to witness aught so overwhelming in wo as the situation of that young and beautiful creature! She had battled with a might exceeding the strength of her sex, against nameless indignities, and she bore the marks of the conflict. Her maidenly attire was rent into shapelessness; her brow was bruised and swollen; her abundant hair, almost preternaturally black, streamed wildly over her bosom, revealing in its interstices fresh waving streaks of crimson which confirmed the tale of ultra-barbarian violence; and her cheek had borrowed the same fatal hue from the neck of her slaughtered parent, to whom, in her insensibility, she still clung with love strong in death! Through the means adopted, she gave tokens of reviving. Her hand still retained a small gold cross, and she raised it to her lips. The clouded lids were slowly expanded from her large dark eyes. A low, agonizing moan followed. I hastened to present the wine; but in the act the mantilla, concealing my uniform, fell from the arm which conveyed the glass. She shrieked appallingly, became convulsed, passed from fit to fit, and expired!"

Nor is this vivid, truthful picture of the woes carried by war into the bosom of families, a solitary case. War abounds with them, and cannot rage without multiplying them by hundreds and thousands. On the capture of Hamburg in 1813, the soldiers, with drawn swords and loaded muskets, ran from house to house, demanding of the citizens, *your money and your women, or your life, INSTANTLY!* All this, too, after they had suffered during the siege an incredible amount of cruelty and distress. The French com-

mander, Davoust, fortified the city, says Bourienne, 'at incalculable loss to the inhabitants. From the immense stores heaped up in the place, the garrison was plentifully supplied, while provisions in the town were to be obtained with much difficulty even in small quantities, and for exorbitant prices. All the horses were seized for the artillery; the best were selected, and the rest slaughtered in the streets, and the flesh distributed to the soldiers, while the inhabitants, pressed with famine, bought the hides at a dear rate. At length provisions began to fail in December, and all useless mouths were ordered to leave the city on pain of receiving fifty strokes of the bastinado. Still the inhabitants clung to their natal soil; and there was issued on the 25th an order which declared that, out of compassion, twenty-four hours longer would be granted, when all found in the city, who could not contribute to its defence, should be considered as in league with the enemy, and consequently liable to be shot! But even this was not enough; and on one of the last and coldest nights in December, all the proscribed, without distinction of age or sex, health or sickness, were torn from their beds, and carried beyond the walls.'

What safety or repose for families during an assault upon the city where they dwell! When the English fleet was bombarding Copenhagen, and every woman and child was flying in terror from the destructive missiles, and from burning and falling houses, a little child was seen running across the street for shelter he knew not where, when a rocket struck the poor innocent, and dashed him to pieces! In 1845, an old bomb-shell, dug out of the sand, and brought into the city of New York to be used as old iron, accidentally exploded, and killed several men. 'Guided by hundreds who were rushing to the spot,' says an eye-witness, 'I entered Charlton street, and observed on both sides for some distance, that the windows were entirely demolished, the doors shattered, and holes actually blown through the sides of the houses, large enough in one case, some forty rods from the spot of the explosion, for a man to enter. Upon the side-walk in front of a shop of old iron, lay some thirty or forty rusty bomb-shells about eight inches in diameter. It was said by the crowd, that a man had one of these between his knees, endeavoring to loosen the charge with a stick, when it exploded, and produced the terrible scene before me. The body of the man was torn to pieces, and scattered through the streets. Observing a crowd around an object at a short distance, I approached, and saw apparently a large piece of butcher's meat which a boy was pushing about with his foot;—it proved to be the lower part of a man's leg, with the crushed bones, and mangled flesh! 'The other leg,' said a by-stander, 'was blown over into Hudson street.' I saw a crowd collected around a window-sill, gazing at some object;—it was a man's hand, torn from his body, and thrown with violence against the wall, the fingers burnt, and crushed, and blackened. The mangled trunk of the unfortunate man, headless and limbless, had been carried into the house, and the shrieks of his wife were now heard over the bloody remains. Upon an iron window frame lay the torn body of another

man, already dead, and his blood and brains dripping down upon the pavement. Two young men, who happened to be passing by in the middle of the street, were literally blown up into the air, and fell with broken and mangled limbs, and both died the next day. Such was the horrid execution of a single shell; and yet Napoleon, in less than ten hours, threw three thousand such projectiles into the heart of Vienna, three hundred every hour, five every minute, crashing through the roofs of dwellings, and exploding at the fireside, in the infant's cradle, or on the couches of the sick!

I will not here quote such horrid instances as Magdeburg in the seventeenth century; but look at Dresden in 1813. 'To the public distress from other causes, were added the ravages of a contagious fever among the inhabitants. No less than three hundred of the citizens alone were carried off by it every week; and two hundred dead bodies were every day brought out of the military hospitals. Such was the accumulation in the church-yards, that the grave-diggers could not inter them; and they were laid naked, in ghastly rows, along the place of sepulture. The bodies were heaped in such numbers on the dead carts, that they frequently fell from them; and the wheels gave a frightful sound in cracking the bones of the bodies which thus lay in the streets. The hospital attendants and carters trampled down the corpses in the carts, like baggage or straw, to make room for more; and not unfrequently some of the bodies gave signs of life, and even uttered shrieks, under this harsh usage! Several bodies, thrown into the Elbe for dead, were revived by the sudden immersion in cold water; and the wretches were vainly struggling in the waves by which they were soon swallowed up!'

The battle-field makes terrible havoc of domestic sympathies and hopes. I once read of a devoted wife who left her babes, and walked some forty miles to see her husband in the army. She arrived the night before a battle, and contrived, by a dexterous appeal to the sentinel's heart, to gain admission to her husband's tent. The hours sped swiftly away, and the dawn heard the signal for battle. She hurried from his fond embrace with many a tender kiss for his babes, but lingered near the scene, and watched from a neighboring hill every movement of the two armies, until the combat ceased, and all was quiet once more. The shades of night now hang in gloom over that battle-ground, and forbid all search for the wounded, the dying, or the dead. Morn approaches; and with its earliest dawn this faithful wife, with a throbbing heart, wanders over that field of slaughter to see if the father of her babes has fallen. Alas, it is too true! There he is, all covered with gore. She sinks on his bosom in a swoon, and rises no more!

"For two or three days after the battle of Vittoria," says a British officer, "I was employed in collecting the guns and various articles scattered over the battle-ground, and along the road. In one part, very near a half-destroyed barouche, I found a very interesting and beautiful letter written in English, and addressed to his wife by a Monsieur Thiebault, once treasurer to Joseph

Bonaparte. With a little trouble, I discovered not less than twenty written by the same person in the same amiable and affectionate strain. I gathered them up, and carried them home, rejoicing in my treasure. In the evening I went to a café, and seeing there several of the French officers who had been taken, I asked one if he knew a Mons. Thiebault? 'Extremely well,' he replied; 'he was killed the other day by a chance-shot among the baggage; his son, now a prisoner, is quite disconsolate; and his wife, a most sweet woman, a native of Scotland, left only the day before for Bayonne, and is still ignorant of her irreparable loss.'—There was another touching case in the same battle. "A pay-master of a British regiment had two sons in his own regiment, both lieutenants. He was a widower, and had no relations beside those youths; they lived in his tent, and were his pride and delight. The civil staff usually remain with the baggage when the troops engage, and join them with it afterwards; and when this pay-master came up in the evening, an officer met him. 'My boys,' said the old man, 'how are they? Have they done their duty?' 'They have behaved most nobly; but you have lost'—'Which of them?' 'Alas! sir, both are dead.'"

In a sea-fight of the ship *Swallow*, a seaman named Phelan had a wife on board stationed, as usual, to assist the surgeon in his care of the wounded as they were brought below. Among these was one of Phelan's messmates whose dying agonies she was endeavoring to console, when she chanced to hear that her husband was wounded, and, rushing instantly on deck, she received the wounded tar in her arms. He faintly raised his head to kiss her. She burst into a flood of tears, and told him, like a true wife, to take courage, all might yet be well; but scarcely had she uttered the last syllable, when a shot took off her head! The poor tar, closely folded in her arms, opened his eyes once more, then shut them forever!

At the siege of Antwerp in 1833, a young French officer fell in the trenches; and his father, on being informed of his death, hastened from Paris to fetch his body. From Marshal Gerard he obtained permission to take away the beloved remains, that his wife might once more see her son even in death. They were laid in an open shell, and wrapped in a winding sheet, but so as to leave the face and neck exposed. Though the youth had been dead fifteen days, his corpse yet looked fresh. The shell containing it was placed lengthwise in a carriage so narrow, that, in sitting by the side of it, the father's arm rested on the breast of his son; but the venerable old man bore this trying situation with great firmness. Having rested at Brussels, he prepared, at the midnight hour, to proceed with his precious charge; and calmly seating himself by its side, he merely remarked, "I shall now ride with my dear son for the last time." Thus he bore those remains to the fond mother; but her anguish over them can be better imagined than described.

What domestic desolation must come from such a battle as that of Waterloo, or a campaign like that of Napoleon in Russia! The

former was said to have clothed no small part of England in mourning; and of the latter Bourienne exclaims, "How many wives and mothers in France could not, without a palpitating heart, break the cover of the official gazette! How many families lost their support and their hope! Never were more tears shed. In vain did the cannon of the Invalids thunder forth the announcement of a victory. How many thousands, in the silence of retirement, were even then preparing the external symbols of mourning! It is still remembered that for the long space of six months, the black dresses of Paris presented a very striking sight in every part of the city."

Glance at one scene in the campaign of 1794-5. 'We could not,' says an eye-witness, 'proceed a hundred yards without perceiving the dead bodies of men, women and children. One scene made an impression which time can never efface. Near a cart we saw a stout looking man, and a beautiful young woman with an infant about seven months old at the breast, all three frozen and dead! The mother must have expired in the act of suckling her child, as she lay on the drifted snow with one breast exposed, and the milk apparently drawn in a stream from the nipple by the babe, and instantly congealed. The infant seemed as if its lips had but just been disengaged, and its little head reposed on its mother's bosom with an overflow of milk frozen as it trickled from the mouth.'

There is another class of domestic sufferings from war at which decency blushes. I will not stain these pages with minute examples; but take a case of suicidal escape from such outrages. A subaltern officer in Russia, having conceived a passion for a fine looking peasant girl, used every art to win her affections; but, finding all his efforts ineffectual, he applied to the commanding officer who immediately issued an order for the couple to be forthwith joined in wedlock. The parents remonstrated, but in vain. The day fixed for the marriage arrived, and the boor accompanied his devoted daughter; but, just as the priest was about to legalize the union, the aged father, in a fit of desperation, plunged a knife into her heart, and, presenting her to the soldier, exclaimed, 'there, sir, is your victim!'

How much do the poor in their humble abodes suffer from war! Take two cases of privateering related by the perpetrators themselves. 'These prizes are of little or no value to us,' remarks one, 'because we can get nobody to purchase them; but the poor, unhappy people who lose them, have lost their all. It would need a heart of stone to see the sorrow painted on their countenances when brought on board. Some of them retire into corners, and weep like children. If you ask what is the matter, a flood of tears is the answer. Sometimes you will hear them sob out—*My wife! my children! O what will become of them?* I have been more than once obliged to avoid the affecting sight, unable to restrain my own tears, or to prevent theirs. It is far worse when a capture is made after an engagement—the mangled bodies of my fellow-creatures lying pale and breathless on the deck, some dying, and

others begging me to put them out of their miseries, while a hungry dog is lapping up the blood that streams all about the ship!'— 'We were some ten miles from Marseilles,' says the narrator of the other case, 'when we saw a small vessel anchored in a narrow bay; and, fierce for prize-money, we manned a boat, and pushed forward till we came within pistol-shot of the craft, without seeing any one except an old woman seated in the door of a cottage at some distance. Just then a musket-shot from behind a rock laid our bowman a corpse, another disabled our marine, a third tore his cravat from the lieutenant's neck, and a fourth crippled the coxswain's arm. Still we saw no one; and, exasperated by these discharges, we gave three cheers, and, pulling for the place whence they seemed to come, saw at length a man and a boy running from us. We interchanged several shots in vain, until the lieutenant, resting his musket on a rock, shot the child while in the act of handing a cartridge to the man. The father instantly threw down his musket, and fell by the side of his son. We seized his musket; but he paid no attention to us. When we bade him follow us, he heeded us not; but, with the child's head in his lap, he kept wiping away the blood that oozed from the wound in his forehead, and neither wept nor spoke, but watched the last chilling shiver of his boy with an eye of inexpressible sadness. Then he jumped from the ground with a frantic air; the marine brought his bayonet to the charge, and the miserable father tried to run upon its point; but the marine, dropping his musket, encircled him in his arms. We desired him to lead us to the cottage. The marine carried the corpse, and the father walked by its side in silence, till we suddenly came upon the rear of the cottage. The old woman was still at her wheel, and, on discovering her son a prisoner, gave a shriek which announced to a lovely female in the hut that something painful had occurred. She rushed to assist her mother—her eye fell first upon her dead son in the arms of an enemy; and, seizing the boy, she tore him from the marine, kissed him more like a maniac than a mother, and, giving one deep, piercing sigh, fell at her mother's feet. We could stand it no longer, and hastened away; but that scene I can never blot from my memory.'

The late English war in China furnishes some revolting instances of the domestic desolation consequent on this trade of blood. 'In almost every house the children had been madly murdered. The bodies of most of these victims were found lying usually in the chambers of the women, as if each father had assembled his whole family before the massacre; in some instances these poor little sufferers were the next day still breathing, and writhing in the agony of a broken spine; the way in which they were usually put to death. In one house were found in a single room the bodies of seven dead and dying persons. It was evidently the abode of a man of some consideration; and the delicate forms and features of the sufferers indicated the high elevation of their rank. On the floor, essaying in vain to put food into the mouths of two young children that were writhing in the agonies of death from dislocated spines, sat a decrepit old man, weeping bitterly at

the piteous moans and convulsive breathings of the poor infants. On a bed near these children, lay a beautiful young woman apparently asleep; but she was cold, and had long been dead. One arm clasped her neck, over which a silk scarf was thrown to conceal the gash in her throat which had destroyed life. Near her was the corpse of a woman somewhat older, her features distorted as if she had died by strangulation; not far from her lay a dead child stabbed through the neck; and in a narrow verandah adjoining, were the corpses of two more women suspended by their necks from the rafters. They were both young, one quite a girl; and her features, in spite of their hideous distortion from the mode of her death, still retained traces of their original beauty.'

Let us select two instances from the war of our own revolution. A state of fierce, almost savage exasperation existed between the whigs and tories; and a party of the latter, on capturing a Capt. Huddy from New Jersey, barbarously hung him with an insulting label on his bosom. This excited general indignation, and the people of that state urged Washington to secure justice for the murder, or make retaliation. A grand council of war held on the subject, came to the unanimous conclusion, that there should be retaliation, that the victim should be of equal rank with Capt. Huddy, and be designated by lot. The lot fell on Capt. Asgill, a young man of nineteen, the only son of a British nobleman. When the tidings, which interested many in his fate, reached England, his sister was sick with a delirious fever, and his father so near his end that his family did not venture to inform him of the affair. The mother applied to the king and queen in behalf of her son, and wrote an impassioned letter to the French minister. 'The subject,' says she, 'on which I implore your assistance, is too heart-rending to be dwelt on. My son, my only son, dear to me as he is brave, amiable as he is beloved, only nineteen years of age, a prisoner of war, is at present confined in America as an object of reprisal. Figure to yourself, sir, the situation of a family in these circumstances. Surrounded with objects of distress, bowed down with grief, words are wanting to paint the scenes of misery around me. My husband given over by his physicians some hours before the arrival of this news, not in a condition to be informed of it; and my daughter attacked by a delirious fever, and speaking of her brother in tones of wildness without any interval of reason, unless it be to listen to some circumstances which may console her heart. Let your own sensibility conceive my profound, inexpressible misery, and plead in my favor for a son born to abundance, to independence, and the happiest prospects. Permit me once more to entreat your interference; but, whether my request be granted or not, I am confident you will pity the distress by which it is prompted, and your humanity will drop a tear on my fault, and blot it out forever.'

The other case is still more touching. Col. Hayne, of South Carolina, a man of high character, endeared to all that knew his worth, and bound fast to life by six small children, and a wife tenderly beloved, was taken prisoner by the British, and sentenced to

be hung! His wife, falling a victim to disease and grief combined, did not live to plead for her husband; but great and generous efforts were made for his rescue. A large number, both Americans and Englishmen, interceded in his behalf; the ladies of Charleston signed a petition for his release; and his six motherless children were presented on their knees as humble suitors for the life of their father. It was all in vain; for war has no heart but of iron. His eldest son, a lad about thirteen years old, was permitted, as a special favor, to stay with him awhile in prison. On seeing his father loaded with irons, and condemned to die on the gallows, the poor boy was overwhelmed with consternation and grief. The wretched father tried to console him by various considerations, and added, 'to-morrow, my son, I set out for immortality; you will follow me to the place of my execution; and, when I am dead, take my body, and bury it by the side of your dear mother.' Overcome by this appeal, the boy threw his arms around his father's neck, crying, 'O my father, I'll die with you! I *will* die with you, father!' The wretched father, still loaded down with irons, was unable to return his son's embrace, and merely said in reply, 'no, my son, never! Live to honor God by a good life; live to serve your country, and to take care of your brother and little sisters.'

The next morning, Col. Hayne was led forth to execution. That fond and faithful boy accompanied him; and, when they came in sight of the gallows, the father turned to him, and said, 'now, my son, show yourself a man. That tree is the boundary of my life, and all its sorrows. Beyond that, the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are forever at rest. Don't, my son, lay our separation too much at heart; it will be short at longest. It was but the other day your dear mother died; to-day I die; and you, my son, though young, must follow us shortly.' 'Yes, my father,' replied the broken-hearted boy, 'I *shall* follow you shortly; for I feel indeed that I can't, can't live long.' And so it was; for, on seeing his much-loved father first in the hands of the executioner, and then struggling in the halter from the gallows, he stood transfixed with horror. Till then he had all along wept profusely as some relief to his agonized feelings; but that sight!—it dried up the fountain of his tears;—he never wept again. His reason reeled on the spot; he became an incurable maniac; and in his last moments, he called out, and kept calling out for his father in tones that drew tears from the hardest hearts.

Such is the influence of war on domestic happiness. And must its baleful ravages still continue? Shall such a fiend from hell be permitted to prowl in pollution, blood and tears over this only Eden of earth? Husbands and fathers, wives and mothers, sons and brothers, sisters and daughters! will you make no vigorous, determined, persevering efforts to banish from Christendom, if not from the whole world, this deadliest foe to your present and immortal welfare?

PLAIN SKETCHES OF WAR.

BY R. P. STEBBINS,

PRES. THEOL. SEM., MEADVILLE, PA.

WAR is acknowledged by most to be one of the greatest evils; but still there is upon this subject a carelessness truly alarming. When the tocsin is sounded, and our fathers and brothers are giving us their last farewell, then we weep; but it is too late for repentance. We must not wait till the day of trial comes, before we prepare to meet it. We must adopt the motto of the warrior, as we do his other principles, by inversion: "*in time of peace prepare for PEACE.*"

But how shall we prepare for peace? Spend the money, now squandered for warlike preparations, in educating the people. Better, if we would keep peace, sell our arsenals and muskets, our war-ships and swords, and buy spelling-books, and turn our generals and commodores into school-masters, than increase our army and navy. To prevent war, be unprepared for it; so when the passions are up, they will have time to subside ere we can act. A war-like spirit and preparation is the most active and deadly foe of peace. Who is the peaceful man,—he who carries his dirk and pistols, or he who is unarmed, and careful in the discharge of his duties? In what neighborhood would you prefer to live for safety's sake;—in that where knives and dirks were worn and used, or in that where no such weapons were named or known? The spirit of war, the military spirit, is the one which will plunge us into blood.

The advocates for war dare not impose for its support a direct tax upon the people. They would not bear it; they would rebel; and their rebellion would be as justifiable as the war they are indirectly taxed to pay for. But this draining of our pockets does not come to us in the revolting shape of a tax. It sweetens our tea, smokes in our coffee, pleases in our books, adorns and warms in our vestments. We never think that we are paying more than the real value of the article bought, when we make a purchase. This is the reason why war is thought by so many to be a money-making business. But the cost is none the less real, nor the destruction of property any the less deplorable, for not being directly perceived. Since the commencement of the Revolution we have expended (1836) \$450,000,000 for war and warlike preparations, and only \$90,000,000 for civil purposes. If a direct tax was imposed upon us for our warlike preparations, our navies and arms would be sunk in the depths of the ocean to-morrow.

The national debt of England is nearly four thousand millions of dollars; a debt produced by war. The interest on that debt, and the parts of it which have been liquidated, amount to more than

ten times as much more, or more than thirty thousand millions of dollars. And what has she obtained in return? Ask the depths of the ocean; and the sunken fleets of Trafalgar and the Nile will answer. She has gained the fame of making her "Lion" roar over the vanquished armada, of "letting slip the dogs of war" upon the palmy shores of Hindostan, of giving Wellington immortality upon the plains of Waterloo. And is this all? No. It has erected monuments in Westminster Abbey to the greatest butchers of our race that ever lived; it has written poverty upon the foreheads of a majority of her laborers; it has crushed the many with burdensome taxes to honor the destroyers of our race with a name,—a name which, if society understood its interests as it ought, would only render its possessor detestable.

Give me the money that has been spent in war, and I will purchase every foot of land upon the globe. I will clothe every man, woman and child in an attire that kings and queens would be proud of; I will build a school house upon every hill side, and in every valley over the whole habitable earth; I will supply that school house with a competent teacher; I will build an academy in every town, and endow it; a college in every State, and fill it with able professors; I will crown every hill with a church consecrated to the promulgation of the gospel of peace; I will support in its pulpit an able teacher of righteousness, so that on every Sabbath morning the chime on one hill should answer to the chime on another, round the earth's broad circumference; and the voice of prayer, and the song of praise, should ascend like an universal holocaust to heaven. The darkness of ignorance would flee before the bright light of the sun of science; paganism would be crushed by the fall of her temples, shaken to their deep foundations by the voice of truth; war would no more stalk over the earth, trampling under his giant tread all that is beautiful and lovely beneath the sky. This is not fancy; I wish it was; for it reflects upon the character of man. It is the darkest chapter in human depravity thus to squander God's richest blessings upon passion and lust.

Our religion forbids fighting. So the early Christians understood it; and they went to the stake rather than take up arms. It was one of the charges made by the heathen against the Christians, that they would not fight; and they vindicated themselves by saying that their religion forbade it. War tells us to cherish hatred towards those whom Christianity commands us to love. What would be said to you by an army, were you to exhort them, upon the eve of a battle, to love their enemies, to cherish feelings of good-will towards those whom they were about to destroy? Would not many a lip of scorn be curled at you? Would you not be told that such doctrine would do for the church, not for the battle-field? Would not the commander-in-chief order you to be seized for preaching treachery to his troops? Where in the code of war do you find the broad, deep, unbounded love of the New Testament inculcated on soldiers? Are they not commanded to kill, to wreak vengeance on their enemies? Of what nature is that

spirit which burns in the bosoms of those who fight for hire? Is it the spirit of love, of forgiveness? Can there be love in the bosom of that man who returns from the field exulting in the death of his foe? Go to the army, and hear the prayers there offered; and tell me what spirit he is of, who prays that the aim of the musket may secure its victim, and the roar of the cannon be the requiem of thousands, and the sea weeds be the winding-sheet of men? Are these the sentiments of Christianity? How can love consist in doing harm, unmixed harm? "Love," says Paul, "worketh no ill to its neighbor." What! encourage men to mangle and hew each other to pieces, to cherish the spirit of love! Lead out men to fight, teach them to gash and shoot each other, just to make them tender-hearted!

The *trade* of the warrior is to injure; his sworn duty, to harm; his office, to destroy. It may be said, this evil is done that good may come out of it. Do evil that good may come! Not so thought Paul. This is the rule of Christianity, do good, only good. Does any one say, it is no evil to war? Its sole aim is to harm, to injure, to kill. Follow the track of a victorious army. Why do I call it victorious? Because desolation, misery and death are in its path. See the fertile fields laid waste; the ravaged village smouldering in ruins; birds of prey uttering their cries, hastening to devour; children flying, imploring the protection of their pale and trembling mothers, who are themselves exposed to the brutality of the soldiers, and fear life more than death; sons gnawing the ground in the agony of the death-struggle; fathers lifting up imploring hands for protection, only to be pinned to the earth with the bayonet; husbands begging for a drop of water, or praying to be run through with the sword, to relieve them from their misery, their excruciating torture; groans from the mangled, and wails from the expiring. This is war; these are the deeds of love which are performed on the battle-field; this the mercy which exercises its kind offices in war; this the forgiveness which soldiers offer to their enemies!

Go with me to the field of battle, and tell me if it is not an arena of the worst passions which burn in the human bosom; tell me if Christ's religion teaches men to do this; tell me if he taught the sword to devour, the fire to burn, the bullet to mangle God's image; tell me if loving ever covered a field with slaughter, with the dead and dying; if praying for those who injure us, ever carried pain to the domestic circle, and caused widows and orphans to pour forth tears like water. Go with me to the hospitals, and see the misery which war brings with it, and tell me whether Christianity ever achieved such deeds of darkness, spread such a curtain of sackcloth over human prospects!

Look at that majestic ship on the bosom of the ocean. See the thousand human beings on board, their bosoms swelling high with hope, their hearts beating with pride. In the distance, a flag is seen streaming upon the edge of the waters. It is the enemy's. The running to and fro—the bustle—the confusion—the imprecations upon the foe—the oaths—the curses—tell what deeds of darkness are to be done. One short hour is enveloped in smoke, and

that beautiful ship is sinking beneath the waves, its snowy canvass torn and stripped, its deck slippery with human blood, fragments of human bodies strewed every where, the sea crimsoned with the current of life, the cockpit filled with those who are enduring every extremity of torture. Now a smile of joy lights up the distorted features of these mangled victims; word is passed that the enemy's ship is foundering, a shout of victory goes up from those parched and dying lips, and down they go, victor and vanquished, a thousand fathoms into the boiling ocean. What a triumph this! What a work for Christian hands! What a dying hour for a disciple of the Prince of Peace! What a condition in which to meet Him who died for his foes!

Shall I be told, that a nation may be insulted, if it will not fight? I answer, it insults itself, if it does; a far greater evil. I shall be asked, if *defensive* war is wrong; but what *is* defensive war? Can it be defined? Is it not an intangible idea in the minds of most persons? But granting that revenge, retaliation, rendering evil for evil, were the spirit of Christianity, it would be a very uncertain rule to act upon. Indeed, it could not be acted upon at all; caprice and passion alone would decide the justice or injustice of the war. What nation has ever taken up arms, which has not stoutly contended that she was maintaining her rights? Not one.—Shall I be told, that the nation that declares war first, is in the wrong? Then our revolutionary war was wrong; then the Polish war was wrong.—Shall I be told, that nations have a right to resist oppression, to rebel if unjust laws are imposed? Who is to decide whether the law *is* unjust or not;—the party imposing the law, or the party obeying it? Not the party imposing the law, or *we* were wrong in our Revolution. So Greece, Poland, South America, every free state upon the earth. Nor can you give to the subject this right of adjudication; for then you would annihilate all government. If an individual or a community may shoot down the man who comes delegated to enforce a law, because they do not like it, “chaos and old night” would again set up their kingdom on the earth. The Pennsylvania and Massachusetts rebellions would be right; the Baltimore and New York mobs would be right. What, then, is defensive war? Why does this intangible idea float in the minds of so many, that defensive wars are right, when a defensive war cannot be defined? The truth is, men see wars right, when they think that they are for their own interest.—It is said, again, that a man may fight for his liberty, that he is solemnly, religiously bound to fight for it. How much liberty may he fight for? How much must he be oppressed before he may “render evil for evil?” Let the amount be defined. This cannot be done. No man can tell how deep the chain shall have cut into the flesh before the sufferer may stab his master. It may be a tax of three cents per pound on tea; it may be a stain upon that airy nothing, national honor; or it may be slavery in its worst forms.

GRIMKÉ ON PEACE.

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF
THOMAS S. GRIMKÉ.

THE DELUSIONS AND SUICIDAL RESULTS OF WAR.

WAR is the law of violence, PEACE the law of love. That law of violence prevailed without mitigation, from the murder of Abel to the advent of the Prince of Peace. During all that period of forty centuries, war appeared to be the great end of all the institutions of society. Governments seemed to be successfully organized, only when strong for the destruction of others. Rulers were deemed fortunate and illustrious only when marches and battle-fields, burning cities and shattered navies were the trophies of their renown. The warrior was the great man, and peace was regarded as worthy only of the vulgar, ignorant multitude; as the natural state *not of the free, but of the slave*. The spirit of all those ages was embodied in the sentiment of Cleomenes: Homer is the poet of the Spartans, because he sings of war; Hesiod of the Helots, because agriculture is his theme. War was considered as the only natural state of government in all its forms of despotism, oligarchy and democracy. Even in the comparatively free states of Greece and Italy, war was the master passion of the people, the master spring of government. The republicans of antiquity appear to have lived in vain, unless they died in battle; and all the vital powers of their government were so entirely military, that they perished as soon as they lost the capacity to make war successfully. With war, as the prevailing spirit of all their institutions, these republics demonstrated *how utterly unfit the people are to govern themselves, if the law of violence be the fundamental law of their social compact*; that, if nations, though comparatively free and enlightened, live by the sword, they shall perish by the sword; *that the law of violence is the law of murder to others, of suicide to ourselves*.

We might have imagined, if history had not attested the reverse, that an experiment of four thousand years would have sufficed to prove, that the rational ends of society can never be attained by constructing its institutions in conformity with the standard of war; but the sword and the torch had been eloquent in vain. A thousand battle-fields, white with the bones of brothers, were counted as idle advocates in the cause of justice and humanity. Ten thousand cities, abandoned to the cruelty and licentiousness of the soldiery, and burnt, or dismantled, or razed to the ground, pleaded in vain against the law of violence. The river, the lake, the sea, crimsoned with the blood of fellow-citizens, and neighbors, and strangers, had lifted up their voices in vain to denounce the folly and wickedness of war. The shrieks and agonies, the rage and hatred, the

wounds and curses of the battle-field, and the storm and the sack, had scattered in vain their terrible warnings throughout all lands. In vain had the insolent Lysander destroyed the walls, and burnt the fleets of Athens, to the music of her own female flute players. In vain had the disgrace and the sufferings of Miltiades and Nicias, of Themistocles, Pausanias and Alcibiades, of Marius and Sylla, of Hannibal, Pompey and Cæsar, filled the nations with pity and dismay. The lamentations of the widow, and the tears of the orphan, the broken hearts of age, and the blasted hopes of youth, and beauty, and love, had pleaded in vain against the law of violence. The earth had drunk in the life-blood of the slain, and hidden their mangled bodies in her bosom; and there the garden, the orchard and the harvest flourished once more beautiful in the tints of nature, and rich in the melody of fount, and leaf, and breeze. The waters had swallowed into their depths the dying and the dead, and the ruined fleets both of victor and vanquished; and again the waves danced in their sportiveness, or rushed in their fury, over the battle-plain of hostile navies. The innocence of childhood had forgotten the parent's death, the widow had recovered the lost smile of former years, the miserable old man had been gathered to his fathers, and affection had found new objects for its attachments. The ancient and modern Assyrian, the Babylonish, Median and Persian empires; the kingdoms of ancient and modern Egypt, of Judah and Israel, and of all the successors of Alexander; the commercial states of Tyre, and Rhodes, and Carthage; the republics of Greece and Italy, and the barbarians of Spain, and Gaul, and Germany, Switzerland and Belgium, had submitted to the all-conquering eagle. The terrible judgment, "all they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword," had been written in letters of blood on the land and the ocean, on the palaces of kings, and the cottages of peasants, on the senate houses of the people, and the temples of their false and cruel gods. The Roman empire, the grave of a hundred states, was destined to illustrate more remarkably than all the preceding nations, that the law of violence is a self-destroyer. Her power had been constantly extending nearly eight hundred years, till a single city had swelled to the magnitude of an empire embracing the fairest portions of Africa, Europe and Asia. *But her law had ever been, and was still, the law of violence.* Her battle shout of defiance had pierced the deep gloom of the Hercynian forest; and the Goth, the Burgundian, the Vandal and the Hun, came down to the feast of victory at the trumpet-summons. Their progress was terrific, as when the mountain torrent rushes in its fury to sweep away the vineyard and the harvest, the peasant's cabin, the shepherd and his flock. The Pyrenees, the Alps, and the Balkan range were feeble barriers against the children of eternal snows; and, as the barbarians poured down from those mountain summits the wild music of their battle songs over the beautiful and delicious regions of Iberia, Italy and Greece, the Roman empire confessed in her agony of fear, that the sword was her only title to all her dominions from the rising to the setting sun. What pencil

can faithfully picture the terrible realities of that ferocious struggle? The Roman empire, the mightiest structure of the whole ancient world, **ITSELF THE COLOSSAL TEMPLE OF WAR**, perished by the sword and faggot of barbarians. The august colonades that towered along the shores of the Atlantic, and the banks of the Euphrates, were defaced and shattered. The vast roof which had sheltered a hundred nations, the walls whose ample circuit had embraced a continent of territory, were rent, and cast down, and scattered far and wide. Even the very shrine and altar of the god of war, the self-styled eternal city, was burnt, and sacked, and enslaved by Alaric and Attila, by Genseric, Totila and Theodoric. Of all that spacious and majestic structure, nothing remained in western Europe, but a chaos of ruins, and here and there a pillar, solitary and solemn, as those of Colonna, Palmyra or Chelminar. The only inscription which the conquerors vouchsafed for the monument of the most illustrious and powerful of ancient empires, was the prophecy so fearfully fulfilled, "*They that take the sword shall perish by the sword.*"

THE PEOPLE MORE PEACEFUL THAN RULERS.

To the provincial military tyrannies of Rome, succeeded the feudal aristocracies and monarchies of the victors; whilst the sudden rise of the Saracens contributed to perpetuate the law of violence. The whole structure of society in the civilized portions of Europe, then became more decidedly military than it had ever been; for the feudal system was singularly adapted to a state of endless warfare at home and abroad. *Martial law was the great, the universal law of society.* The people, as well as the rulers, were all soldiers; and every community exhibited the spectacle of a standing army, and a permanent encampment. Age after age rolled away; and at length the arts of peace so far prevailed over those of war, *that SOCIETY lost its military character, but the administration of GOVERNMENT, and the spirit of RULERS, remained the same.* The people had indeed been changed; but the great, permanent institutions of society partook not of the same spirit. The sword was still the sceptre of the monarch, and the casque of the warrior his favorite crown. Governments, instead of being the fountains of peace abroad, and happiness at home, became the instruments of misery and injustice in the hands of conquerors and tyrants. The people went onward in the improvement of their condition, yet exercised comparatively no influence on the character of rulers. Although the institutions of society can have but **ONE** rational object, *the good of the people*, yet the end was forever sacrificed to the means, the good of the people to the power of rulers. This state of things still prevails; for experience testifies that, if the law of war be no longer the fundamental law of European *society*, it is still the fundamental law of their *governments*. The fate of all those nations still depends, to a vast extent, on the personal character of monarchs and their counsellors; and such must continue to be the destiny of that continent, until the progress of events shall have recon-

structed their governments in conformity with the great truth, **THE PEOPLE ARE MASTERS, AND THE RULERS, SERVANTS.** Thus far, the chief responsibility of their rulers has been to the law of violence, to the axe and the scaffold. And although something has been gradually done in some portions of Europe, to meliorate the political condition of the people, and restrain the power and ambition of rulers, yet, if the advancement of reform be in after years correspondent to the past, the American republic will number a hundred states, before the work shall have been accomplished. Fortunately for the world, it can hardly be said, that there is now in it any *state of society* constituted on the principles of war. No military republics, like those of Greece and Rome, torment the nations, and entail on their own posterity the curse of fire and sword. The feudal system, as the domestic and social constitution of European communities, has utterly perished; and as soon should we expect the age of Arthur and the Round Table, of Charlemagne and his Paladins to return, as to see the people in any country again modelled on the military principles of the feudo-social compact. Hence the great object of reform is **GOVERNMENT**; and its reconstruction any where, on principles of responsibility to the people, will be a glorious triumph in the cause of Peace.

It must be obvious, that the interest and happiness of the **PEOPLE** are hostile to war; that if left to themselves, however ignorant and uneducated, they would scarcely ever make war; that of the battles and sieges which have brought such misery into the world, not one in a hundred would have occurred, had it depended on the people; that all their personal habits and social intercourse, all their employments, affections and duties, are inimical to war, and friendly to peace. How demoniac, then, is that spirit which debauches the people by ambition and the love of military fame, and breathes into all their institutions, as its living principle, the spirit of bloodshed and violence! The good sense, the duties and affections of the people revolt at such things; and the ascendancy of their influence in its natural wholesome state, must exterminate war. The most ignorant states of society contain in themselves the elements of peace. Who can believe that the mass of society in the countries ravaged by the ancient or modern warrior, entered into the spirit of those wars, any otherwise than as sufferers burning with rage and revenge at their miseries? This is equally true of nearly all the wars that have ever existed. The most ignorant and unrefined, as well as the most enlightened and polished states of society, are equally hostile to war in their duties, interests, affections and employments. Justly to represent these, is the great duty of government. To give them an authoritative voice in affairs of state, is the great object of every true friend of the people; but the people, unless educated, cannot exercise a wholesome authoritative control over rulers. The friends of peace therefore must exert their influence chiefly in every such country, through the medium of **EDUCATION.**

PACIFIC EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE.

Education is the most efficient and lasting means for revolutionizing society. This can make the peaceful warlike, and the warlike peaceful; the ignorant intelligent, and the civilized barbarous; the enlightened superstitious, and the superstitious enlightened; the cruel compassionate, and the meek ferocious; the freeman a slave, and the slave a freeman; the pagan a Christian, and the Christian an idolater. *The great object of education ought then to be, to stamp on every such state of society, the peaceful character.*

EDUCATE FOR PEACE, NOT FOR WAR. Give the religion of peace if it be not already there; and let all the institutions of education, breathe its spirit, and bear its divine image. Christianity teaches, that war is the enemy, peace the friend, of God and man. Education then must be imbued with this spirit. If not, it is the enemy of our religion; and its influences are perpetually at work to undermine the precepts, and destroy the examples of Christ and his Apostles. *With the RELIGION of peace, the people must have the EDUCATION of peace, if their best interests are consulted.* The principles and operations of war, the character, achievements and glory of the warrior, have no sympathies with the education of peace, as they have none with the religion of peace. **THE WHOLE SCHEME OF EDUCATION must be in its elements, practice and influence, decidedly, unchangeably PEACEFUL.**

But impious and ruinous as is the union between pagan and Christian influences in education, it is precisely that which exists in Christian countries. Let the course of study in the schools, even in our own land, be examined, and not one will be found constructed on the basis of Christian influences, of peace and love, of humility, long suffering and forgiveness. He will find the paramount influences every where to be heathen. The history of wars, and the biographies of warriors, are almost the only food of that kind vouchsafed to the youthful mind. The Acts of the Apostles are taught scarcely any where; the commentaries of Cæsar, and the life of Agricola, robbers and murderers in the sight of God, every where; while the lives of Howard and Martyn, of Johnson and Dwight, of Penn and Jones, Spencer and Burke, men of whom even the Christian world is unworthy, are studied no where. The gospels are seldom text-books of instruction; the Æneid and Iliad always. Can this be right?

And who are the guilty? If the voices of the just made perfect, of angels and archangels, could reply, that fearful answer to every Christian, especially to every Christian minister, would be, "*thou art the man!*" The virtues of Jesus Christ are the very reverse of what are called the heroic virtues of classic antiquity. We know that he never would have acted like the great men of Greece and Rome; that the object of *his* system was utterly to abolish *theirs*; that his or theirs must eventually rule the world, and one or the other perish. Now which ever conquers, can conquer only through the power of *education*. Give to the religion of peace the

education of peace, and its victory is sure. Give to it the education of war and violence, the influence of heathen heroism and glory; and while these prevail, it never can conquer. The lion and the lamb do indeed lie down together; but the lamb is the slave or the victim of the lion. Hitherto, such has been the lot of Christianity; the slave of heathen influences, the victim of war and the warrior. And why? Because its professors, and above all, its holy ministry, have not vindicated its authority, cost what it might, against war and the warrior in every form. Is it not absolutely astonishing, that those who have bound on their souls the vow of humility, love, forgiveness, forbearance, are, yet constantly employed, by their schemes of education, in impairing and even destroying those peaceful, holy influences? With a deep feeling of awe and respect, with profound emotions of gratitude to the clergy for what they have done, and with a strong faith in their entire regeneration in future years, I speak what I believe a solemn truth. *Their compromise with war and the warrior has produced incalculable mischiefs to religion, liberty, education and peace.* They have tolerated, when they ought to have condemned, war and the warrior in every form. They acknowledge their master to be the Prince of Peace. They know that he never would have raised or commanded an army, nor ever employed war in any shape, or under any emergency. They must acknowledge, that if he were the ruler of a nation, he would command them to return good for evil, blessing for cursing, love for hatred, entreaties for insult, peace for war. They cannot deny, that a nation governed in conformity to his laws, would have neither army nor navy; that an arsenal, or a cannon foundry would be unknown among them; that sword and helmet, banner and lance, could not be found there; that a fortress would be as little tolerated as a temple of idols, and the glory of the warrior would be as earnestly condemned, and as carefully banished, as the leprosy or the plague.

All this the Christian ministry know. They condemn duelling in every form between individuals; but they excuse and even justify it between nations. If a friend should call out the treacherous confidant who had slandered and betrayed him; if a parent should avenge in a duel the injuries to his son; if the son should challenge the man who had insulted his father; if the brother should summon to mortal combat the seducer of his sister; yea, even if the husband, in obedience to the law of honor, should slay the wretch who had blasted his hopes, degraded his children, and polluted his home, Christian ministers would not dare to justify, or even to excuse him. To the friend, the parent, the son, the husband, they would say, Jesus would have forgiven, and have prayed for such enemies; he would have saved both body and soul, not have destroyed them. He demands this sacrifice as a proof that you are his disciples. Go and do likewise. Now, a nation can sustain no injury comparable to those of the insulted and dishonored friend and brother, parent, son and husband. Nor can they put it on the ground that nations have no arbiter, whilst individuals may

appeal to the laws of the country; for the most aggravated and cruel private injuries are the very ones which the laws of society do not redress.

It becomes, then, the Christian ministry, and I ask it of them as a dutiful son, as a faithful friend, as an affectionate, respectful counsellor, to consider solemnly and prayerfully, whether they are acting the part which becomes the messengers of the Prince of Peace. They have been the decided enemies of *private* war, and of the *duellist*, ever since the delirium of the age of chivalry had passed away; but have they not been more or less the vindicators and apologists of *public* war and the *warrior*? They forbid the *private* man to do what they know the Savior never would have done; yet they sanction the *public* man, and *private men under his control*, in punishing insult or avenging injury, when they know that Christ never would. And on what principle is it, that the Christian minister can approach the throne of God in the name of the meek and lowly Jesus, the Prince of Peace, and ask a blessing on the warrior's arms, even of his own country, or return thanks to Heaven for his success in battle? Would not similar supplications or thanksgivings on behalf of the avenger of private insults or injuries, be mockery and blasphemy? Now, what difference is there between the prayer, that an injured and insulted father or husband might disable or slay his adversary, and the prayer that an army of a wronged and dishonored people might scatter and destroy its enemies? Can the Christian minister return thanks to God, that the father and the husband have mangled or slain in a duel the seducer of his daughter and his wife? How then can he offer the prayer of thanksgiving to God, that fleets and armies have avenged, by the slaughter of thousands, wrongs and insults vastly inferior? How can the Christian intercede or return thanks for the success of those who, instead of requiting evil with good, and cursing with blessing, go forth to inflict evil for evil, and curse for curse, by destroying thousands of lives, and turning the sweet fountains of ten thousand innocent homes into the bitter waters of poverty and affliction? *Have they not thus drawn a distinction which Christ and his Apostles never drew?* Let me beseech the clergy and all Christians, to think well of these things! O that they would bear with me while I expostulate with them in no spirit of disrespect or uncharitableness! O that, instead of being offended at my freedom of speech, they would bring their sentiments and conduct to the test of the gospel!

The clergy in Christian countries have always exercised a great and extensive influence over education; but their influence has never been exerted deeply, comprehensively, decidedly, in favor of peace. Not only have they tolerated war among nations, but they have made the warrior, in all the attractive forms of eloquence and poetry, of history and biography, the daily companion of youth. Not only by the books which they have selected, but by the enthusiasm with which they have explained and commended them as master-works, the clergy have taught practically, that

Christian virtues are mean and worthless in comparison of *heroic* virtues. And yet, if a Christian minister have in him the spirit of the meek and lowly Jesus, and make the sermon on the mount, and the gospel of John his text-book of morals, can he believe that the disciple whom Jesus loved, would have chosen war and the warrior as the companion of youth? Can such a clergyman believe the spirit and example of Cæsar and Agricola, of Roman kings and consuls, of the heroes in Virgil and Homer, not unfriendly to Christian morals? Can he believe an Apostle would ever have written such books for the instruction of youth, or adopted them into his scheme of education?

There was a time when for ages the clergy were absolute masters of all education. Oh! that they had then been faithful to the great trust committed to them! Had they constructed all their schemes on the principles of peace, and devoted the immense revenues of the church to the general education of the people in the spirit of peace, they would indeed have been the most signal and illustrious of benefactors. But they saw not, or disregarded, the dangerous influences of war in education, and the truth, beauty and power of peace principles. Ages rolled away; the clergy acquired a new and higher power than that of priestly authority, the power of knowledge and talents, of virtue and piety, acting on free and enlightened consciences. Yet still the clergy appeared insensible of their high and solemn duty to exclude the influences of war from schemes of education, and to substitute the principles and influences of peace. Three hundred years have glided away; and still Christians and the clergy are nominally on the side of peace, practically on the side of war, in all their systems of education. And yet the cause of peace can never triumph, until the Christian clergy shall condemn war and the warrior in every form, as they have condemned private violence and the duellist. Nor can the spirit of peace ever be the leading characteristic and vital principle of education, until Christians and the clergy shall in like manner substitute Christian for heathen education, and the Christian excellences for the heathen virtues inseparable from the classic poets and historians. Peace can never triumph, till education in all its departments shall teach youth, that those which are called *heroic* virtues, are expressly prohibited by Christ, both in precept and example; that the only warrior, if I may venture the term, whom Christ acknowledges, is the MARTYR, laying down property, liberty and life in his cause, but resolute not to bear arms in defence of them, or in vindication of his master's rights. Peace can never triumph, until children shall be universally taught, that a peasant, with a Christian spirit, is a nobler and a lovelier object to angels, than Cæsar, Alexander or Napoleon. How hard is it to convince Christians of these things, and bring them to act on the broad, simple, uncompromising precepts of the gospel! War has sworn on the altar of human victims, eternal enmity to the love and humility of the gospel; yet Christians and the holy ministry of peace, love, and humility, not only justify war and the warrior, but scatter their

influence with a prodigal hand, and perpetuate them with emulous enthusiasm, in all the forms of education.

How insensible have Christians, and above all, the Christian clergy, appeared to this sublime, remarkable truth, *that in the mysterious providence of God, the law of violence and retaliation was universally tolerated and often directly employed by God himself in his moral government of the world, until the advent of the Prince of Peace*; BUT FROM THAT MOMENT THE LAW OF INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL MORALS, WAS ABSOLUTELY AND FOREVER CHANGED. Nor is this contrast surprising, when we compare the Jewish and Christian dispensations. The Mosaic institutes were a vast and complex scheme of national morals and social duties, of civil and political administration, of religious rites and ecclesiastical arrangements, of sacrifices and ceremonies. It was the system of a nation and a government with a rich and splendid national church. But Christianity was a scheme the very opposite of all this; for its influence was altogether *individual and social*; its worship was simple and spiritual; its founders and rulers, the poor and humble. Its character as a church, was universal; its prominent virtues were humility and self-sacrifice, forgiveness of enemies, and love to all mankind. *Hence the law of violence and retaliation was forever abolished; and the law of peace and love, of humility, forbearance and forgiveness, irrevocably ordained in its stead.* Yet the general tenor of the precepts of Christians, and the general spirit of their schemes of government and education, have utterly denied that the law of violence and retaliation is forever abolished, as the great law for individuals, communities and governments. The Jews rejected the meek and humble Jesus, expecting a conquering Messiah; and they were animated and sustained in the ruinous war against Vespasian and Titus, by their misconstruction of the prophecies respecting the Messiah. And have not Christians, whilst acknowledging the meek and humble Jesus as their Messiah, *practically rejected him* by denying the authority of his precepts, and disregarding the beauty of his example? Have not Christians actually governed themselves and their communities, as though the god of war, or the martial prophet of Mecca, not the Prince of Peace, was their Messiah? Have they not, as individuals, as subjects, and as rulers, acted as though they did not doubt that the Christian bore the character of the Jewish Messiah; and that they had a right in his name, to suspend the law of peace, humility and love, and to re-establish the law of retaliation and violence? The history of Christian countries on the great subject of peace and war, is undeniably the history of heathen communities. With some few exceptions in the mode of warfare, and the treatment of prisoners, the wars of Christian nations are not distinguishable from those of the Pagan in their origin, conduct and termination. The reason is manifest; *war in any shape, from any motive, and carried on in any mode, is utterly indefensible on Christian principles, and utterly irreconcilable with a Christian spirit.* When will the disciples, and above all, the ministers of the Prince of Peace, acknowledge in theory and practice, this great and solemn truth? When will they

admit, that God is wiser than man, and knows best the principles upon which his moral government ought to be administered among men ?

There was a time, when the distinguishing mark of Christians was, that they would not bear arms ; but, for more than sixteen hundred years, peace has been the lost Pleiad in the constellation of Christian virtues. From the commencement of the history of Christian nations and governments, they have ceased to bear that mark, and more than sixteen centuries have recorded their inextinguishable wars. Oh ! that Christians had persevered in the primitive spirit, *which regarded the character of a soldier as pagan, not Christian !* Oh ! that they had abided inflexibly by the rule, never to bear arms ! Then would the primitive church have bequeathed an illustrious, invaluable example to all posterity. Then pagan, not Christian governments, would have been overturned. Then the northern invaders, after conquering the monarchs and armies of heathenism, would themselves have been subdued and civilized by the all-prevailing law of Christian peace and love. But, unfortunately, Christianity was first enslaved by the warlike character of classic paganism, and afterwards by the martial spirit of the barbarous heathen. Had its disciples inflexibly resisted the first, they never would have dishonored their Founder and his church by the last. Their maxims should ever have been, 'let the heathen take arms ; but come what may, Christians never will. Christianity never shall be defended or spread abroad by force of arms. Christians never shall employ the sword. Let the heathen rule us with a rod of iron ; let them insult, persecute, oppress, torment, slay us ; let them confiscate property, slander character, cast us into prison, strip us of life itself ; let them separate husband and wife, parent and child ; let them seduce the brother to betray the brother, and the friend the friend ; let them poison the happiness of private and social life, and heap on us all the enormities and cruelties that malice can suggest, and tyranny execute. Still we will bear it all ; nor shall the sword ever be employed to deliver, much less to avenge us. Be it our duty to exhibit the consistency and beauty, the unconquerable strength, the inflexible constancy of Christian love, humility and forgiveness. Cost what it may, we will return good for evil, blessing for cursing ; we will love them that hate us, and pray for such as persecute and oppress us. Thus and thus only will we conquer our enemies, and convert the heathen to Christianity.' Then would they indeed have conquered ; for the law of love, and humility, and forgiveness is invincible in the hands of faith and hope. Thus would the whole Roman empire, and all the barbarian hordes that overran it, have been subdued by the pure and holy religion of peace ; not by that misnamed Christian church with the warrior's helmet on her head, with his sword in her right hand, and a bloody cross in the left, as her battle ensign.

For ages the church was indeed a warrior, and resembled the Marphisa of poetical chivalry, not the Bride of the Lamb, meek, humble and resigned. Her prelates, in glittering armor, were

seen on the war-steed, brandishing the iron mace of the pagan Alamar, while they shrunk from the Christian sword of Tancred or Gonzalvo. Century after century elapsed, and at length the church laid aside her sword and shield, and her clergy withdrew from the camp and the battle-field; but Christian rulers and communities still waged war, and all their institutions were still imbued with its spirit. Such, substantially, is still the fact; and such it must remain, till professed Christians, and especially the clergy, shall abjure their compromise with war and the warrior, and banish their influence from the education of Christian youth. The dawn of that day, I fear, is still far distant in the Christianity of Europe. Oh! that its morning star were now shining on the hearts of the clergy of my own, my beloved country! Oh! that our clergy would realize, that the reign of the Prince of Peace can never commence, till the chosen messengers of his love shall abjure forever all allegiance to war, and teach universally, that humility and love, forbearance and forgiveness, are the great, the indispensable elements of Christian morals, and of all the education of Christian youth.

I believe that the time is to come, when the warrior, with his plume, and his casque, and his scimitar, with his martial music, and his glittering armor, shall be seen no more forever; when the implements of war shall be found only in the cabinets of the curious, or among the historical memorials of the antiquary; when not a battle-ship shall crest the mountain wave, or repose beautiful and majestic on the tranquil bosom of the ocean; when not an army shall wind its dragon folds over hill, and valley, and plain; when the castle and the tower, the rampart and the battlement, shall be levelled with the ground, and the orchard, the garden and the vineyard shall smile over their graves; when not a fortified town shall be seen on the face of the whole earth, and every citadel shall be dedicated with peculiar rites, as the temple of Christian peace; when Alexander, Cæsar and Napoleon, shall be accounted the Molochs of mankind, and the battle-fields of Arbela and Pharsalia, of Marengo and Austerlitz, the polluted shrines of a sanguinary and idolatrous superstition; when the illustrious achievements of the most renowned of conquerors shall be remembered only with astonishment, indignation and mourning; when the master-works of military science shall be esteemed as mischievous and wicked as the frauds of astrology and magic, and the Iliad and Æneid, Cæsar, and Livy, and Sallust, shall never deform the souls of Christian youth; when the siege, and the battle, and the naval action, and all the machinery of *national murder* and *national robbery*, by land and by sea, shall have been swept away forever; when the glory and ambition of individuals and nations shall be found only in the fellowship of love, in deep humility, in the emulation of good works; in the spirit of usefulness, and the sense of duty; in peace, Christian in its character, and universal in its dominion.

I feel an assurance, delightful in its prospects, and strong in its faith, that our country is yet destined to be the noblest monument

of the principles of peace. It is impossible to contemplate our history, and not feel that we have been ordained to perform a more conspicuous part in the moral government of the world, than any other people, ancient or modern. Oh! that we did but realize the high and responsible office to which we have been called in the administration of Providence; the office of friend, counsellor, teacher of the nations of the earth. Oh! that we did but look back on the *past* with the humility and gratitude which becomes the most favored of nations; on the *present*, with the sense of unworthiness, and the diffidence which belongs to true wisdom; on the *future*, with the generous devotion and steadfastness of purpose which springs from an enlightened sense of duty. I *know* that the national institutions of the ancient people of Israel were established by God himself; and I *believe*, with a faith as strong as knowledge, that the peculiar structure of our government and state of society, is equally an ordinance of his unseen power. What though in our history, I read of no patriarchs, or prophets, or divine legislators; of no pillar of cloud by day, or of fire by night; not of the terrors of Sinai, or the vision of Pisgah; not of the chariot of fire, and mantle of power; nor yet of the fiery tempest of Sodom, or the severed waves of Jordan! What though in the record of his dealings with us, I read not that he stood, and measured the earth; that he beheld, and drove asunder the nations; that the mountains saw him, and trembled; that the deep lifted up its hands on high; that the sun and moon stood still in their habitations! What though in the history of the founders of our institutions, I read not of cloven tongues like as of fire, nor of the earthquake at midnight that burst the prison gates; not of the trance of Peter, nor the vision of Cornelius, nor the mid-day glory that struck Paul with blindness! Yet do I not doubt that we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand; that he is our God, and is leading us onward, through ways of pleasantness, and paths of peace, to an inheritance more fair and rich than any people have ever had.

THE CHIEF OBJECTION TO WAR.—The great objection to war is not so much the number of lives, and the amount of property it destroys, as its moral influence on nations and individuals. It creates and perpetuates national jealousy, fear, hatred and envy. It arrogates to itself the prerogative of the Creator only to involve the innocent multitude in the punishment of the guilty few. It corrupts the moral taste, and hardens the heart; cherishes and strengthens the base and violent passions; destroys the distinguishing features of Christian charity, its universality, and its love of enemies; turns into mockery and contempt, the test virtue of Christians, humility; weakens the sense of moral obligation, banishes the spirit of improvement, usefulness and benevolence, and inculcates the horrible maxim, that murder and robbery are matters of state expediency.

WAR AS A JUDICIAL REDRESS.

WE are advocates for civil government ; but, when war is compared to a judicial process, and vindicated as a method of determining right, and punishing guilt, we protest against such an abuse of terms. We inquire for its character, not in barbarous ages or countries, but among civilized nations at the present day. How does it determine right, redress wrong, or punish guilt? Look at a few facts for illustration. England taxed her colonies against their will; and our fathers, indignant at the wrong, drew the sword, and fought until both parties, tired of the struggle, ended the dispute by a negotiation which insured to us a place among the nations of Christendom. Napoleon displeased Great Britain; and in revenge she declared war, and eventually rallied nearly all Europe in desperate and successful efforts for his overthrow. The same power embarrassed our commerce, and impressed our seamen; and, for the punishment and redress of such wrongs, we plunged into a war of three years, which left, by the treaty of Ghent, all the controverted points just where it had found them. Still later did we differ with England about the boundary between us along the state of Maine, and the territory of Oregon; and war-spirits among us called aloud for the savage, brutal arbitrament of the sword to determine in each case where the line ought to run.

Such is war; and now we ask, wherein consists its resemblance to a process of justice? Let us examine the question somewhat in detail; and, first, the *law*, or rule of decision. In all controversies, there must be some standard recognized by both parties, such a standard society has provided in its codes of law; and to these laws every dispute must be referred. The law is common to all, known beforehand to all, and ready for every one that may need its protection, or deserve its penalties.

Here is the hinge or helm of justice in society, whether civilized or savage; but is there any thing like it in war? I know we talk about the Laws of War; but what does the phrase mean? A set of principles to determine right between nations? No; they are only a string of rules to regulate their fighting, to prescribe how they shall inflict on each other all the nameless evils of war. Well do we call them laws of *war*; not laws of right or justice, but by-laws of crime, mischief and blood; rules to regulate violence and outrage, theft and robbery, murder, and rapine, and conflagration. War acknowledges no law as an umpire. It appeals to the sword alone, to might as the only arbiter of right; and all its laws, like the rules adopted by a court just to guide its proceedings in the application of law, or like the etiquette of duelling which prescribes how the parties shall fight, merely determine the mode

of appeal to this blind, brutal standard. Laws of war! as well might we talk about the laws of piracy, or of pandemonium!!

Let us look next at the provisions made by society for a right application of its laws. We find first a judge, and next a jury of twelve peers to the parties in controversy; both bound by the solemnities of an oath to administer impartial justice, one by stating truly the law, and the other by giving a verdict in accordance alike with the law and the facts. How guarded is every step! The judge, appointed by the highest authority in the state, must not only have weight of character, and thorough knowledge of the law, but be held to a strict responsibility; and the jury, whom society takes from its own bosom, and prescribes their qualifications, are drawn out by lot, with the right of either party in criminal cases to exclude a certain number without assigning a reason, and any number for good and sufficient reasons.

Now, is there in war any counterpart to all this? Show us the judge and jury, or any umpire equivalent to either. Who selects them? What are their qualifications? What rules direct their mode of procedure in awarding justice? Point us in the whole war-system to the slightest vestige of such safe-guards as these, to any legal or rational provisions whatever for the equitable determination of controversies between nations.

Glance next at the *principle of reference*, so essential to justice. Not the rudest court on earth allows a man to be judge in his own case; even savages insist on the reference of disputes to a third party. The maxim is universal. Expunge this principle, and there remains no security for justice. If you lay claim to what I regard as my own, we can settle the dispute only by referring it to umpires. Does war proceed on this principle? Does it forbid nations to decide each its own case, and demand a reference of their disputes to arbiters? No; they spurn the thought of submitting to the decision of others, and indignantly exclaim, 'we can judge for ourselves; we understand our own rights, and shall assert them too at whatever hazards to those who may dare to cross our path.' Just put this language into the mouth of a mob, a gang of black-legs, or a horde of pirates; and you see at once how it scouts all justice, and claims a reckless, illimitable impunity in crime.

Scrutinize, also, the *process of legal justice*. In a civil case, like that of debt or damage, one man may prosecute another at will on the certainty of being obliged, if defeated, to pay the costs, and perhaps suffer a retaliatory prosecution; but no man is allowed, without special authority from some court, to arraign his fellow for a criminal offence. The accused is first examined before a magistrate, and either released, or bound over to a more thorough examination before a grand jury, who determine in view of evidence whether he shall be put upon trial for the offence charged against him. Furnished beforehand with a copy of these charges, he meets his accuser face to face in open court, is allowed the best counsel he can procure, and permitted to cross-examine the witnesses, to rebut or discredit their testimony, to sift all the evidence in the case, and counteract every effort for his conviction.

All reasonable doubts are construed in his favor; questions of law may also be started at every step to arrest a final decision against him; and, if convicted, he may appeal to a higher tribunal, or demand a new trial, or a hearing on such points of law as may yet open some loop-hole of escape. The whole court, too, are under oath to deal fairly with him; and not only may unfavorable rulings of the judge be carried up for revision to a full bench of his peers, but the jury of twelve men must be unanimous in their decision, and may be directed to review it several times in succession. This jury, composed of men never committed against the prisoner, are kept by themselves until they agree upon their verdict, and then are required in a body to present it in open court under all the responsibilities of their oath. Now comes the sentence, not from the jury, but from the judge; and even this may be arrested by an appeal, or suspended for a new trial, or its execution either delayed for time to elicit further evidence in the culprit's favor, and soften the asperities of prejudice and passion, or entirely prevented by the interposition of executive clemency with an absolute pardon, or a commutation of the penalty. What a series of safeguards! How many opportunities for escaping conviction, or the utmost rigors of punishment! How constantly does the law hold its shield over the offender, guard him against the slightest injustice, and give him, even when convicted, the hope of having his sentence either remitted or mitigated!

Now, is there in war a shadow of resemblance to all this? If so, tell us where. In its arrogant, stern refusal of reference to impartial umpires? In the mustering of its fleets and armies for conflict? In the savage butcheries of its battle-fields? In its siege, and sack, and demolition of cities? In its burning of villages, its plunder of provinces, its indiscriminate, cold-blooded massacre of peaceful inhabitants? Do you find here any open, impartial court, any charges fairly tabled, any accuser confronting the accused, any witnesses testifying under oath, any sifting of their testimony, any arguing of the law or the facts, any candid, thorough investigation of the case by men duly qualified, and solemnly bound to give a righteous decision?

But, mark the *final execution of justice*. How cautiously, how tenderly does the law proceed to the infliction of its own sentence! The offender, even when convicted by an impartial jury of his peers, and after receiving his sentence from the lips of a select and sworn judge, cannot, after all, be sent to his doom without an express warrant from the highest executive authority. How protracted the process! And at every step the way is open for his escape; nor is the sword of justice suffered to fall upon any but the convicted wrong-doer.

Has war any process like this? Is it careful to hurl its thunderbolts on the guilty alone? Do its real authors bear the brunt of its evils? Are rulers its only sufferers? Is their blood alone shed, only their property destroyed, their families alone ravished, or butchered, or beggared? Alas! these very men, the greatest criminals in the world, generally escape, and even rise by war to wealth,

and power, and fame on the poverty and woes of the people!— Do you say it is impossible to arraign and punish a whole community as you can a single culprit? True; and this fact alone proves how utterly absurd is the idea of securing justice by war. What! justice by the process of twenty, fifty or a hundred thousand professional cut-throats meeting on a field of battle to shoot, and stab, and hew, and trample each other down! As well might you seek justice by letting loose a menagerie of jackals, tigers and hyenas, to tear each other to pieces.

Justice of war! what a strange abuse of terms! No law to define right; no judge to interpret that law, or jury to apply it; no tribunal to try the cause; no rules prescribing the mode of trial, and requiring notice of the complaint, and opportunity for vindication; no charges duly preferred; no testimony given under oath, and fairly examined; no delay or chance for the correction of errors; no privilege of appeal to a higher tribunal; no right to claim a new hearing; no hope of reprieve or pardon; no trustworthy officer to execute the precise sentence of the law; no restriction of the penalty to the exact demerits of the criminal; no precautions to guard the innocent against suffering with the guilty! Each party makes a law for itself, erects its own tribunal of blood, and then proceeds to act as accuser and witness, as counsel, judge and executioner. What a burlesque on all ideas of justice! What an outrage on common sense to call this a judicial process, a mode of redress for national grievances!

Do you say we have no other mode? Then surely it is high time we had. Do you deem any other impossible? How so? Each nation has provided the means of justice between individuals; and can the brotherhood of nations devise no means of justice between themselves? Cannot rulers adjust their difficulties in the same way that the people do theirs?

These questions, admitting only an affirmative answer, push us to the necessity of a CONGRESS OF NATIONS, first to establish a Code of International Law, and next to organize a High Court of Nations for the interpretation of that law, and the peaceful, equitable adjustment of all national disputes. Without some provision of this kind, there never can be any system of justice between nations, with its standard of right, its board of arbitrators, and the rules requisite for a fair trial, and a righteous decision.

Already is the moral sense of the world giving its verdict against the arbitraments of war as no criterion of right. Does it guarantee the conquests of Napoleon? No; every one of them has been relinquished, and the boundaries of all Europe are nearly the same now that they were before his sword reconstructed almost its entire geography. Does Christendom submit to the partition of Poland? True; but it is with a deep under-tone of displeasure, with such a strong, settled conviction of its injustice as must render the possession continually precarious, and may yet restore Poland to her own sons.

WAR AND MISSIONS,

OR

PEACE AUXILIARY TO THE WORLD'S CONVERSION.

GOD is intent on the salvation of our race ; and his church, after ages of slumber, has at length girded herself somewhat in earnest for evangelizing all nations. The work is well begun ; and already is the Bible translated into nearly two hundred languages, the cross is planted in not a few of the strongholds of paganism, and more than a thousand missionaries are at this hour preaching Jesus and him crucified in almost every country on the globe.

Let us, then, contemplate THE CAUSE OF PEACE AS AUXILIARY TO THIS WORK OF MISSIONS. The former seeks to abolish war ; to extirpate the entire system from Christendom forever ; to make peace among nations, as much as among individuals, co-extensive with our religion of peace ; to weave its pacific principles once more into the creed and character of all professed Christians, and thus render these principles effective in securing peace wherever Christianity itself prevails.

Look at *God's example* in the case. Has he not always treated war as a most serious obstruction to the spread of his gospel ? What time did he select for our Savior's great mission from heaven ? A time when the temple of Janus at Rome, in token of general peace and tranquillity, was shut more than twenty years ; a longer period of rest from war than had then been known for ages. Review the history of his church from that day to this ; and where will you find her eras of zealous, successful evangelization ? Not in war, but in peace almost alone ; and during the last thirty years of general peace, more has been done towards the world's conversion to God, than had been done for centuries before.

Equally conclusive is *the argument from the nature of the case*. The missionary enterprise aims to spread Christianity over the whole earth ; if peace is confessedly one of its fruits and promised results, it certainly ought to go along with the gospel ; and hence the revival among ourselves of its pacific principles, is a very desirable, if not indispensable preparation for the missionary work. We shall of course give to the heathen a Christianity no better than we profess at home. Ours is the prototype of theirs ; the character of the church must ever be the model of her converts ; they will embrace the kind of Christianity exhibited before them ; and, if that is in any respect defective, its imperfections will all be stamped upon them in bold relief. The converts to Popery among pagans have notoriously been a species of baptised idolaters, counterparts of Papists at home ; and, since whole nations in Europe

were first driven into a nominal Christianity by the sword, it is no wonder that the religion of their descendants is now the patroness of a war-system the most terribly effective that the world ever saw. If rum-drinkers ourselves, we shall spread a rum-drinking Christianity; if slave-holders, a slave-holding Christianity; if warriors, or abettors of war, a war-tolerating Christianity. Every point of our faith, every aspect of our character, we shall be likely to impress upon our converts among the heathen; and, if peace is a part of our religion, we should of course prepare to enforce it aright all over the earth.

What, then, does the gospel teach on this subject? 'Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy. Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and do good to them that despitefully use you. Do good unto all men. If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. See that none render evil for evil unto *any* man. Follow peace with *all* men; and let all bitterness, and anger, and wrath, and clamor, be put away from you. Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them. Avenge not yourselves; but whoso smiteth you on one cheek, turn to him the other also. Put up thy sword; for all they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword.' Such was the Christianity foretold by ancient prophets; and Isaiah, portraying its millennial triumphs, represents it as constraining all nations to 'beat their swords into ploughshares, their spears into pruning-hooks, and cease even from learning the art of war any more.'

Surely, then, peace is quite essential to a full preparation of the church for the work of converting all nations to the Christianity thus foretold by prophets, and thus taught by Christ and his Apostles. This work God has assigned to his people; but, if strangers to the pacific principles of his gospel, or reluctant to inculcate them aright, are they duly qualified to teach all nations a religion of peace? Christians they may be, and even excellent in other respects; but, while defective on this point, are they the co-workers required by a God of peace for preaching his gospel of peace to every creature? They may teach a part of it; but will they the whole? Will they so enforce its pacific principles as to uproot the Upas of war, and sweep away the entire mass of its abominations and woes? Will they not leave in their converts the moral gangrene of war? Here then is an obvious, important part of the training necessary to qualify Christians fully for their great work of converting the world to a pure, unmitigated gospel.

We insist on all this, moreover, as *necessary to insure God's full blessing*. Already has the missionary cause accomplished a great deal; but, in proportion to the means used, how little in comparison with what was achieved by a dozen fishermen starting from Galilee, poor and alone, on the vast project of a world's evangelization! How can we account for the difference? Only on the

supposition of God's refusal to bestow an equal blessing. But why this refusal? Is his arm shortened? Surely not. He could, if he would, crown our missionaries with all the success vouchsafed to Apostles. Why then does he not? There may be many other reasons; but we think a chief one is to be found in the war-degeneracy of the church. Even under the Jewish dispensation, God manifested his abhorrence of blood by forbidding David, expressly for this reason, to build the temple; and ever since the war-degeneracy of his followers, has the Prince of Peace shown his displeasure by his diminished blessing on their efforts to spread his religion. How rapid its early progress! How signal, how glorious the success of its first missionaries! How fast did she multiply her trophies, and gather her laurels, so long as she kept herself pure, and true to her peaceful Lord! Without scrip or purse, with no diadem on her brow save a crown of thorns, and no weapon in her hand but the sword of the Spirit, she went forth under God's smiles from conquering to conquer. Paganism bowed or fled before her; and in less than three centuries did she fill the Roman Empire with such a multitude of her converts, that Constantine took her to his throne, and robed her in imperial purple. It was a master-stroke of policy, and showed the extent of her triumphs and her power; but it proved well nigh her ruin. It was Delilah shearing Samson of his locks. She aped Cæsar, and shared Cæsar's fate. She took the sword, and she well nigh perished by the sword. The Holy Spirit, the Dove of peace from heaven, fled before the vultures of war; and from that day the church lost the secret of her power, the mainspring of her progress, her simple reliance under God on moral means alone. She abandoned her principles of peace; and the God of peace has frowned upon her for more than fifteen centuries. For ages had her members gone to the stake rather than turn warriors; but she sent them forth, just like pagans, to this trade of blood, and has ever since lent it her sanction and support. The cross, emblem of peace, she put upon the banners of war; she left the stake, and went forth to the battle-field; instead of baring her own bosom to the persecutor's steel, she dipt her hands in the blood of her foes; and the result was, that for a thousand years she lost far more than she gained, and left nearly all the countries touching the Mediterranean on three continents, the very centre of her primitive triumphs, in a condition less favorable to the religion of Jesus than they were at the hour of his crucifixion. Her whole war-period was at best a dead loss to the church; it merely embalmed in blood the trophies of her primitive purity and zeal. So with the Reformation; it won all its triumphs with the sword of the Spirit, and cut the sinews of its strength when it drew the sword of war; nor has it in two or three centuries gained so much as it once did in a single year.

Peace, moreover, *fosters the spirit of missions*. The former is closely allied to the latter. It was the spirit of peace that brought

our Savior from the bosom of his Father ; the spirit of peace that dictated and pervaded his sermon on the mount ; the spirit of peace that breathed through his whole life, and drew from his cross the prayer, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The same spirit animated the martyr at the stake, and carried the Apostles from continent to continent, through fire and blood, with their message of salvation to perishing men. Look at Brainerd in the Indian's wigwam ; track the Moravian through the snows of Greenland ; follow the footsteps of Schwartz across the burning plains of India, or of Martyn over the mountains of Persia ; and you find in each case the same spirit that loves its enemies, turns the other cheek to the smiter, and seeks to overcome evil only with good. No malice, no rancor, no purpose or desire of revenge, but an irrepressible out-gushing of good will to all. Such is the spirit of peace ; nor can it exist without nourishing the disposition to bless the world with our religion of peace.

How unlike such a spirit is that of war ! They are antagonistic, utterly incompatible. Could two neighbors, while fiercely panting each for the other's blood, seek one another's salvation ? No more can two nations, while putting forth their utmost energies in vindictive, murderous strife, labor one for the spiritual good of the other. So of the world ; and, if all its myriads were simultaneously engaged in war, the work of its Christianization must cease for the time, nor could ever begin again until the fires of war were quenched. I grant it possible for a government to fight without infusing the war-spirit into a tithe of its subjects ; but let such a spirit once madden our whole nation ; let its pride, and wrath, and revenge be kindled into a blaze ; let scores and hundreds of thousands rush from our hills, and vales, and prairies to the work of blood ; let the worst passions of our nature be let loose on the field of battle to revel and rage like so many demons fresh from hell ; and must not such a state of mind exclude for the time all desire, all thought of evangelizing the nations ?

Peace, also, *saves the MEN needed for the work of missions.* The population of Europe, under the war influences of the last century, grew so slowly, Adam Smith says, as to double only in five hundred years ; but their rate of increase during the last thirty years of general peace, would probably double their whole number in fifty or sixty years. The loss of life in the war of our Revolution has been estimated at some 300,000, ten times as many men as are needed to carry on the work of evangelizing all nations ; and the late wars of Europe, in twenty-two years, sacrificed no less than nine or ten millions ! The handful of men we keep for a standing army, are nearly ten times as numerous as all the missionaries now among the heathen ; and Europe alone sustains even in peace some three millions of warriors, a hundred times as many men as the church needs for the world's immediate evangelization !

Nor is this all ; for *peace alone can furnish the MONEY indispensable for this work.* We cannot well conceive how vastly the genius

of peace has, since the downfall of Napoleon, augmented the productive power of Christendom. Its improvements in machinery, and its various applications of steam, have alone been equivalent probably to the unaided labor of half the inhabitants on the globe; and her share of this surplus the church may, if she will, spare for evangelizing the nations.

Nor is it possible without peace to raise the funds needed in the missionary cause. Our best laborers dragged by war from their fields and shops to the camp, our commerce swept from the ocean, our vessels rotting at our wharves, the grass growing in the very heart of our cities, our manufactures crippled, our agriculture neglected, every department of gainful industry paralyzed, all the great sources of our wealth dried up, at the very time that the expenses of living, and the taxes of government are enormously increased, whence could we get the means of giving the gospel to the whole world?

What a boundless spendthrift is war! It is estimated that every gun of our navy costs an average of fifteen thousand dollars a year; enough to support some twenty or thirty missionaries! Forty millions of dollars wasted in our war with a handful of Indians in Florida! fifty millions a year in our last war with England! hundreds of millions in our revolutionary war! Still worse do we find it in the Old World. England, as stated by one of her ablest and best men, has lavished upon Lord Wellington alone eleven millions of dollars! As much upon a single warrior as all Christendom has ever given in five years for the support of missionaries among the heathen!! The war operations of England, near the time of the battle at Waterloo, are said to have consumed one million sterling a day; about twice as much *every day* as the whole church of Christ is even now contributing *annually* for the spread of his gospel! It has been estimated, that the late wars of Europe, in little more than twenty years, wasted in one way and another, some \$40,000,000,000, the bare interest of which would be, at six per cent., \$2,400,000,000 a year, and, at only two and a half per cent., no less than \$1,000,000,000! the simple interest at this low rate enough to support, at \$500 each, two millions of missionaries, or one to every three hundred souls in all the pagan world!!

War, also, destroys or engrosses the very producers of a nation's wealth. A million perished in six months of the Russian Campaign, and nine or ten millions in all the wars consequent on the French Revolution. Did our revolutionary struggle leave the American church for the time any surplus of money or men for spreading the gospel? From a population of some twenty-five millions, Napoleon had at times more than a million of soldiers under arms; not less than a fifth part of all the healthy, vigorous laborers in France. In La Vendee alone, the Revolutionists in eight or nine months, massacred upwards of a million; twenty per cent. more than the whole province contained forty years after! The so called Thirty Years' War in the seventeenth century, reduced the population of Germany from sixteen millions to four

millions, or three-fourths, and that of Wirtemberg from half a million to less than fifty thousand, or more than nine-tenths! In this single dutchy were eight towns, forty-five villages, and 36,000 houses laid in ashes, and no less than 70,000 hearth-fires completely extinguished! Let such ravages of war overspread all Christendom only once in a century; and where could the church find either money or men for evangelizing the nations?

But the war-system makes enormous drafts even in a time of peace. Ours is the cheapest in Christendom; and yet does it in peace waste upon the army, and navy, and fortifications, and other war purposes, some twenty millions a year, besides all the millions annually spent upon our militia system. Some of our war-ships have cost more than a million each; our arsenal at Springfield contains muskets to the value of three millions; in the navy yard at Charlestown we have invested \$4,741,000; the Military Academy at West Point has already consumed \$4,002,901; millions on millions have been squandered on the construction of some single forts; and lately our government proposed to spend on a system of land defences no less than \$51,677,929.

Do you imagine the church bears only a mere fraction of these burdens? It has been ascertained that her members and their families here pay one third of all our taxes, and consequently one third of our war-expenses. An equal ratio may obtain in other countries; and, if so, Christendom filches from the church one third of all its enormous expenditures for war; nor is it any exaggeration to suppose she pays for this purpose more than a hundred times as much as she is now contributing for the spread of her gospel! Even in our own country, her war-tax is considerably more than all she gives to build her churches, to support her ministers, and carry on all her enterprises of benevolence and reform. Does this statement seem exaggerated? Well it may; but a full knowledge of the facts in the case would convince the most skeptical, that it is much below the truth.

More enormous still are the war-expenses of most other nations. Those of England alone are supposed now to be more than \$200,000,000 a year; the interest and management of her war-debt amounting to nearly \$150,000,000. All Europe keeps under arms, in a time of general peace, some three millions of men, at an annual expense of six or eight hundred millions of dollars; while the sum total of her war-debts is said, on the best authorities, to be nearly ten thousand millions, the interest on which, at six per cent., would be \$600,000,000 a year. Thus the mere interest on the war-debts of Europe alone, would suffice for the support of more than one million of missionaries among the heathen, a thousand times as many as the whole church now has in the field!!

Nor is this the worst of the case; for *war either dries up or poisons the very fountains of those moral influences which create and sustain the missionary enterprise.* These are found in the general prosperity of the church at home—in the growth of her numbers

and her graces ; in her frequent and glorious revivals of religion ; in the multitude and ceaseless activity of her Sabbath schools ; in her system of educating a corps of able, devoted men for her ministry ; in the success of her efforts to stay the ravages of intemperance, and fill the land with tracts, and Bibles, and churches, and the benign influences of a Sabbath devoted to the worship of God, and the salvation of souls. Here are the mainsprings of the missionary cause ; and every one of them a vigorous, long protracted war would either destroy, suspend, or seriously paralyze. On this point we cannot here dwell ; its full discussion would require a volume ; and we can only commend it to the serious consideration of all that seek the prosperity of religion at home or abroad.

But suppose the church, after all, able and willing in the midst of war to do even more than ever for the spread of her gospel, how are her missionaries to reach their distant fields, or to carry on their blessed work there ? Our vessels of commerce which now transport them, war would of course sweep from the ocean ; and so entirely dependant should we be on the mercy of a powerful, exasperated foe, that France, with a solitary war-ship, might drive most of our missionaries from the Pacific, and England, with a single dash of her premier's pen, might silence half our missionaries now in the eastern world.

But let the heralds of the cross reach their field ; and *will they there find no obstruction from war ?* How often has its occurrence on the spot arrested or neutralized their labors, broken up their stations, and driven the missionaries out of the country ! Go to Syria, to China, to Burmah, to Africa, to the islands of the Pacific ; and you will find ample and startling illustrations of this truth.

But the worst effect is seen in *the prejudices diffused all over the earth by the wars of nations reputedly Christian.* These wars, so many libels of blood on our religion of peace, have filled the world with such hatred of its character, such contempt of its claims, or such fears of its influence, as to make them dread its approach, and spurn its offers. Let us listen to the testimony of men who have themselves witnessed these very results. 'This country,' says Mr. Hume, an American missionary in India so late as 1844, 'was conquered at an immense expense of treasure and blood ; the government still retains it by the power of the sword ; and the effect is most unhappy on the minds of the natives, who regard the missionary as the representative and teacher of a religion which lends its sanction to war, nor seeks to restrain its professors from the rage of conquest, and the lust of gain.' Why were the Jesuit missionaries expelled from China, and all Christians forbidden to set foot on the shores of Japan ? Those countries caught a horror of men so notorious for their rapacity, and their terrible success in war. What drew down the wrath of Burmah upon Judson and his co-workers ? Not hatred of Christianity, for the Burmans as a body knew not enough about the gospel to hate it intelligently ; but their dread of British bayonets bristling along their borders,

of baptised warriors carrying, or threatening to carry, fire and sword into the heart of their dominions. Here was the secret of the persecution waged for a time against those missionaries; and, had they never been confounded with warriors from Christendom, they might have been permitted to continue their work unmolested until all Burmah had bowed at the foot of the cross. Why was it for ages so extremely difficult to Christianize the aborigines of America? Ask the story of their wrongs, the history of our wars against them. A Romish priest, soon after the conquest of South America by the Spaniards, was one day conversing with some Indians, and urging them, by the awful retributions of heaven and of hell, to embrace Christianity, the religion of their conquerors. "Are there any Spaniards in heaven?" inquired those savages. 'Spaniards!' replied the priest; 'to be sure; the Spaniards are the children of the church—they all go to heaven.' "Then," retorted those indignant, outraged sons of the forest, "then, sir, we'll go to hell!" What a plunge! Yet so felt not only the twelve millions whom the Spaniards are said to have destroyed in little more than forty years, but nearly all the Indians both in South and North America; and the gangrene of a similar prejudice has crept more or less over the great mass of unevangelized minds on the globe.

Still more specific are the statements of Wolfe, the missionary who traversed three continents. 'A Jew once said to me, "You go to war, and you call Jesus Christ the Prince of Peace, and pray to him to help your warriors vanquish your enemies; and, after battle, you go to your churches, and there sing *Te Deum* for the victory."—When in the land of the Afghans, a minister of the prince asked me, "What is your religion in England? Have you any at all?" Yes, said I, we have. "What then is it?" he retorted. "You send messengers here to bribe the king, and stir up war. Is that your religion?"—I once gave a Turk the gospel to read, and pointed him to the fifth chapter of Matthew as showing the beauty of its doctrines. "But," said he, "you Christians are the greatest hypocrites in the world." How so? "Why, here it is said, 'Blessed are the peace-makers;' and yet you, more than any others, teach us to make war, and are yourselves the greatest warriors on earth! How can you be so shameless?"'

We cannot suppose the heathen ignorant of our war character. Have they read none of our history written for so many ages in blood? Have they never heard of such campaigns as those of Marlborough, Eugene and Napoleon; of such sieges as that of Magdeburg, Saragossa or Genoa; of such battle-fields as those of Agincourt and Fontenay, of Austerlitz, Borodino and Waterloo? Know they not that Christendom is now covered with barracks, and bristling with millions of bayonets? Nay, have we not ourselves carried the proof of our guilt to the very doors of the heathen? Show us in the wide world any considerable country which nominal Christians have not drenched in blood. Traverse all Asia, all Africa, all America; and where will you not find their war-tracks in fire, and blood, and tears?

This argument, however, we rest not on the strongest facts of the case. We will not now detail the frauds and outrages of our own forefathers on the sons of the forest; we will not retrace the long train of Spanish wars in North and South America; nor will we review the crusades, or the centuries of fierce, bloody conflict with Mohanmedans, or the scores of wars on the shores of Africa, or the southern peninsula of Asia. Leave all these out of view, and come, we do not say to the cold-blooded butcheries of Napoleon on the sands of Syria, but to the atrocities perpetrated in war by nominal Christians upon the heathen in the heart of this very century. Look at our own ruthless, infamous war against the Seminoles in Florida. Go to Scinde or Afghanistan, and there witness from British soldiers rapine, carnage and conflagration at which even a savage might shudder. See Britain, the chief nurse of modern missions, sending her fleets and armies to force the poison of India upon the sons and daughters of China. Hear some of the results from the lips of her own agents in this work of villany and blood. 'At Amoy, we killed fifteen hundred of the Chinese, with the loss ourselves of only sixteen men. Such a tremendous bombardment as was continued for two hours in a neighborhood so densely populated, must of course have occasioned the most pitiable sights; and at one spot four children were struck down, and the frantic father was seen first embracing their dead bodies, and then attempting to drown himself in a neighboring tank. Numerous scenes like this were witnessed!'

Trace the British in their late crusade against the Afghans. At Ghuznee, 'a wild fusilade was opened upon them by our troops; and, in the midst of indescribable confusion, the native soldiers, gathering in threes or fours around each Afghan, shot and hunted them down like mad dogs. The scene soon excited feelings of horror, as the Afghans sunk under repeated wounds, and the ground was strewed with bleeding, mangled, heaving carcasses; here ghastly figures stiffly stretched in calm but grim repose, and there the last breath yielded up through clenched teeth in attitudes of despair and defiance, with hard struggles, and muttered imprecations.' At the sacking of Istalif, supposed to contain 14,000 soldiers, 'Maj. Sanders was engaged for two days in directing the work of destruction; and during this time the place was given over to fire and sword; not a living soul was spared, whether armed or unarmed; the men were hunted down like wild beasts, not a prisoner taken, no mercy dreamt of! Whenever the body of an Afghan was found, the Hindoo Sepoy set fire to his clothes, that the curse of a "burnt father" might rest upon his children; and even the wounded, when found alive, were in this way roasted to death! Cabool, also, with its 60,000 inhabitants one year before, we made a heap of ruins, and left here and at Istalif 80,000 human beings houseless, and without food. We laid waste the country wherever we went, burning the strongholds of the chiefs, and villages of the peasantry, showing no mercy, and giving no quarter to friend or foe, armed or unarmed, open enemies, or professed allies.'

Take another case from China. 'At Ningpo, the people, hurrying to get out of the city as fast as possible, were crowded in dense masses into the narrow street, where, coming up with our cannon within one hundred yards of them, we poured upon the crowded fugitives so destructive a fire of grape and canister, that we had to remove their dead or wounded bodies to the sides of the street, before our guns could advance; and thus we pursued them for miles with our artillery and bayonets!'

Look now at a case of individual suffering. 'After we had,' says Capt. Loch, 'forced our way over piles of furniture placed to barricade the door, we entered an open court strewn with rich stuffs, and covered with clotted blood; and upon the steps leading to the great hall, lay in their own gore, two bodies of youthful Tartars, apparently brothers, cold and stiff. Having gained the threshold of their abode, they had fallen from the loss of blood, and died on the spot. Stepping over these bodies, we entered the hall, and met face to face three women seated, a mother and two daughters. At their feet lay two bodies of elderly men, with their throats cut from ear to ear, and their senseless heads resting on the feet of their relations. To the right were two young girls, beautiful and delicate, crouching over a living soldier, and endeavoring thus to conceal him. I stopped, horror-struck at what I saw, and stood spell-bound to the spot. The women must have discovered my feelings; for the expression on the mother's face of cold, unutterable despair, soon changed to the evident workings of scorn and hate, which at last burst forth in a paroxysm of invective, and finally sought relief in floods of tears. Action was the only language she could make intelligible to us; and, coming close to me, she seized me by the arm, and, with clenched fist and deadly frown, pointed to the bodies, to her daughters, to herself, and her yet splendid house. Then she stepped back a pace, closed her hands firmly, and in a hoarse, husky voice spoke, as I could see by her gestures, of her misery, of her hate, and, I doubt not, of revenge. It was a scene one could not bear long. I attempted by signs to explain, and offered my services to pass her in safety through the gates into the open country; but the poor woman would not listen to me, and the whole family were by this time in loud and bitter lamentations.'

What must be the result of all this? 'The British forces,' says an eye-witness, 'have made Christianity and civilization, in the eyes of the Chinese, synonymous with murder and rapine. Violating women; breaking in pieces monuments of the dead; digging up and mutilating bodies; protecting, with the ships of war, the opium smugglers on the coast; opening the way for them, and for pirates, to Whampoa, and making the settlement of Hong Kong a sink where the filth of China and of Europe run together!' Thus have baptised warriors made the very name of Christianity a hissing, a scorn and a loathing through the pagan world; and the missionary, go where he will, must meet these deep, bitter, almost incurable prejudices against our religion of peace, so strangely belied for fifteen centuries by her warring votaries. Not a sea can

he cross, not a country reach, scarce an island touch, but the war-dogs from Christendom have been there before him, to throw in his way obstacles which ages can hardly suffice to remove.

Surely, then, it is high time for the church to remove from Christendom this crying sin and shame. Do you say she cannot? Yes, she can, if she will; for she has in her hands all the power requisite under God for the purpose. Let her come up to this work in earnest; let her put forth upon it her utmost energies; let all her members through the world unite as one man against war; let all her pulpits open their moral batteries upon it; let every press under her control or influence teem with remonstrances against it; let all her schools and all her firesides train the young to hold it in deep, undying abhorrence; let every Christian pray, and talk, and act against it, and utterly refuse it his support or sanction in any way; and not only would there be no more war in Christendom, but the whole system would come to an end ere-long and forever.

Do you still plead that war is an affair of the state, rather than the church? True, the state does wage it; but has the church lent it no aid, no encouragement? Does she never talk of its glories, never train her own sons for its murderous work, never pray to the God of peace for its success, never return him thanks for its blood-drenched victories? Be it then that she cannot alone abolish or prevent war, she certainly can clear her own skirts of its guilt, by solemnly protesting before all men against it as utterly unchristian, and thus compel the whole world henceforth to regard Christianity as no more responsible for the wars of Christendom, than for the idolatries of India, or the cannibalism of New Zealand.

Do you tell us, however, to spread Christianity, and that alone will, while nothing else can, put an end to war? True, if we spread the gospel in its *purity*, its pacific like its other principles, so as to secure peace equally with repentance and faith; but has the church done this for fifteen hundred years? If so, what mean the centuries of war among her own members, the millions of bayonets even now bristling all over Christendom, or the thousand millions of dollars still wasted every year upon its war-system? Make men *such* Christians, and they will cease from war! *Have* they? If so, tell us when and where. Do you say they were Christians only in name? None of them *real* disciples of Christ? None such now engaged in war, or lending it their countenance? Alas! the archbishop of England stereotyped, to be repeated in all her churches, a solemn form of thanksgiving to God for the very atrocities of which we have here quoted a few specimens from Scinde, Afghanistan and China. Put an end to war by spreading such views of Christianity, a gospel thus bathed in blood, and steeped in pollution! Never. We must weave peace into the actual Christianity of Christendom, before our missionaries will carry peace along with them as one of its fruits. Thus all say of intemperance; and why not of war? So long as the evil was in the bosom of the church; so long as her officers trafficked in the liquid poison for a livelihood; so long as her members, without rebuke, drank it as a

daily beverage ; so long as some of her most godly ministers could distil and peddle it for their own support in preaching the gospel, would you have said, spread *such* a Christianity, and that will stop these drinking usages ; make men *such* Christians, and they will cease from the very practices in which they are now indulging without scruple ?

Still perhaps you say, 'the church must not turn aside from her missionary work to the cause of peace.' Turn aside for peace ! Why, it lies right in her path, a part of this very work, and quite indispensable to the speedy or ultimate accomplishment of this work. Peace is her first want, the place to stand upon for an effective application of her great moral lever to the world. She *must* have peace ; and her best economy is to make sure of it from the outset. How strange for a man to say he cannot afford a scaffold for the edifice he is erecting ! So poor he cannot stop long enough to eat, or spend an hour in quenching a fire that would soon lay in ashes the earnings of his whole life ! The church cannot spare the time or the money requisite for the cause of peace ! A vigorous, decisive support of this cause would be the best economy she has ever practised even for her missionary work. It has been said by wise, cool-headed men, that a war between us and England might put back the world's conversion a whole century ; yet could the Christians in these two countries prevent such a war with one half the effort they expend on the missionary cause in a single year. In no other way could a part of our money be spent to better purpose even for this cause ; and hence the church should contribute, and her wealthy members leave legacies, for peace just as they do for missions.

What a world of evil has been prevented, how vast an amount of good secured, by God's blessing on the little already done in the cause of peace ! Hardly a thousand dollars a year were given to this cause in our own country during the first twenty-five years from its origin, and probably not more than four thousand a year from all Christendom ; and yet has this pittance sufficed materially to change the international policy of the civilized world, and preserve its general peace ever since the overthrow of Napoleon ; a result as truly owing under God to the cause of peace, as the triumphs of temperance are to that cause, or the spread of the gospel to the missionary enterprise. In what way could the same amount of money have done more good, or contributed more to the world's evangelization ? To this glorious result peace is indispensable ; and in vain, so long as the war-cancer is gnawing her own vitals, or the war-system of Christendom is resting like a mammoth incubus on her bosom, and leaving its blood-prints on the banners of her cross, will the church wait for the coming of that era when 'the kingdoms of this world shall all become the kingdom of our Lord, and every man shall sit under his own vine and fig-tree, with none to molest or make him afraid.'

CAUSES OF WAR.

BY JONATHAN DYMOND.*

IN attempting to form an accurate estimate of the moral character of human actions and opinions, it is often of importance to inquire how they have been produced. There is always great reason to doubt the rectitude of that of which the causes and motives are impure; and if, therefore, some of the motives to war, and of its causes, are inconsistent with reason or with virtue, I would invite the reader to pursue his inquiries on this subject with suspicion at least of the rectitude of our ordinary opinions.

There are some customs which have obtained so generally and so long, that what was originally an effect becomes a cause, and what was a cause becomes an effect, until, by the reciprocal influence of each, the custom is continued by circumstances so multiplied and involved, that it is difficult to detect them in all their ramifications, or to determine those to which it is principally to be referred. What were once the occasions of wars, may be easily supposed. Robbery, or the repulsion of robbers, was probably the only motive to hostility, until robbery became refined into ambition, and it was sufficient to produce a war, that a chief was not content with the territory of his fathers; but by the gradually increasing complication of society from age to age, and by the multiplication of remote interests and obscure rights, the motives to war have become so numerous and so technical, that ordinary observation often fails to perceive what they are. They are sometimes known only to a cabinet, which is influenced in its decision by reasonings of which a nation knows little, or by feelings of which it knows nothing; so that of those who personally engage in hostilities, there is perhaps not often one in ten who can distinctly tell why he is fighting.

This refinement in the motives of war is no trifling evidence that they are insufficient or bad. When it is considered how tremendous a battle is, how many it hurries in a moment from the world, how much wretchedness and how much guilt it produces, it would surely appear that nothing but *obvious* necessity should induce us to resort to it. But when, instead of a battle, we have a war with many battles, and of course with multiplied sufferings and accumulated guilt, the motives to so dreadful a measure ought to be such as to force themselves upon involuntary observation, and to be written, as it were, in the skies. If, then, a large pro-

* This and the four following articles or tracts contain the substance of all that Dymond wrote on the subject of Peace and War, mainly as abridged by himself in his *Principles of Morality*, but with a few additions from his somewhat fuller *Inquiry into the accordancy of War with the Principles of Christianity*.—AM. ED.

portion of a people are often without any distinct perception of the reasons why they are slaughtering mankind, it implies, I think, *prima facie* evidence against the adequacy or the justice of the motives to slaughter.

Of the causes of war, one undoubtedly consists in the want of inquiry. We have been accustomed from earliest life to a familiarity with its "pomp and circumstance;" soldiers have passed us at every step, and battles and victories have been the topic of every one around us. It thus becomes familiarized to all our thoughts, and interwoven with all our associations. We have never inquired whether these things should be; the question does not even suggest itself. We acquiesce in it, as we acquiesce in the rising of the sun, without any other idea than that it is a part of the ordinary processes of the world. And how are we to feel disapprobation of a system that we do not examine? Want of inquiry has been the means by which long continued practices, whatever their enormity, have obtained the general concurrence of the world, and continued to pollute or degrade it long after the few who inquire into their nature have discovered them to be bad. It was by these means that the slave trade was so long tolerated by this land of humanity. Men did not *think* of its iniquity. We were induced to think; and soon we abhorred, and then abolished it. Of the effects of this want of inquiry we have indeed frequent examples upon the subject before us. Many who have all their lives concluded that war is lawful and right, have found, when they began to examine the question, that their conclusions were founded upon no evidence; that they had believed in its rectitude, not because they had possessed themselves of proof, but because they had never inquired whether it was capable of proof or not. In the present moral state of the world, one of the first concerns of him who would discover pure morality should be, to question the purity of that which now obtains.

Another cause of our complacency with war, and therefore another cause of war itself, consists in that callousness to human misery which the custom induces. They who are shocked at a single murder on the highway, hear with indifference of the slaughter of a thousand on the field. They whom the idea of a single corpse would thrill with horror, contemplate with frigid indifference heaps of human carcasses mangled by human hands. If a murder is committed, the narrative is given in the public newspaper with many adjectives of horror, many expressions of commiseration, and many hopes that the perpetrator will be detected. In the next paragraph, the editor perhaps tells us that he has hurried a second edition to the press, in order that he may be the first to glad the public with the intelligence, that in an engagement which has just taken place, *eight hundred and fifty of the enemy were killed*. Now, is not this latter intelligence eight hundred and fifty times as deplorable as the first? Yet the first is the subject of our sorrow, and this—of our joy! The inconsistency and disproportionateness which has been occasioned in our sentiments of benevolence, offers a curious moral phenomenon.

The immolations of the Hindoos fill us with compassion or horror, and we are zealously laboring to prevent them. The sacrifices of life by our criminal executions, (one hundred and sixty kinds of crime being punishable with death in the time of Blackstone,) are the subject of our anxious commiseration, and we are strenuously endeavoring to diminish their number. We feel that the life of a Hindoo or a malefactor is a serious thing, and that nothing but imperious necessity should induce us to destroy the one, or to permit the destruction of the other. Yet what are these sacrifices of life in comparison with the sacrifices of war? In the late campaign in Russia, their fell, during one hundred and seventy-three days in succession, an average of two thousand nine hundred men per day; more than five hundred thousand human beings in less than six months! And most of these victims expired with peculiar intensity of suffering. We are carrying our benevolence to the Indies; but what becomes of it in Russia, or at Leipsic? We are laboring to save a few lives from the gallows; but where is our solicitude to save them on the field? Life is life wheresoever it be sacrificed, and has every where equal claims to our regard. I am not now saying that war is wrong, but that we regard its miseries with an indifference with which we regard no others; that if our sympathy were *reasonably* excited respecting them, we should be powerfully prompted to avoid war; and that the want of this reasonable and virtuous sympathy, is one cause of its prevalence in the world.

Another cause is found in national irritability. It is assumed, that the best way of supporting the dignity, and maintaining the security of a nation is, when occasions of disagreement arise, to assume a high attitude and a fearless tone. We keep ourselves in a state of irritability which is continually alive to occasions of offence; and he that is prepared to be offended, readily finds offences. A jealous sensibility sees insults and injuries where sober eyes see nothing; and nations thus surround themselves with a sort of artificial tentacula, which they throw wide in quest of irritation, and by which they are stimulated to revenge by every touch of accident or inadvertency. They who are easily offended, will also easily offend. What is the experience of private life? The man who is always on the alert to discover trespasses on his honor or his rights, never fails to quarrel with his neighbors. Such a person may be dreaded as a torpedo. We may fear, but we shall not love him; and fear without love easily lapses into enmity. There are therefore many feuds and litigations in the life of such a man, that would never have disturbed its quiet, if he had not captiously snarled at the trespasses of accident, and savagely retaliated insignificant injuries. The viper that we chance to molest, we suffer to live, if he continue to be quiet; but if he raise himself in menaces of destruction, we knock him on the head.

It is with nations as with men. If on every offence we fly to arms, we shall of necessity provoke exasperation; and if we exasperate a people as petulant as ourselves, we may probably continue

to butcher one another, until we cease only from the emptiness of exchequers, or weariness of slaughter. To threaten war, is therefore often equivalent to beginning it. In the present state of men's principles, it is not probable that one nation will observe another levying men, and building ships, and founding cannon, without providing men, and ships, and cannon themselves; and when both are thus threatening and defying, what is the hope that there will not be a war?

If nations fought only when they could not be at peace, there would be very little fighting in the world. The wars that are waged for "insults to flags," and an endless train of similar motives, are perhaps generally attributable to the irritability of our pride. We are at no pains to appear pacific towards the offender; our remonstrance is a threat; and the nation, which would give satisfaction to an inquiry, will give no other answer to a menace than a menace in return. At length we begin to fight, not because we are aggrieved, but because we are angry. One example may be offered: "In 1789," says Smollett, "a small Spanish vessel committed some violence in Nootka Sound, under the pretence that the country belonged to Spain. This appears to have been the principal ground of offence; and with this both the government and the people of England were very angry. The irritability and haughtiness which they manifested, were unaccountable to the Spaniards, and the peremptory tone was imputed by Spain, not to feelings of offended dignity and violated justice, but to some lurking enmity, and some secret designs which we did not choose to avow." If the tone had been less peremptory and more rational, no such suspicion would have been excited, and the hostility which was consequent upon the suspicion, would of course have been avoided. Happily the English were not so passionate, but that before they proceeded to fight, they negotiated, and settled the affair amicably. The preparations, however, for this foolish war cost 3,133,000 pounds!

So well indeed is national irritability known to be an efficient cause of war, that they who from any motive wish to promote it, endeavor to rouse the temper of a people by stimulating their passions—just as the boys in our streets stimulate two dogs to fight. These persons talk of the insults, or the encroachments, or the contempts of the destined enemy, with every artifice of aggravation; they tell us of foreigners who want to trample upon our rights, of rivals who ridicule our power, of foes who will crush, and of tyrants who will enslave us. They pursue their object certainly by efficacious means; they desire a war, and therefore irritate our passions; and when men are angry, they are easily persuaded to fight. That this cause of war is morally bad, that petulance and irritability are wholly incompatible with Christianity, is too clear to need proof.

Wars are often prompted from considerations of interest, as well as from passion. The love of gain adds its influence to our other motives; and even without other motives, we know that this love is

sufficient to give great obliquity to the moral judgment, and to tempt us to many crimes. During a war of ten years there will always be many whose income depends on its continuance; and a countless host of commissaries, and purveyors, and agents, and mechanics, commend a war because it fills their pockets. And unhappily, if money is in prospect, the desolation of a kingdom is often of little concern; destruction and slaughter are not to be put in competition with a hundred a year! In truth, it seems sometimes to be the system of the conductors of a war, to give to the sources of gain endless ramifications. The more there are who profit by it, the more numerous are its supporters; and thus the projects of a cabinet become identified with the wishes of a people, and both are gratified in the prosecution of war.

A support more systematic and powerful, however, is given to war, because it offers to the higher ranks of society a profession which unites gentility with profit, and which, without the vulgarity of trade, maintains or enriches them. It is of little consequence to inquire whether the distinction of vulgarity between the toils of war, and the toils of commerce be fictitious. In the abstract, it is fictitious; but of this species of reputation public opinion holds the *arbitrium et jus et norma*; and public opinion is in favor of war.

The army and the navy, therefore, afford to the middle and higher classes a most acceptable profession. The profession of arms is like the profession of law or physic—a regular source of employment and profit. Boys are educated for the army as they are educated for the bar; and parents appear to have no other idea than that war is part of the business of the world. Of younger sons, whose fathers in pursuance of the unhappy system of primogeniture, do not choose to support them at the expense of the heir, the army and the navy are the common resource. They would not know what to do without them. To many of these the news of a peace is a calamity; and, though they may not lift their voices in favor of new hostilities for the sake of gain; it is unhappily certain that they often secretly desire it. It is in this manner that much of the rank, the influence, and the wealth of a country become interested in the prosecution of wars; and when a custom is promoted by wealth, and influence, and rank, what is the wonder that it should be continued? It is said, (if my memory serves me, by Sir Walter Raleigh,) “he that taketh up his rest to live by this profession, shall hardly be an honest man.” By depending upon war for a subsistence, a powerful inducement is given to desire it; and when the question of war is to be decided, it is to be feared that the whispers of interest will prevail, and that humanity, and religion, and conscience will be sacrificed to promote it.

Of those causes of war which consist in the ambition of princes, or statesmen, or commanders, it is not necessary to speak; because no one to whom the world will listen is willing to defend them.

Statesmen, however, have, besides ambition, many purposes of nice policy which make war convenient; and when they have such purposes, they are sometimes cool speculators in the lives of

men. They who have much patronage, have many dependents, and they who have many dependents, have much power. By a war, thousands become dependent on a minister; and, if he be disposed, he can often pursue schemes of guilt, and intrench himself in unpunished wickedness, because the war enables him to silence the clamor of opposition by an office, and to secure the suffrages of venality by a bribe. He has therefore many motives to war in ambition that does not refer to conquest, or in fear that extends only to his office or his pocket; and fear or ambition are sometimes more interesting considerations than the happiness and the lives of men. Cabinets have in truth many secret motives to wars of which the people know little. They talk in public of invasions of right, of breaches of treaty, of the support of honor, of the necessity of retaliation, when these motives have no influence on their determinations. Some untold purpose of expediency, or the private quarrel of a prince, or the pique or anger of a minister, are often the real motives to a contest, whilst its promoters are loudly talking of the honor or the safety of the country. But perhaps the most operative cause of war consists in this, that an idea of glory is attached to military exploits, and of honor to the military profession. The glories of battle, and of those who perish in it, or return in triumph to their country, are favorite topics of declamation with the historian, the biographer, and the poet. They have told us a thousand times of *dying heroes*, who "resign their lives amidst the joys of conquest, and, filled with their country's glory, smile in death;" and thus every excitement that eloquence and genius can command, is employed to arouse that ambition of fame which can be gratified only at the expence of blood.

The nature and principles of this fame and glory, in the view alike of virtue and of intellect, are low and bad. "Glory," says an able reviewer, "is the most selfish of all passions except love." "I cannot," says Jane Taylor, "tell how or why the love of glory is a less selfish principle than the love of riches." Philosophy and intellect may therefore well despise it, and Christianity silently, yet emphatically, condemns it. "Christianity," says Bishop Watson, "quite annihilates the disposition for martial glory." Paley himself, an advocate of war, goes still further—*No part* of the heroic character is the subject of the "commendation, or precepts, or example of Christ;" but the character the most opposite to the heroic, is the subject of them all.

Such is the foundation of the glory which has for so many ages deceived and deluded multitudes of mankind! Upon this foundation a structure has been raised so vast, so brilliant, so attractive, that the greater portion of mankind are content to gaze in admiration, without any inquiry into its basis, or any solicitude for its durability. If, however, the gorgeous temple will be able to stand only till Christian truth and light become predominant, it surely will be wise of those who seek a niche in its apartments as their paramount and final good, to pause ere they proceed. If they desire a reputation that shall outlive guilt and fiction, let them look to the basis of military fame. If this fame should one day sink

into oblivion and contempt, it will not be the first instance in which wide-spread glory has been found to be a glittering bubble that has burst and been forgotten. Look at the days of chivalry. Of the ten thousand Quixottes of the middle ages, where is now the honor or the name? Yet poets once sang their praises, and the chronicler of their achievements believed he was recording an everlasting fame. Where are now the glories of the tournament? glories "of which all Europe rang from side to side." Where is the champion whom princesses caressed, and nobles envied? Where are now the triumphs of Duns Scotus, and where the folios that perpetuated his fame? The glories of war have indeed out-lived these; human passions are less mutable than human follies; but I am willing to avow my conviction, that these glories are alike destined to sink into forgetfulness, and that the time is approaching when the applauses of heroism, and the splendors of conquest, will be remembered only as follies and iniquities that are past. Let him who seeks for fame, other than that which an era of Christian purity will allow, make haste; for every hour that he delays its acquisition, will shorten its duration. This is certain, if there be certainty in the promises of Heaven.

Of this factitious glory as a cause of war, Gibbon says, "As long as mankind shall continue to bestow more liberal applause on their destroyers than on their benefactors, the thirst of military glory will ever be the vice of the most exalted characters." "'Tis strange to imagine," says the Earl of Shaftesbury, "that war, which of all things appears the most savage, should be the passion of the most heroic spirits." But he gives us the reasons. "By a small misguidance of the affections, a lover of mankind becomes a ravager; a hero and deliverer becomes an oppressor and destroyer."

These are amongst the great perpetual causes of war. And what are they? First, we do not inquire whether war is right or wrong. Secondly, we are habitually haughty and irritable in our intercourse with other nations. Thirdly, war is a source of profit to individuals, and establishes professions which are very convenient to the middle and higher ranks of life. Fourthly, it gratifies the ambition of public men, and serves the purposes of state policy. Fifthly, notions of glory are attached to warlike affairs, which glory is factitious and impure.

In the view of reason, and especially in the view of religion, what is the character of these causes? Are they pure? Are they honorable? Are they, when connected with their effects, compatible with the moral law? Especially, is it probable that a system of which these are the great ever-enduring causes, can itself be good or right?

ACTUAL CAUSES OF WAR.—The real causes of war are almost invariably trivial or wicked. "A hundred thousand mad animals, whose heads are covered with hats, advance," says Voltaire, "to kill or be killed by a like number of their fellow mortals covered with turbans. By this strange procedure, they want at best to decide whether a tract of land, to which none of them have any

claim, shall belong to a certain man whom they call Sultan, or to another whom they call Czar, neither of whom ever saw or will see the spot so furiously contended for, and very few of these creatures who thus butcher each other. What an excess of madness!"

"Sometimes," says Dean Swift, "a war between two princes is to decide which of them shall dispossess a third of his dominions, whereto neither of them pretends to have any right. Sometimes one prince quarrelleth with another for fear the other should quarrel with him. Sometimes a war is entered upon because the enemy is too strong, and sometimes because he is too weak. Sometimes our neighbors want the things that we have, or have the things that we want; and we both fight till they have ours, or give us theirs. It is justifiable to enter into a war even against our nearest ally, when one of his towns is convenient for us, or a part of his territory would render our dominions round and compact. If a prince sends forces into a nation, when the people are poor and ignorant, he may lawfully put half of them to death, and make slaves of the rest, in order to civilize and reduce them from their barbarous way of living."

What says history on this point? The ten years' war of the Greeks against Troy was all for a worthless courtesan; and often has the mistress of a monarch, or of his minister, whelmed nations in blood. In the reign of Edward I. a petty strife between the crews of an English and a French vessel at a spring near Bayonne, to determine which should supply themselves with water first, involved the two countries in a war that destroyed not less than 100,000 lives. 'The war of 1756, which cost France the flower of her youth, and more than half of her current money, besides the loss of her navy, her commerce and her credit, originated in the desire of a few ambitious persons to render themselves necessary and important.' Every one has heard of "the log-wood war" between England and Spain. Early in the eleventh century the republics of Bologna and Modena fought twenty years about a stolen bucket not worth more than a shilling or two; and soon after the settlement of the Pilgrims in New England, two powerful tribes of Indians, getting into a dispute about some grasshoppers shot by their children for sport, plunged into a war, that continued until one tribe was entirely destroyed, and the other nearly so.

The Peace Society of Mass. near 1825 instituted an inquiry into the actual causes of war, and, besides a multitude of petty ancient wars, and of those waged by Christian nations with tribes of savages, ascertained 286 wars of magnitude to have had the following origin—22 for plunder or tribute; 44 for the extension of territory; 24 for retaliation or revenge; 6 about disputed boundaries; 8 respecting points of honor or prerogative; 5 for the protection or extension of commerce; 55 civil wars; 41 about contested titles to crowns; 30 under pretence of assisting allies; 23 from mere jealousy of rival greatness; 28 religious wars, including the crusades; *not one for defence alone!*

MORAL RESULTS OF WAR.

BY JONATHAN DYMOND.

To expatiate upon the miseries of war, appears a trite and a needless employment. We all know that its evils are great and dreadful. Yet the very circumstance that the knowledge is familiar, may make it inoperative upon our sentiments and our conduct. It is not the intensity of misery, not the extent of evil alone, which is necessary to animate us to that exertion which evil and misery should excite; if it were, surely we should be much more averse than we now are to contribute, in word or in action, to the promotion of war.

But there are mischiefs attendant upon the system, which are not to every man thus familiar, and on which, for that reason, it is expedient to remark. In referring especially to some of those moral consequences of war which commonly obtain little of our attention, it may be observed, that social and political considerations are necessarily involved in the moral tendency; for the happiness of society is always diminished by the diminution of morality, and enlightened policy knows that the greatest support of a state is the virtue of the people.

And yet the reader should bear in mind—what nothing but the frequency of the calamity can make him forget—the intense suffering and irreparable deprivations which one battle inevitably entails upon private life. These are calamities of which the world thinks little, and which, if it thought of them, it could not remove. A father or a husband can seldom be replaced; a void is created in the domestic felicity which there is little hope that the future will fill. By the slaughter of a war, there are thousands who weep in unpitied and unnoticed secrecy, whom the world does not see; and thousands who retire in silence to hopeless poverty, for whom it does not care. To these, the conquest of a kingdom is of little importance. The loss of a protector or a friend is ill repaid by empty glory. An addition of territory may add titles to a king; but the brilliancy of a crown throws little light upon domestic gloom. It is not my intention to insist upon these calamities, intense, and irreparable, and unnumbered as they are; but those who begin a war without taking them into their estimates of its consequences, must be regarded as at most half-seeing politicians. The legitimate object of political measures is the good of the people; and a great sum of good a war must produce, if it out-balances even *this* portion of its mischiefs.

Nor should we be forgetful of that dreadful part of all warfare, the destruction of mankind. The frequency with which this destruction is represented to our minds, has almost extinguished our perception of its horror. Between the years 1141 and 1815, an

interval of six hundred and seventy years, England has been at war, with France alone, two hundred and sixty-six years! If to this we add our wars with other countries, probably we shall find that one half of the last six or seven centuries has been spent by this country in war! A dreadful picture of human violence! How many of our fellow men, of our fellow Christians, have these centuries of slaughter cut off! What is the sum total of the misery of their deaths?

When political writers expatiate upon the extent and the evils of taxation, they do not sufficiently bear in mind the reflection, that almost all our taxation is the effect of war. A man declaims upon national debts; he ought to declaim upon the parent of those debts. Do we reflect that if heavy taxation entails evils and misery upon the community, that misery and those evils are inflicted upon us by war? The amount of supplies in Queen Anne's reign was about seventy millions; and of this about sixty-six millions was expended in war. Where is our equivalent good?

Such considerations ought undoubtedly to influence the conduct of public men in their disagreement with other states, even if higher considerations do not influence it. They ought to form part of the calculations of the evil of hostility. I believe that a greater mass of human suffering, and loss of human enjoyment are occasioned by the pecuniary distresses of a war, than any ordinary advantages of a war compensate. But this consideration seems too remote to obtain our notice. Anger at offence, or hope of triumph, overpowers the sober calculations of reason, and out-balances the weight of after and long continued calamities. The only question appears to be, whether taxes enough for a war can be raised, and whether the people will be willing to pay them. But the great question ought to be, (setting questions of Christianity aside,) whether the nation will gain as much by the war as they will lose by taxation, and its other calamities.

If the happiness of the people were, what it ought to be, the primary and the ultimate object of national measures, I think the policy which pursued this object, would often find that even the pecuniary distresses resulting from a war, make a greater deduction from the quantum of felicity, than those evils which the war may have been designed to avoid.

"But war," says Erasmus, "does more harm to the morals of men, than even to their property and persons." If, indeed, it depraves our morals more than it injures our persons, and deducts from our property, how enormous must its mischiefs be!

I do not know whether the greater sum of moral evil resulting from war, is suffered by those who are immediately engaged in it, or by the public. The mischief is most extensive upon the community, but upon the profession it is most intense.

"Rara fides pietasque viris qui castra sequuntur."—LUCAN.

No one pretends to applaud the morals of an army, and for its religion, few think of it at all. The fact is too notorious to be in-

sisted upon, that thousands who had filled their stations in life with propriety, and been virtuous from principle, have lost, by a military life, both the practice and the regard of morality, and, when they have become habituated to the vices of war, have laughed at their honest and plodding brethren who are still spiritless enough for virtue, or stupid enough for piety.

Does any man ask, What occasions depravity in military life? I answer in the words of Robert Hall, "War reverses, with respect to its objects, all the rules of morality. It is nothing less than a temporary repeal of all the principles of virtue. It is a system out of which almost all the virtues are excluded, and in which nearly all the vices are incorporated." And it requires no sagacity to discover, that those who are engaged in a practice which reverses all the rules of morality, which repeals all the principles of virtue, and in which nearly all the vices are incorporated, cannot, without the intervention of a miracle, retain their minds and morals undepraved.

Look for illustration to the familiarity with the plunder of property, and the slaughter of mankind which war induces. He who plunders the citizen of another nation without remorse or reflection, and bears away the spoil with triumph, will inevitably lose something of his principles of probity. He who is familiar with slaughter, who has himself often perpetrated it, and who exults in the perpetration, will not retain undepraved the principles of virtue. His moral feelings are blunted; his moral vision is obscured; his principles are shaken; an inroad is made upon their integrity, and it is an inroad that makes after inroads the more easy. Mankind do not generally resist the influence of habit. If we rob and shoot those who are "enemies" to-day, we are in some degree prepared to shoot and rob those who are not enemies to-morrow. Law may indeed still restrain us from violence; but the power and efficiency of principle is diminished; and this alienation of the mind from the practice, the love, and the perception of Christian purity, of necessity extends its influence to the other circumstances of life. *The whole evil* is imputable to war; and we say that this evil forms a powerful evidence against it, whether we direct that evidence to the abstract question of its lawfulness, or to the practical question of its expediency. *That* can scarcely be lawful which necessarily occasions such wide-spread immorality. *That* can scarcely be expedient, which is so pernicious to virtue, and therefore to the state.

The economy of war requires of every soldier an implicit submission to his superior; and this submission is required of every gradation of rank to that above it. "I swear to obey the orders of the officers who are set over me: so help me, God." This system may be necessary to hostile operations; but I think it is unquestionably adverse to intellectual and moral excellence.

The very nature of unconditional obedience implies the relinquishment of the use of the reasoning powers. Little more is

required of the soldier than that he be obedient and brave. His obedience is that of an animal, which is moved by a goad or a bit, without judgment of his own; and his bravery is that of a mastiff that fights whatever mastiff others put before him. It is obvious that in such agency the intellect and the understanding have little part. Now, I think that this is important. He who, with whatever motive, resigns the direction of his conduct implicitly to another, surely cannot retain that erectness and independence of mind, that manly consciousness of mental freedom, which is one of the highest privileges of our nature. A British Captain (Basil Hall) declares that "the tendency of strict discipline, such as prevails on board ships of war, where almost every act of a man's life is regulated by the orders of his superiors, is to weaken the faculty of independent thought." Thus the rational being becomes reduced in the intellectual scale; an encroachment is made upon the integrity of its independence. God has given us, individually, capacities for the regulation of our individual conduct. To resign its direction, therefore, to the absolute disposal of another, appears to be an unmanly and unjustifiable relinquishment of the privileges which he has granted to us. And the effect is obviously bad; for, although no character will apply universally to any large class of men, and although the intellectual character of the military profession does not result *only* from this unhappy subjection, yet it will not be disputed, that the honorable exercise of intellect amongst that profession is not relatively great. It is not from them that we expect, because it is not from them that we generally find, those vigorous exertions of intellect which dignify our nature, and extend the boundaries of human knowledge.

But the intellectual effects of military subjection form but a small portion of its evils. The great mischief is, that it requires the relinquishment of our moral agency; that it requires us to do what is opposed to our consciences, and what we know to be wrong. A soldier must obey, how criminal soever the command, and how criminal soever he knows it to be. It is certain, that of those who compose armies, many commit actions which they believe to be wicked, and which they would not commit but for the obligations of a military life. Although a soldier determinately believes that the war is unjust, although he is convinced that his particular part of the service is atrociously criminal, still he must proceed—he must prosecute the purposes of injustice or robbery, must participate in the guilt, and be himself a robber.

To what a situation is a rational and responsible being reduced, who commits actions, good or bad, at the word of another? I can conceive no greater degradation. It is the lowest, the final abjectness of the moral nature. It is all this, if we abate the glitter of war; and if we add this glitter, it is still the same.

Such a resignation of our moral agency is not contended for, or tolerated in any other circumstance of human life. War

stands upon this pinnacle of depravity alone. She only, in the supremacy of crime, has told us that she has abolished even the obligation to be virtuous.

Some writers who have perceived the monstrousness of this system, have told us that a soldier should assure himself, before he engages in a war, that it is a lawful and just one; and they acknowledge that, if he does not feel this assurance, he is a murderer. But how is he to know that the war is just? It is frequently difficult for the people distinctly to discover what the objects of a war are. And if the soldier knew that it was just in its commencement, how is he to know that it will continue just in its prosecution? Every war is, in some parts of its course, wicked and unjust; and who can tell what that course will be? You say, when he discovers any injustice or wickedness, let him withdraw. We answer, he cannot; and the truth is, that there is no way of avoiding the evil, but by avoiding the army.

It is an inquiry of much interest, under what circumstances of *responsibility* a man supposes himself to be placed, who thus abandons and violates his own sense of rectitude and of his duties. Either he is responsible for his actions, or he is not; and the question is a serious one to determine. Christianity has certainly never stated any cases in which personal responsibility ceases. If she admits such cases, she has at least not told us so; but she has told us, explicitly and repeatedly, that she does require individual obedience, and impose individual responsibility. She has made no exceptions to the imperativeness of her obligations, whether we are required by others to neglect them or not; and I can discover in her sanctions no reason to suppose, that in her final adjudications she admits the plea, that another required us to do that which she required us to forbear. But it may be feared, it may be *believed*, that, how little soever religion will abate of the responsibility of those who obey, she will impose not a little upon those who command. They, at least, are answerable for the enormities of war; unless, indeed, any one shall tell me that responsibility attaches no where; that what would be wickedness in another man, is innocence in a soldier; and that heaven has granted to the directors of war a privileged immunity, by virtue of which crime incurs no guilt, and receives no punishment.

And here it is fitting to observe, that the obedience to arbitrary power which war exacts, possesses more of the character of servility, and even of slavery, than we are accustomed to suppose. I will acknowledge that when I see a company of men in a stated dress, and of a stated color, ranged, rank and file, in the attitude of obedience, turning or walking at the word of another, now changing the position of a limb, and now altering the angle of a foot, I feel that there is something in the system that is wrong—something incongruous with the proper dignity with the intellectual station of man.

No one questions whether military power *be* arbitrary. And what are the customary feelings of mankind with respect to a subjection to arbitrary power? How do we feel and think, when we hear of a person who is obliged to do whatever other men command, and who, the moment he refuses, is punished for attempting to be free? If a man orders his servant to do a given action, he is at liberty, if he think the action improper, or if, from any other cause, he choose not to do it, to refuse his obedience. Far other is the nature of military subjection. The soldier is compelled to obey, whatever be his inclination or his will. It matters not whether he have entered the service voluntarily or involuntarily. Being in it, he has but one alternative, submission to arbitrary power, or punishment—the punishment of death perhaps—for refusing to submit. Let the reader imagine to himself any other cause or purpose for which freemen shall be subjected to such a condition, and he will then see that condition in its proper light. The influence of habit, and the gloss of public opinion make situations that would otherwise be loathsome and revolting, not only tolerable but pleasurable. Take away this influence and this gloss from the situation of a soldier, and what should we call it? A state of degradation and of bondage. But habit and public opinion, although they may influence notions, cannot alter things. It is a state intellectually morally and politically, of bondage and degradation.

But the reader will say that this submission to arbitrary power is necessary to the prosecution of war. I know it; and that is the very point for observation. It is *because* it is necessary to war I notice it here; for a brief but clear argument results: That custom to which such a state of mankind is necessary, must inevitably be bad, inevitably adverse to rectitude and to Christianity. So deplorable is the bondage which war produces, that we often hear, during a war, of subsidies from one nation to another, for the loan, or rather for the purchase of an army. To borrow ten thousand men who know nothing of our quarrel, and care nothing for it, to help us slaughter their fellows! To pay for their help in guineas to their sovereign! Well has it been exclaimed,

“War is a game that, were their subjects wise,
Kings would not play at.”

A prince sells his subjects as a farmer sells his cattle, and sends them to destroy a people whom, if they had been higher bidders, he would perhaps have sent them to defend. The historian Smollett has to record such miserable facts, as that a potentate's troops were, during one war, “hired to the king of Great Britain and his enemies alternately, as the scale of convenience happened to preponderate!” That a large number of persons, with the feelings and reason of men, should coolly listen to the bargain of their sale, should compute the guineas that will pay for their blood, and should then quietly be led to a

place where they are to kill people towards whom they have no animosity, is simply wonderful. To what has inveteracy of habit reconciled mankind! I have no capacity of supposing a case of slavery, if slavery be denied in this. Men have been sold in another continent, and philanthropy has been shocked, and aroused to interference; yet these men were sold not to be slaughtered, but to work; but of the purchases and sales of the world's political slave-dealers, what does philanthropy think or care? There is no reason to doubt that, upon other subjects of horror, similar familiarity of habit would produce similar effects, or that he who heedlessly contemplates the purchase of an army, wants nothing but this familiarity to make him heedlessly look on at the commission of parricide.

Yet I do not know whether, in its effects on the military character, the greatest moral evil of war is to be sought. Upon the community its effects are indeed less apparent, because they who are the secondary subjects of the immoral influence, are less intensely affected by it than the immediate agents of its diffusion. But whatever is deficient in the degree of evil, is probably more than compensated by its extent. The influence is like that of a continual and noxious vapor; we neither regard nor perceive it, but it secretly undermines the moral health.

Every one knows that vice is contagious. The depravity of one man has always a tendency to deprave his neighbors; and it therefore requires no unusual acuteness to discover, that the prodigious mass of immorality and crime accumulated by a war, must have a powerful effect in demoralizing the public. But there is one circumstance connected with the injurious influence of war, which makes it peculiarly operative and malignant. It is, that we do not hate or fear the influence, and do not fortify ourselves against it. Other vicious influences insinuate themselves into our minds by stealth; but this we receive with open embrace. Glory, and patriotism, and bravery, and conquest, are bright and glittering things. Who, when he is looking delighted upon these things, is armed against the mischiefs which they veil?

The evil is of almost universal operation. During a war, a whole people become familiarized with the utmost excesses of enormity, with the utmost intensity of human wickedness, and they rejoice and exult in them; so that there is probably not an individual in a hundred, who does not lose something of his Christian principles by a ten years' war. "It is, in my mind," said Fox, "no small misfortune to live at a period when scenes of horror and blood are frequent. One of the most evil consequences of war is, that it tends to render the hearts of mankind callous to the feelings and sentiments of humanity."

Those who know what the moral law of God is, and who feel an interest in the virtue and the happiness of the world, will not regard the animosity of party, and the restlessness of resentment which are produced by a war, as trifling evils. If any

thing be opposite to Christianity, it is retaliation and revenge. In the obligation to restrain these dispositions, much of the characteristic placability of Christianity consists. The very essence and spirit of our religion are abhorrent from resentment. But the very essence and spirit of war are promotive of resentment; and what then must be their mutual adverseness? That war excites these passions, needs not to be proved. When a war is in contemplation, or when it has been begun, what are the endeavors of its promoters? They animate us by every artifice of excitement to hatred and animosity. Pamphlets, Placards, Newspapers, Caricatures—every agent is in requisition to irritate us into malignity. Nay, dreadful as it is, the pulpit resounds with declamations to stimulate our too sluggish resentment, and invite us to slaughter. Thus the most unchristianlike of all our passions, the passion which it is most the object of our religion to repress, is excited and fostered. Christianity cannot flourish under circumstances like these. The more effectually we are animated to war, the more nearly we extinguish the dispositions of our religion. War and Christianity are like the opposite ends of a balance, of which one is depressed by the elevation of the other.

These are the consequences which make war dreadful to a state. Slaughter and devastation are sufficiently terrible; but their collateral evils are their greatest. It is *the immoral feeling* that war diffuses, the depravation of principle, which forms the mass of its mischief.

To attempt to pursue the consequences of war through all their ramifications of evil, were both endless and vain. It is a moral gangrene which diffuses its humors through the whole political and social system. To expose its mischief, is to exhibit all evil; for there is no evil which it does not occasion, and it has much that is peculiar to itself.

That, together with its multiplied evils, war produces some good, I have no wish to deny. I know that it sometimes elicits valuable qualities which had otherwise been concealed, and that it often produces collateral and adventitious, and sometimes immediate advantages. If all this *could* be denied, it would be needless to deny it; for it is of no consequence to the question whether it be proved. That any wide-extended system should not produce *some* benefits, can never happen. In such a system, it were an unheard-of purity of evil, which was evil without any mixture of good. But to compare the ascertained advantages of war with its ascertained mischiefs, and to maintain a question as to the preponderance of the balance, implies not ignorance, but disingenuousness, not incapacity to decide, but a voluntary concealment of truth.

WAR UNLAWFUL FOR CHRISTIANS.

BY JONATHAN DYMOND.

THE inquiry is silently yet not slowly spreading in the world—*Is War compatible with the Christian religion?* There was a period when the question was seldom asked, and when war was regarded by almost every man as both inevitable and right. That period has certainly passed away; and not only individuals but public societies, and societies in distant nations, are urging the question upon the attention of mankind. The simple circumstance that it is thus urged, contains no irrational motive to investigation; for why should men ask the question if they did not doubt? And how, after these long ages of prescription, could they begin to doubt, without a reason?

It is not unworthy of remark, that while disquisitions are frequently issuing from the press, of which the tendency is to show that war is not compatible with Christianity, few serious attempts are made to show that it is. Whether this results from the circumstance, that no individual is peculiarly interested in the proof, or that there is a secret consciousness that proof cannot be brought, or that those who may be desirous of defending the custom, rest in security that the impotence of its assailants will be of no avail against a custom so established and so supported, I do not know; yet the fact is remarkable, that scarcely a defender is to be found. It cannot be doubted that the question is one of the utmost interest and importance to man. Whether the custom be defensible or not, every man should *inquire* into its consistency with the Moral Law. If it is defensible, he may by inquiry dismiss the scruples which certainly subsist in the minds of multitudes, and thus exempt himself from the offence of participating in that which, though pure, he “esteemeth to be unclean.” If it is not defensible, the propriety of investigation is increased in a tenfold degree.

It may, therefore, be a subject of reasonable regret, that the question of the Moral Lawfulness of War is not brought fairly before the public. I say fairly, because, though many of the publications which impugn its lawfulness, advert to the ordinary arguments in its favor, yet they do not give to those arguments all that vigor and force which would be imparted by a stated and an able advocate. Few books would probably tend more powerfully to promote the discovery and dissemination of truth, than one which should frankly, and fully, and ably advocate, upon sound moral principles, the practice of war. The public would then see the whole of what can be urged in its favor, without being obliged to seek for arguments, as they now must, in incidental, or imperfect, or scattered disquisitions; and pos-

sessing in a distinct form the evidence of both parties, they would be enabled to judge justly between them.

I would recommend to him who would estimate the moral character of war, to endeavor to forget that he has ever presented to his mind the idea of a battle, and to contemplate it with those emotions which it would excite in the mind of a being who had never before heard of human slaughter. The prevailing emotions of such a being would be astonishment and horror. If he were shocked by the horribleness of the scene, he would be amazed at its absurdity. That a large number of persons should assemble by agreement, and deliberately kill one another, appears to the understanding a proceeding so preposterous, so monstrous, that I think a being such as I have supposed, would inevitably conclude they were mad. Nor is it likely, if it were attempted to explain to him some motives to such conduct, that he would be able to comprehend how any possible circumstances could make it reasonable. The ferocity and prodigious folly of the act would, in his estimation, outbalance the weight of every conceivable motive, and he would turn unsatisfied away, "astonished at the madness of mankind."

It may properly be a subject of wonder, that the arguments which are brought to justify a custom such as war, receive so little investigation. It must be a studious ingenuity of mischief which could devise a practice more calamitous or horrible; and yet it is a practice of which it rarely occurs to us to inquire into the necessity, or to ask whether it cannot be, or ought not to be avoided. In one truth, however, all will acquiesce—that the arguments in favor of such a practice should be unanswerably strong.

Let it not be said that the experience and the practice of other ages have superseded the necessity of inquiry in our own; that there can be no reason to question the lawfulness of that which has been sanctioned by forty centuries; or that he who presumes to question it, is amusing himself with schemes of visionary philanthropy. "There is not, it may be," says Lord Clarendon, "a greater obstruction to the investigation of truth, or the improvement of knowledge, than the too frequent appeal, and the too supine resignation of our understanding, to antiquity." Whosoever proposes an alteration of existing institutions, will meet from some men with a sort of instinctive opposition, which appears to be influenced by no process of reasoning, by no considerations of propriety, or principles of rectitude, which defends the existing system because it exists, and which would have equally defended its opposite, if that had been the oldest. "Nor is it out of modesty that we have this resignation, or that we do, in truth, think those who have gone before us, to be wiser than ourselves; we are as proud and as peevish as any of our progenitors; but it is out of laziness; we will rather take their words, than take the pains to examine the reason they governed themselves by." To those who urge objections from the authority of ages, it is indeed a

sufficient answer to say, that they apply to *every* long-continued custom. Slave-dealers urged them against the friends of the abolition of the slave-trade; Papists urged them against Wickliffe and Luther; and the Athenians probably thought it a good objection to an Apostle, "that he seemed to be a setter forth of *strange* gods."

The foundation of our duty is the will of God, and that will is to be ascertained by the Revelation he has made. To Christianity, therefore, we appeal; we admit no other test of truth; and with him who thinks that the decisions of Christianity may be superseded by other considerations, we have no concern; we address not our argument to him, but leave him to find some other and better standard. Does he loosely say wars are necessary? But supposing the Christian religion to prohibit them, it is preposterous, and irreverent also, to justify ourselves in supporting them because they are necessary. To talk of a divine law which must be disobeyed, implies such confusion, as well as laxity of moral principles, that neither the philosopher nor the Christian is required to notice it.—Perhaps some who say "wars are necessary," do not very accurately inquire what they mean. There are two sorts of necessity—moral and physical; and these, it is probable, some men are accustomed to confound. That there is any *physical* necessity for war, that people cannot, if they choose, refuse to engage in it, no one will maintain. And a *moral* necessity to perform an action, consists only in the prospect of a certain *degree* of evil by refraining from it. If then those who say wars are necessary, mean that they are physically necessary, we deny it. If they mean that wars avert greater evils than they occasion, we ask for proof. Proof has never yet been given; and, even if we thought we possessed such proof, we should still be referred to the primary question, "What is the will of God?"

It is some satisfaction to be able to give, on a question of this nature, the testimony of some great minds against the lawfulness of war, opposed as these testimonies are to the general prejudice and the general practice of the world. It has been observed by Beccaria, that "it is the fate of great truths to glow only like a flash of lightning amid the dark clouds in which error has enveloped the universe;" and if our testimonies are few or transient, it matters not, so that their light be the light of truth. There are indeed many who in describing the horrible particulars of a siege or a battle, indulge in some declamation on the horrors of war, such as has been often repeated, and often applauded, and as often forgotten. But such declamations are of little value and of little effect; he who reads the next paragraph, finds probably that he is invited to follow the path to glory and to victory, to share the hero's danger, and partake the hero's praise; and he soon discovers that the moralizing parts of his author are the impulse of feelings rather than of principles, and thinks that, though it may be very well to write, yet it is better to forget them.

There are, however, testimonies delivered in the calm of reflection by acute and enlightened men, which may reasonably be allowed at least so much weight as to free the present inquiry from the charge of being wild or visionary. Christianity indeed needs no such auxiliaries; but, if they induce an examination of her duties, a wise man will not wish them to be disregarded.

“They who defend war,” says Erasmus, “must defend the dispositions which lead to war; and these dispositions are absolutely forbidden by the gospel. Since the time that Jesus Christ said, Put up thy sword into its scabbard, Christians ought not to go to war. Christ suffered Peter to fall into an error in this matter, on purpose that, when he had put up Peter’s sword, it might remain no longer a doubt that war was prohibited, which, before that order, had been considered as allowable.” Wickliffe seems to have thought it wrong to take away the life of a man on any account, and that war is utterly unlawful. “I am persuaded,” says Bishop Watson, “that when the spirit of Christianity shall exert its proper influence, war will cease throughout the whole Christian world. War has practices and principles peculiar to itself, which but ill quadrate with the rules of moral rectitude, and are quite abhorrent from the benignity of Christianity.” “There is,” says Southey, “but one community of Christians in the world, and that, unhappily, of all communities one of the smallest, enlightened enough to understand the prohibition of war by our Divine Master in its plain, literal and undeniable sense, and conscientious enough to obey it, subduing the very instinct of nature to obedience.” Dr. Vicesimus Knox speaks in language equally specific:—“Morality and religion forbid war in its motives, conduct and consequences.” The Paterines of Gazaria in Italy in the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries, “held that it was not lawful to bear arms, or to kill mankind.”

Those who have attended to the mode in which the moral law is instituted in the expressions of the will of God, will have no difficulty in supposing it contains no specific prohibition of war. Accordingly, if we be asked for such a prohibition in the manner in which *Thou shalt not kill* is directed against murder, we willingly answer that no such prohibition exists; nor is it necessary to the argument. Even those who would require such a prohibition, are themselves satisfied respecting the obligation of many negative duties on which there has been no specific decision in the New Testament. They believe that suicide is not lawful; yet Christianity never forbade it. It can be shown, indeed, by implication and inference, that suicide could not have been allowed; and with this they are satisfied. Yet there is probably in the Christian Scriptures not a twentieth part of as much indirect evidence against the lawfulness of suicide, as there is against the lawfulness of war. To those who require such a command as ‘*Thou shalt not engage in war,*’ it is therefore sufficient to reply, that they require that which, upon this and many other subjects, Christianity has not seen fit to give.

In this discussion, we have to refer to the *general tendency of the Christian revelation*;—to the *individual declarations of Jesus Christ*;—to his *practice*;—to the *sentiments and practices of his commissioned followers*;—to the *opinions respecting its lawfulness which were held by their immediate converts*; and to some other species of Christian evidence.

The moral law is a law of *benevolence*. This benevolence is good-will and kind affections towards one another, and is placed at the basis of practical morality; it is “the fulfilling of the law;” it is the test of the validity of our pretensions to the Christian character. This law of benevolence is universally applicable to public affairs as well as to private, to the intercourse of nations as well as of individuals.

Let us refer, then, to some of those requisitions of this law which appear peculiarly to respect the moral character of war. “Have peace one with another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.—Walk with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love.—Be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another; love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous; not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing.—Be at peace among yourselves. See that none render evil for evil unto any man. God hath called us to peace.—Follow after love, patience, meekness. Be gentle, showing all meekness unto all men. Live in peace.—Lay aside all malice. Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice.—Avenge not yourselves. If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink. Recompense to no man evil for evil. Overcome evil with good.”

Now, what evidence do these passages convey respecting the lawfulness of war? Could any approval or allowance of it have been subjoined to these instructions, without obvious and most gross inconsistency? But, if war is obviously inconsistent with the general character of Christianity; if war could not have been permitted by its teachers, without an egregious violation of their own precepts, we think that the evidence of its unlawfulness, arising from this general character alone, is as clear, as absolute, and as exclusive, as could have been contained in any form of prohibition whatever.

But it is not from general principles alone, that the law of Christianity respecting war may be deduced. “Ye have heard that it *hath* been said, ‘An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth;’ but *I* say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. Ye have heard that it *hath* been said, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy;’ but *I* say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; for if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye?”

Of the precepts from the Mount the most obvious characteristic is greater moral excellence and superior purity. They are

directed not so immediately to the external regulation of the conduct, as to the restraint and purification of the affections. In another precept it is not enough that an unlawful passion be just so far restrained as to produce no open immorality—the passion itself is forbidden. The tendency of the discourse is to attach guilt not to action only, but also to thought. It has been said, “Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment; but *I* say unto you, ‘that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment.’” Mat. v. 21, 22. Our Lawgiver attaches guilt to some of the violent feelings, such as resentment, hatred, revenge; and by doing this, we contend that he attaches guilt to war. War cannot be carried on without those passions which he prohibits. Our argument, therefore, is syllogistical:—War cannot be allowed, if that which is necessary to war is prohibited. This, indeed, is precisely the argument of Erasmus:—“They who defend war, must defend the dispositions which lead to war; and these dispositions are absolutely forbidden.”

Whatever might have been allowed under the Mosaic institution as to retaliation or resentment, Christianity says, “If ye love them only which love you, what reward have ye?—Love your enemies.” Now, what sort of love does that man bear towards his enemy, who runs him through with a bayonet? We repeat, that the distinguishing duties of Christianity must be sacrificed when war is carried on. The question is between the abandonment of these duties, and the abandonment of war, for both cannot be retained; although a late writer of some distinction gravely recommends soldiers, whilst shooting and stabbing their enemies, to maintain towards them a feeling of good-will! Gisborne, in his *Duties of Men*, advises the soldier “never to forget the common ties of human nature by which he is inseparably united to his enemy!”

It is however objected, that the prohibitions, “Resist not evil,” &c. are figurative; that they do not mean that no injury is to be punished, and no outrage to be repelled. It has been asked with complacent exultation, What would these advocates of peace say to him who struck them on the right cheek? Would they turn to him the other? What would these patient moralists say to him who robbed them of a coat? Would they give a cloak also? What would these philanthropists say to him who asked them to lend a hundred pounds? Would they not turn away?

This is *argumentum ad hominem*; one example, among many, of that low and dishonest mode of intellectual warfare which consists in exciting the feelings instead of convincing the understanding. It is, however, some satisfaction, that the motive to the adoption of this mode of warfare, is itself an indication of a bad cause; for what honest reasoner would produce only a laugh, if he were able to produce conviction?

We willingly *grant* that not all the precepts from the Mount were designed to be literally obeyed in the intercourse of life. But what then? To show that their meaning is not literal, is

not to show that they do not forbid war. We ask in our turn, What is the meaning of these precepts? What is the meaning of "Resist not evil?" Does it mean to allow bombardment—devastation—slaughter? If not, it does not allow war. What, again, do the objectors say is the meaning of, "Love your enemies," or of, "Do good to them that hate you?" Does it mean, "ruin their commerce"—"sink their fleets"—"plunder their cities"—"shoot through their hearts?" If the precept does not mean all this, it does not allow war. It is, therefore, not at all necessary here to discuss the precise signification of some of the precepts from the Mount, or to define what limits Christianity may admit in their application, since whatever exceptions she may allow, it is manifest what she does *not* allow; if we give to our objectors whatever license of interpretation they may desire, they cannot, without virtually rejecting the precepts, *so* interpret them as to make them allow war.

Of the injunctions contrasted with "eye for eye, and tooth for tooth," the entire scope and purpose is the suppression of the violent passions, and the inculcation of forbearance and forgiveness, benevolence and love. They forbid not specifically the act, but the *spirit* of war; and this method of prohibition Christ ordinarily employed. He did not often condemn the individual doctrines or customs of the age, however false, or however vicious; but he condemned the passions by which only vice could exist, and inculcated the truth which dismissed every error. And this method was undoubtedly *wise*. In the gradual alterations of human wickedness, many new species of profligacy might arise which the world had not yet practised; in the gradual vicissitudes of human error, many new fallacies might obtain which the world had not yet held; and how were these errors and these crimes to be opposed, but by the inculcation of principles applicable to every crime and every error—principles which define not always what is wrong, but tell us what always is right?

There are two modes of censure or condemnation; the one is to reprobate evil, and the other to enforce the opposite good; and both these modes were adopted by Christ. He not only censured the passions necessary to war, but inculcated the affections most opposed to them. The conduct and dispositions upon which he pronounced his solemn benediction, are exceedingly remarkable. They are these, and in this order: Poverty of Spirit;—Mourning;—Meekness;—Desire of righteousness;—Mercy;—Purity of heart;—Peace-making; Sufferance of persecution. Now, let the reader try whether he can propose eight other qualities, to be retained as the general habit of the mind, which shall be more incongruous with war.

Of these benedictions, I think the most emphatical is that pronounced upon the *Peace-makers*. "Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God." Higher praise or a higher title, no man can receive. Now, I do not say these benedictions contain an absolute proof that Christ prohib-

ited war ; but I say they make it clear that he did not approve it. He selected a number of subjects for his solemn approbation ; and not one of them possesses any congruity with war, and some of them cannot possibly exist in conjunction with it. Can any one believe that he who made this selection, and distinguished the peace-makers with peculiar approbation, could have sanctioned his followers in destroying one another ? Or does any one believe that those who were mourners, and meek, and merciful, and peace-making, could at the same time perpetrate such destruction ? If I be told that a temporary suspension of Christian dispositions, although necessary to the prosecution of war, does not imply the extinction of Christian principles, or that these dispositions may be the general habit of the mind, and may both precede and follow the acts of war, I answer that this is to grant all I require, since it grants that, when we engage in war, we abandon Christianity.

When the betrayers and murderers of Jesus Christ approached him, his followers asked, " Shall we smite with the sword ? " and without waiting for an answer, one of them " drew his sword, and smote the servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear. " " Put up again thy sword into his place, " said his Divine Master ; " for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword. " Matt. xxvi. 52. There is the greater importance in the circumstances of this command, because it prohibited the destruction of human life in a cause in which there were the best possible reasons for destroying it. The question, " shall we smite with the sword, " obviously refers to the defence of the Redeemer from his assailants by force of arms. His followers were ready to fight for him ; and, if any reason for fighting could be a good one, they certainly had it. But if, in defence of himself from the hands of bloody ruffians, his religion did not allow the sword to be drawn, for what reason can it be lawful to draw it ? The advocates of war are at least bound to show a better reason for destroying mankind, than is contained in this instance in which it was forbidden.

It will, perhaps, be said, that the reason why Christ did not suffer himself to be defended by arms, was, that such a defence would have defeated the purpose for which he came into the world, namely, to offer up his life ; and that he himself assigns this reason in the context. He does indeed assign it ; but the *primary* reason, the *immediate* context is, " for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword. " The reference to the destined sacrifice of his life is an after reference. This destined sacrifice might perhaps have formed a reason why his followers should not fight *then* ; but the first, the principal reason which he assigned, was the reason why they should not fight at all. Nor is it necessary to define the precise import of the words, " for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword ; " since it is sufficient for us all, that they imply reprobation.

It is with the Apostles as with Christ himself. The incessant object of their discourses and writings is the inculcation of peace,

of mildness, of placability. It might be supposed that they continually retained in prospect the reward which would attach to "peace-makers." We ask the advocate of war, whether he discovers in the writings of the Apostles, or the evangelists, any thing that indicates they approved of war. Do the tenor and spirit of their writings bear any congruity with it? Are not their spirit and tenor entirely discordant with it? We are entitled to renew the observation, that the pacific nature of the apostolic writings, proves presumptively that the writers disallowed war. *That* could not be allowed by them as sanctioned by Christianity, which outraged all the principles they inculcated. "Whence come wars and fightings among you?" is the interrogation of one of the Apostles; and he answers himself by asking, "Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" James iv. 1. This accords precisely with the argument we urge. Christ forbade the passions which lead to war; and now, when these passions had broken out into actual fighting, his Apostle, in condemning war, refers back to these passions. We have been saying that the passions are condemned, and therefore war; and now again the Apostle James thinks, like his Master, that the most effectual way of eradicating war, is to eradicate the passions which produce it.

We are told not only what the arms of the Apostles were not, but what they were. "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." This not only assures us, that the Apostle had nothing to do with military weapons, but tells us the object of their warfare—the bringing of every *thought* to the obedience of Christ; and this object I would beg the reader to notice, because it accords with the object of Christ himself in his precepts from the Mount—the reduction of the thoughts to obedience. The Apostle doubtless knew that, if he could effect this, there was little reason to fear that his converts would slaughter one another. He followed the example of his Master. He attacked wickedness in its root, and inculcated those general principles of purity and forbearance, which would abolish war, as they would abolish all other crimes. The teachers of Christianity addressed themselves not to communities, but to men. They enforced the regulation of the passions; and the rectification of the heart; and it was probably clear to the Apostles, although it is not clear to some philosophers, that whatever duties are binding upon one man, are binding upon ten, upon a hundred, and upon the State.

War is not often directly noticed in the writings of the Apostles. When it is noticed, it is condemned just in that way in which we should suppose any thing would be condemned that was notoriously opposed to the whole system—just as murder is condemned at the present day. Who can find, in modern books, that murder is formally censured? We may find censures of its motives, of its circumstances, of its degrees of atroc-

ity ; but the act itself no one thinks of censuring, because every one knows it is wicked. Setting statutes aside, I doubt whether, if an Otaheitan should choose to argue that Christians allow murder because he cannot find it formally prohibited in their writings, we should not be at a loss to find direct evidence against him. And it arises perhaps from the same causes, that a formal prohibition of war is not to be found in the writings of the Apostles. I do not believe they *imagined* that Christianity would ever be charged with allowing it. They write as if the idea of such a charge never occurred to them. They did, nevertheless, virtually forbid it ; unless any one shall say they disallowed the passions which occasion war, but did not disallow war itself ; that Christianity prohibits the cause, but permits the effect ; which is much the same as to say, that a law which forbade administering arsenic, did not forbid poisoning.

Let us next examine the arguments by which war is defended. Here, two important considerations should be borne in mind—first, that those who urge them, are not simply defending war, they are also defending themselves. If war be wrong, their conduct is wrong ; and the desire of self-justification prompts them to give importance to whatever arguments they can advance in its favor. Their decisions, therefore, may with reason be regarded as in some degree the decisions of a party in the case. The other consideration is, that the defenders of war come to the discussion prepossessed in its favor. They are attached to it by their earliest habits. They do not examine the question as a philosopher would, to whom the subject was new. Their opinion has been already formed. They are discussing a question which they have already determined ; and every man, who is acquainted with the effects of evidence on the mind, knows that under these circumstances a very slender argument in favor of the previous opinion, possesses more influence than many great ones against it. Now all this cannot be predicated of the advocates of peace ; they are opposing the influence of habit ; they are contending against the general prejudice ; they are perhaps dismissing their own previous opinions ; and I would submit it to the candor of the reader, that these circumstances ought to attach suspicion to the arguments against us.

The narrative of the centurion who came to Jesus at Capernaum to solicit him to heal his servant, furnishes one of these arguments. It is said Christ found no fault with the centurion's profession ; that, if he had disallowed the military character, he would have taken this opportunity of censuring it ; and that, instead of such censure, he highly commended the officer, and said of him, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." Matt. viii. 10.

An obvious weakness in this argument is this, that it is founded not upon approval, but upon silence. Approbation, not to his arms, but to his faith, is indeed expressed ; and those who will read the narrative, will find that no occasion was given for notic-

ing his profession. He came to Christ, not as a military officer, but simply as a deserving man. A censure of his profession might undoubtedly have been pronounced ; but it would have been a gratuitous censure, a censure not naturally arising out of the case. The objection is, in its greatest weight, presumptive only ; for no man can be supposed to countenance every thing he does not condemn. To observe silence in such cases, was indeed the ordinary practice of Christ. He very seldom interfered with the civil or political institutions of the world. In these institutions there was sufficient wickedness ; but some of them, flagitious as they were, he never, on any occasion, even noticed. His mode of condemning and extirpating political vices, was by the inculcation of general rules of purity, which, in their eventual and universal application, would reform them all.

But how happens it that Christ did not notice the centurion's *religion*? He surely was an idolater. And is there not as good reason for maintaining that Christ approved idolatry because he did not condemn it, as that he approved war because he did not condemn it? Reasoning from analogy, we should conclude that idolatry was likely to have been noticed rather than war ; and it is therefore peculiarly and singularly unapt to bring forward his silence respecting war, as an evidence of its lawfulness.

A similar argument is advanced from the case of Cornelius to whom Peter was sent from Joppa, of which it is said that, although the gospel was imparted to Cornelius by the special direction of heaven, yet we do not find he quitted his profession, or that it was considered inconsistent with his new character. The objection applies to this argument as to the last—that it is built upon silence, is simply negative. We do not find that he quitted the service ; I might answer, neither do we find that he continued in it. We only know nothing of the matter ; and the evidence is therefore so much less than proof, as silence is less than approbation. Yet that the account is silent respecting any disapprobation of war, might have been a reasonable ground of argument under different circumstances. It might have been a reasonable ground of argument, if the primary object of Christianity had been the reformation of political institutions, or perhaps even if her primary object had been the regulation of the external conduct ; but her primary object was neither of these. She directed herself to the reformation of the heart, knowing that all other reformation would follow. She embraced, indeed, both morality and policy, and has reformed, or will reform, both, not so much immediately as consequently, not so much by filtering the current, as by purifying the spring. The silence of Peter in the case of Cornelius, therefore, will serve the cause of war but little ; that little is diminished when urged against the positive evidence of commands and prohibitions ; and it is reduced to nothingness, when it is opposed to the universal tendency and object of revelation.

It has sometimes been urged that Christ paid taxes to the Roman government when engaged in war, and when therefore the

money he paid, would be employed in its prosecution. This we shall readily grant; but it appears to be forgotten, that, if this proves war to be lawful, it proves too much. These taxes were thrown into the exchequer of the state, and a part of the money was applied to purposes of a most iniquitous and shocking nature—sometimes, probably, to the gratification of the emperor's personal vices, and to his gladiatorial exhibitions, and certainly to the support of a miserable idolatry. If therefore the payment of taxes to such a government proves an approbation of war, it proves the approbation of many other enormities. Moreover, the argument goes too far in relation even to war; for it must necessarily make Christ approve all the Roman wars, without distinction of their justice or injustice—of the most ambitious, the most atrocious, and the most aggressive—and these, even our objectors will not defend. The payment of tribute by our Lord was accordant with his usual system of avoiding to interfere in the civil or political institutions of the world.

“He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one.” This is another passage brought against us. ‘For what purpose,’ it is asked, ‘were they to buy swords, if swords might not be used?’ It may be doubted whether, with some of those who advance this objection, it is not an objection of words rather than of opinion, whether they themselves think there is any weight in it. To those, however, who may be influenced by it, I would observe that, as it appears to me, a sufficient answer to the objection may be found in the immediate context. “Lord, behold here are two swords,” said they; and he immediately answered, “It is enough.” How could two be enough when eleven were to be supplied with them? That swords in the sense, and for the purpose, of military weapons, were even intended in this passage, there appears much reason for doubting.

This reason will be discovered by examining and connecting such passages as these: “The Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them,” said our Lord. Yet, on another occasion, he says, “I came not to send peace on the earth, but a sword.” How are we to explain the meaning of the latter declaration? Obviously, by understanding “sword” to mean something far other than steel. There appears little reason for supposing that physical weapons were intended in the instruction of Christ. I believe they were not intended, partly because no one can imagine his Apostles were in the habit of using such arms, partly because they declared that the weapons of their warfare are *not* carnal, and partly because the word “sword” is often used to imply dissension, or the religious warfare of the Christian. Such an use of language is found in the last quotation; and it is found also in such expressions as *shield* of faith, *helmet* of salvation, *sword* of the spirit, I have *fought* the good fight of faith.

But it will be said that the Apostles did provide themselves with swords, for that on the same evening they asked, “shall we smite with the sword?” This is true; and it may probably

be true also, that some provided themselves with swords in consequence of the injunction of their Master. But what then? It appears to me that the Apostles acted on this occasion upon the principles on which they had wished to act on another, when they asked, "Wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them?" Their Master's principles of action were also the same in both—"Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." This is the language of Christianity; and I would seriously invite him who now justifies "destroying men's lives," to consider what manner of spirit *he* is of.

I think, then, that no argument arising from the instructions to buy swords, can be maintained. This, at least, we know, that when the Apostles were completely commissioned, they neither used nor possessed them. An extraordinary imagination he must have, who conceives an Apostle preaching peace and reconciliation, crying "forgive injuries, love your enemies, render not evil for evil," and, at the conclusion of the discourse, if he chanced to meet violence or insult, promptly drawing his sword, and maiming or murdering the offender. We insist upon this consideration. If swords were to be worn, swords were to be used; and there is no rational way in which they could have been used, but some such as that which we have been supposing. If, therefore, the words, "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one," do not mean to authorize such an use of the sword, they do not mean to authorize its use at all; and those who adduce the passage, must allow its application in such a sense, or they must exclude it from any application to their purpose.

It has been said, again, that when soldiers came to John the Baptist to inquire of him what they should do, he did not direct them to leave the service, but to be content with their wages. This also is at best but a negative evidence. It does not prove the military profession wrong, and it certainly does not prove it right. But in truth, if it asserted the latter, Christians have, as I conceive, nothing to do with it; for I think we need not inquire what John allowed, or what he forbade. He confessedly belonged to that system which required "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth;" and the observations which we shall by and by make on the authority of the law of Moses, apply therefore to that of John the Baptist. Although it could be proved (which it cannot be) that he allowed wars, he acted not inconsistently with his own dispensation; and with that dispensation we have no business. Yet, if any one still insists upon the authority of John, I would refer him for an answer to Jesus Christ himself. What authority *He* attached to John on questions relating to His own dispensation, may be learnt from this—"The least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."

It is perhaps no trifling indication of the difficulty which writers have found in discovering in the Christian Scriptures argu-

ments for war, that they have had recourse to such equivocal and far-fetched arguments. Grotius adduces a passage which he says is "a leading point of evidence, to show that the right of war is not taken away by the law of the gospel." And what is this leading evidence? That Paul, in writing to Timothy, exhorts that prayer should be made "for kings!" Another evidence which this great man adduces is, that Paul suffered himself to be protected on his journey by a guard of soldiers, without hinting any disapprobation of repelling force by force. But how does Grotius know that Paul did not hint this? And who can imagine that to suffer himself to be guarded by a military escort, in the appointment of which he had no control, was to approve war?

But perhaps the real absence of sound Christian arguments in favor of war, is in no circumstance so remarkably intimated as in the citations of Milton in his *Christian Doctrine*. With regard to "the duties of war," he refers to thirty-nine passages of Scripture, thirty-eight of which are from the Hebrew Scriptures; and what is the individual *one* from the Christian? "What king going to war with another king!" &c. Luke xiv. 31.

Such are the arguments adduced from the Christian Scriptures by the advocates of war. These five passages are those which men of acute minds, studiously seeking for evidence, have selected. And what are they? Their evidence is in the majority of instances negative at best. A *NOT* intervenes. The centurion was *not* found fault with; Cornelius was *not* told to leave the profession; John did *not* tell the soldiers to abandon the army; Paul did *not* refuse a military guard. I cannot forbear to solicit the reader to compare these objections with the pacific evidence of the gospel which has been laid before him, I would rather say, to compare it with the gospel itself; for the sum, the tendency, of the whole revelation is in our favor.

In an inquiry whether Christianity allows war, there is a subject that always appears to me of peculiar importance—the prophecies of the Old Testament respecting the arrival of a period of universal peace. The belief is perhaps general amongst Christians, that a time will come when vice shall be eradicated from the world, when the violent passions of mankind shall be repressed, and when the pure benignity of Christianity shall be universally diffused. That such a period will come, we indeed know assuredly; for God has promised it.

Of the many prophecies of the Old Testament respecting this period, we refer only to a few from the writings of Isaiah. In his predictions respecting the "last times," by which he undoubtedly referred to the prevalence of the Christian religion, the prophet says, "They shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the wa-

ters cover the sea. Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders." Isa. ii. 4; xi. 9; lx. 18.

Two things are to be observed in relation to these prophecies; first, that it is the will of God that war should eventually be abolished. This consideration is of importance; for if war be not accordant with His will, war cannot be accordant with Christianity, which is the revelation of His will. Our business, however, is principally with the second consideration—that Christianity will be the means of introducing this period of Peace. From those who say that our religion sanctions war, an answer must be expected to questions such as these: By what instrumentality, by the diffusion of what principles, will the prophecies of Isaiah be fulfilled? Are we to expect some new system of religion by which the imperfections of Christianity shall be removed, and its deficiencies supplied? Are we to believe that God sent his only Son into the world to institute a religion such as this, a religion that in a few centuries would require to be altered and amended? If Christianity allows war, they must tell us what is to extirpate war. If she allows "violence, and wasting, and destruction," they must tell us what principles are to produce gentleness, and benevolence, and forbearance. I know not what answer such inquiries will receive from the advocate of war; but I know that Isaiah says the change will be effected by Christianity.

Whatever the principles of Christianity will require hereafter, they require now. Christianity, with its present principles and obligations, is to produce universal peace. It becomes, therefore, an absurdity, a simple contradiction, to maintain that the principles of Christianity allow war, when they, and they only, are to eradicate it. If we have no other guarantee of Peace than the existence of our religion, and no other hope of Peace than its diffusion, how can that religion sanction war? The case is clear. A more perfect obedience to that same gospel, which, we are told, sanctions slaughter, will be the means, and the only means, of exterminating slaughter from the world. It is not from an alteration of Christianity, but from an assimilation of Christians to its nature, that we are to hope. It is because we violate the principles of our religion, because we are not what they require us to be, that wars are continued. If we will not be peaceable, let us at least be honest, and acknowledge that we continue to slaughter one another, not because Christianity permits it, but because we reject her laws.

The opinions of the earliest professors of Christianity upon the lawfulness of war are of importance, because they who lived nearest to the time of its Founder, were most likely to be informed of his intentions, and to practise them without those adulterations which we know have been introduced by the lapse of ages. During a considerable period after the death of Christ, it is certain that his followers believed he had forbidden war, and

that, in consequence of this belief, many of them refused to engage in it, whatever the consequence, whether reproach, or imprisonment, or death. These facts are indisputable. "It is as easy," says a learned writer of the seventeenth century, "to obscure the sun at mid-day, as to deny that the primitive Christians renounced all revenge and war." Christ and his Apostles delivered general precepts for the regulation of our conduct. It was necessary for their successors to apply them to their practice in life. And to what did they apply the pacific precepts which had been delivered? They applied them to war, and believed they absolutely forbade it. This belief they derived from those very precepts on which we have insisted; they referred expressly to the same passages in the New Testament, and from the authority and obligation of those passages, they refused to bear arms.

A few examples from their history will show with what undoubted confidence they believed in the unlawfulness of war, and how much they were willing to suffer in the cause of Peace. Maximilian, as it is related in the Acts of Ruinart, was brought before the tribunal to be enrolled as a soldier. On the proconsul's asking his name, Maximilian replied, "I am a Christian, and cannot fight." It was, however, ordered that he should be enrolled; but he refused to serve, still alleging that he was a Christian. He was immediately told that there was no alternative between bearing arms, and being put to death. But his fidelity was not to be shaken;—"I cannot fight," said he, "if I die." He continued steadfast to his principles, and was consigned to the executioner.

The primitive Christians not only refused to enlist in the army, but when they embraced Christianity, whilst already enlisted, they abandoned the profession at whatever cost. Marcellus was a centurion in the legion called Trajana. Whilst holding this commission, he became a Christian; and, believing in common with his fellow-Christians, that war was no longer permitted to him, he threw down his belt at the head of the legion, declaring that he had become a Christian, and would serve no longer. He was committed to prison; but he was still faithful to Christianity. "It is not lawful," said he, "for a Christian to bear arms for any earthly consideration;" and he was, in consequence, put to death. Almost immediately afterwards, Cassian, notary to the same legion, gave up his office. He steadfastly maintained the sentiments of Marcellus, and like him was consigned to the executioner. Martin, of whom so much is said by Sulpicius Severus, was bred to the profession of arms, which, on his acceptance of Christianity, he abandoned. To Julian the Apostate, the only reason that we find he gave for his conduct, was this, "I am a Christian, and therefore I cannot fight."

These were not the sentiments, and this was not the conduct, of insulated individuals who might be actuated by individual opinion, or by their private interpretations of the duties of Christianity. Their principles were the principles of the body. They were recognized and defended by the Christian writers, their

contemporaries. Justin Martyr and Tatian talk of soldiers and Christians as distinct characters; and Tatian says that the Christians declined even military commands. Clemens of Alexandria calls his Christian contemporaries the "Followers of Peace," and expressly tells us "that the followers of peace used none of the implements of war." Lactantius, another early Christian, says expressly, "It can never be lawful for a righteous man to go to war." About the end of the second century, Celsus, one of the opponents of Christianity, charged the Christians with refusing to bear arms even in case of necessity. Origen, the defender of the Christians, does not think of denying the fact; he admits the refusal, and justifies it, because war was unlawful. Even after Christianity had spread over almost the whole of the known world, Tertullian, in speaking of a part of the Roman armies, including more than one-third of the standing legions of Rome, distinctly informs us that "not a Christian could be found amongst them."

All this is explicit. The evidence of the following facts is, however, yet more determinate and satisfactory. Some of the arguments which, at the present day, are brought against the advocates of peace, were then urged against those early Christians; and these arguments they examined and repelled. This indicates investigation and inquiry, and manifests that their belief of the unlawfulness of war was not a vague opinion, hastily admitted, and loosely floating amongst them, but was the result of deliberate examination, and a consequent firm conviction that Christ had forbidden it. The very same arguments which are brought in defence of war at the present day, were brought against the Christians sixteen hundred years ago, and they were repelled by those faithful contenders for the purity of our religion. It is remarkable, too, that Tertullian appeals to the precepts from the Mount in proof of those principles on which we are insisting, that the dispositions which the precepts inculcate, are not compatible with war, and that war therefore is irreconcilable with Christianity.

If it be possible, a still stronger evidence of the primitive belief is contained in the circumstance, that some of the Christian authors declared that the refusal of the Christians to bear arms, was a fulfilment of ancient prophecy. The peculiar strength of this evidence consists in this, that the fact of a refusal to bear arms is assumed as notorious and unquestioned. Irenæus, who lived about the year 180, affirms that the prophecy of Isaiah, which declared that men should turn their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, had been fulfilled in his time; "for the Christians," says he, "have changed their swords and their lances into instruments of peace, and they know not how to fight."—Justin Martyr, his contemporary, writes, "That the prophecy is fulfilled, you have good reason to believe for we who in times past killed one another, do not now fight with our enemies." Tertullian, who lived later, says, "You must confess that the prophecy has been accomplished as far as the

practice of every individual is concerned, to whom it is applicable."

It has been sometimes said, that the motive which influenced the early Christians to refuse to engage in war, consisted in the *idolatry* connected with the Roman armies. *One* motive this idolatry unquestionably afforded; but it is obvious from the quotations we have given, that their belief of the unlawfulness of fighting, independent of idolatry, was an insuperable objection to engaging in war. Their words are explicit: "I cannot *fight*, if I die."—"I am a Christian, and therefore I cannot fight."—"Christ," says Tertullian, "by disarming Peter, disarmed every soldier;" and Peter was not about to fight in the armies of idolatry. So entire was their conviction of the incompatibility of war with our religion, that they would not even be present at the gladiatorial fights, "lest," says Theophilus, "we should become partakers of the murders committed there." Can any one believe that they who would not even witness a battle between two men, would themselves fight in a battle between armies? And the destruction of a gladiator, it should be remembered, was authorized by the state, as much as the destruction of enemies in war.

It is therefore indisputable, that the Christians who lived nearest to the time of our Savior, believed with undoubting confidence, that he had unequivocally forbidden war; that they openly avowed this belief; and that in support of it, they were willing to sacrifice, and did sacrifice, their fortunes and their lives.

Christians, however, afterwards became soldiers; but when? When their general fidelity to Christianity became relaxed; when, in other respects, they violated its principles; when they had began "to dissemble," and "to falsify their word," and "to cheat;" when "Christian casuists" had persuaded them that they might "sit at meat in the idol's temple;" when Christians accepted even the priesthoods of idolatry; in a word, "when they had ceased to be Christians."

This departure from the original faithfulness, however, was not suddenly general. Like every other corruption, war obtained by degrees. During the first two hundred years, not a Christian soldier is upon record. In the third century, when Christianity became partially corrupted, Christian soldiers were common. The number increased with the increase of the general profligacy, until at last, in the fourth century, Christians became soldiers without hesitation, and perhaps without remorse. Here and there, however, an ancient father still lifted up his voice for Peace; but these, one after another, dropping from the world, the tenet that war is unlawful, ceased at length to be a tenet of the church.

Let the advocates of war, then, always bear in mind, that they are contending for a corruption which their forefathers abhorred, and are making Jesus Christ the sanctioner of crimes which his purest followers offered up their lives because they would not commit.

An argument has sometimes been advanced in favor of war from the divine communications to the Jews under the administration of Moses. It has been said that, as wars were allowed and enjoined to that people, they cannot be inconsistent with the will of God. Certainly not at that time; but, if Christianity prohibits war, there is to Christians an end of the controversy. War cannot be justified by referring to any antecedent dispensation; and those who refer to the authority by which the Jews prosecuted their wars, must be expected to produce the same authority for our own. Wars were commanded to the Jews; but are they commanded to us? War, in the abstract, was never commanded; and surely the specific wars enjoined upon the Jews for an express purpose, are neither authority nor example for us who have received no such injunction, and can plead no such purpose.

It will, perhaps, be said, that the commands to prosecute wars, even to extermination, are so positive, and so often repeated, that it is not probable, if they were inconsistent with the will of heaven, that they would have been thus peremptorily enjoined. We answer, they were not inconsistent with the will of heaven *then*. But even then, the prophets foresaw that they were not accordant with the universal will of God, since they predicted, that when that will should be fulfilled, war should be eradicated from the world. And by what dispensation was this will to be fulfilled? By that of the "Rod out of the stem of Jesse." Some of the commands under the law, Christianity *requires* us to disobey. "If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, &c., all the men of the city shall stone him with stones that he die. If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, entice thee secretly, saying, 'Let us go and serve other gods,' thou shalt not pity him nor conceal him, but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death." Deut. xxi. 18, 21. ; xiii. 9.

It is worthy of recollection, too, that David was forbidden to build the temple because he had shed blood. "As for me it was in my mind to build an house unto the name of the Lord my God: but the word of the Lord came to me, saying, Thou hast shed blood abundantly, and hast made great wars; thou shalt not build an house unto my name, because thou hast shed much blood upon the earth in my sight." 1 Chron. xxii. 7, 8. So little accordancy did war possess with the purer offices even of the Jewish dispensation.

Perhaps the argument to which the greatest importance is attached by the advocates of war, and by which thinking men are chiefly induced to acquiesce in its lawfulness, is this, that a distinction is to be made between rules which apply to us as individuals, and rules which apply to us as subjects of the state; and that the pacific injunctions of Christ from the Mount, and all the other kindred commands and prohibitions of the Chris-

tian Scriptures, have no reference to our conduct as members of the political body.

When persons make such broad distinctions between the obligations of Christianity on private and on public affairs, the proof of the rectitude of the distinction must be expected of those who make it. General rules are laid down by Christianity, of which in some cases the advocate of war denies the applicability. He, therefore, is to produce the reason and the authority for the exception. And that authority must be a competent authority—the authority mediately or immediately of God. It is to no purpose for such a person to tell us of the magnitude of political affairs—of the greatness of the interests which they involve—of necessity or expediency. All these are very proper considerations in subordination to the Moral Law; otherwise they are wholly nugatory and irrelevant. Let the reader observe the manner in which the argument is supported. ‘If an individual suffers aggression, there is a power to which he can apply that is above himself, and above the aggressor; a power by which the bad passions of those around him are restrained, or by which their aggressions are punished. But amongst nations there is no acknowledged superior or common arbitrator. Even if there were, there is no way in which its decisions could be enforced, but by the sword. War, therefore, is the only means which one nation possesses of protecting itself from the the aggression of another.’ The reader will observe the fundamental fallacy upon which the argument proceeds; it *assumes*, that the reason why an individual is not permitted to use violence is, that the laws will use it for him. Here is the error; for the foundation of the duty of forbearance in private life, is *not* that the laws will punish aggression, but that Christianity requires forbearance.

Undoubtedly, if the existence of a common arbitrator were the foundation of the duty, the duty would not be binding upon nations. But that which we require to be proved is this—that Christianity exonerates nations from those duties which she has imposed upon individuals. This the present argument does not prove; and in truth, with a singular unhappiness in its application, it assumes in effect that she has imposed these duties upon neither the one nor the other.

If it be said, that Christianity allows to individuals some degree and kind of resistance, and that some resistance is therefore lawful to states, we do not deny it. But if it be said, that the degree of lawful resistance extends to the slaughter of our fellow Christians, to war, we do deny it; we say that the rules of Christianity cannot, by any possible latitude of interpretation, be made to extend to it. The duty of forbearance, then, is antecedent to all considerations respecting the condition of man; and, whether he be under the protection of laws or not, the duty of forbearance is imposed.

The only truth which appears to be elicited by the present argument is, that the difficulty of obeying the forbearing rules of Christianity is *greater* in the case of nations than in the case

of individuals; the obligation to obey them is the same in both. Nor let any one urge the difficulty of obedience in opposition to the duty; for he who does this, has yet to learn one of the most awful rules of his religion—a rule enforced by the precepts, and more especially by the final example of Christ, of Apostles and martyrs—the rule which requires that we should be “obedient even unto death.” Let it not, however, be supposed that we believe the difficulty of forbearance would be as great in practice as it is in theory. Our interests are commonly promoted by the fulfilment of our duties; and we hope hereafter to show, that the fulfilment of the duty of forbearance forms no exception to the applicability of the rule.

The intelligent reader will have perceived, that the war of which we speak is all war, without reference to its objects, whether offensive or defensive. In truth, respecting any other than defensive war, it is scarcely worth while to entertain a question; since no one with whom we are concerned to reason, will advocate its opposite. Some persons indeed talk with much complacency of their reprobation of offensive war. Yet to reprobate no more than this, is only to condemn that which wickedness itself is not wont to justify. Even those who practise offensive war, affect to veil its nature by calling it by another name.

In conformity with this, we find that it is to defence that the peaceable precepts of Christianity are directed. *Offence* appears not to have even suggested itself. It is, “Resist not *evil* ;” it is, “Overcome *evil* with good ;” it is, “Do good to them that hate you ;” it is, “Love your *enemies* ;” it is, “Render not evil for *evil* ;” it is, “Unto him that *smiteth thee on the one cheek.*” All this supposes previous offence, or injury, or violence; and it is *then* that forbearance is enjoined.

It is common with those who justify defensive war, to identify the question with that of individual self-defence. This is one of the strongholds of the defender of war, the almost final fastness to which he retires. The instinct of self-preservation, it is said, is an instinct of nature; and since this instinct is implanted by God, whatever is necessary to self-preservation is accordant with his will. The fallacy of the whole argument appears to consist in this, that it assumes an instinct of nature to be a law of paramount authority. God has implanted in the human system various propensities or instincts, of which the purposes are wise. These propensities tend in their own nature to abuse; and, when gratified or followed to excess, they become subversive of the purposes of the wisdom which implanted them, and destructive of the welfare of mankind. He has therefore instituted a superior law, sanctioned by his immediate authority; and by this law, we are required to regulate these propensities. The question therefore is, not whether the instinct of self-preservation is implanted by nature, but whether Christianity has restricted its operation. By this, and by this only, the question is to be determined. Now, he who will be at the trouble of mak-

ing the inquiry, will find that a regulation of the instincts of nature, a restriction of their exercise, is a prominent object of the Christian morality ; and I think it plain that this regulation and restriction apply to the instinct before us. That some of these propensities are to be restrained, is certain. One of the most powerful instincts of our nature, is an affection to which the regulating precepts of Christianity are peculiarly directed. I do not maintain that any natural instinct is to be eradicated, but that all of them are to be regulated and restrained ; and I maintain this of the instinct of self-preservation.

We say, however, that the questions of self-defence and of war, are practically dissimilar ; so that if we had a right to kill a man in self-defence, very few wars would be shown to be lawful. Of the wars which are prosecuted, some are simply wars of aggression ; some are for the maintenance of a balance of power ; some are in assertion of technical rights ; and some, undoubtedly, to repel invasion. The last are perhaps the fewest ; and of these only it can be said that they bear any analogy whatever to the case which is supposed ; and even in these, the analogy is seldom complete. It has rarely indeed happened that wars have been undertaken simply for the preservation of life, and that no other alternative has happened to a people than to kill or be killed. And let it be remembered, that unless this alternative alone remains, the case of individual self-defence is irrelevant ; it applies not practically to the subject.

But, indeed, you cannot in practice make distinctions even moderately accurate between defensive war, and war for other purposes. Suppose the Christian Scriptures had said, An army may fight in its own defence, but not for any other purpose. Whoever will attempt to apply this rule in practice, will find he has a very wide range of justifiable warfare, a range that will embrace many more wars than moralists, laxer than we shall suppose him to be, are willing to defend. If an army may fight in defence of their own lives, they may, and they must fight in defence of the lives of others ; if in the defence of the lives of others, they will fight in defence of their property ; if in defence of property, they will fight in defence of political rights ; if in defence of rights, they will fight in promotion of interests ; if in promotion of interests, they will fight in promotion of glory and crime. Let any honest man look over the gradations by which we arrive at this climax, and I believe he will find that, in practice, no curb can be placed upon the conduct of an army until they reach that climax. There is indeed a wide distance between fighting in defence of life, and fighting in furtherance of our crimes ; but the steps which lead from one to the other, will follow in inevitable succession. I know that the letter of our rule excludes it ; but I know that the rule will be a letter only. It is very easy for us to sit in our studies, and point the commas, and semicolons, and periods of the soldier's career ; it is very easy for us to say, he shall stop at defence of life, or at protection of property, or at the support of rights ; but armies will never listen

to us; we shall be only the Xerxes of morality, throwing out idle chains into the tempestuous ocean of slaughter.

What is the testimony of experience? When nations are mutually exasperated, and armies are levied, and battles are fought, does not every one know that with whatever motives of defence one party may have begun the contest, both in turn become aggressors? In the fury of slaughter, soldiers do not attend, they cannot attend, to questions of aggression. Their business is destruction, and their business they will perform. If the army of defence obtains success, it soon becomes an army of aggression. Having repelled the invader, it begins to punish him. If a war has begun, it is vain to think of distinctions of aggression and defence. Moralists may *talk* of distinctions, but soldiers will *make* none; none can be made; it is beyond the limits of possibility.

Indeed, some of the definitions of defensive or *just* war which are proposed by moralists, indicate how impossible it is to confine warfare within any assignable limits. "The objects of *just* war," says Paley, "are precaution, defence, or reparation. Every *just* war supposes an injury perpetrated, attempted, or feared." I shall acknowledge, that if these be justifying motives to war, I see very little purpose in talking of morality upon the subject. It is in vain to expatiate on moral obligations, if we are at liberty to declare war whenever an "injury is feared;" an injury, without limit to its insignificance! a fear, without stipulation for its reasonableness! The judges, also, of the reasonableness of fear, are to be they who are under its influence; and who so likely to judge amiss as those who are afraid? Sounder philosophy than this has told us, that "he who has to reason upon his duty when the temptation to transgress it is before him, is almost sure to reason himself into error."

Violence, and Rapine, and Ambition are not to be restrained by morality like this. It may serve for the speculations of a study; but we will venture to affirm, that mankind will never be controlled by it. Moral rules are useless, if, from their own nature they cannot be, or will not be applied. Who believes that if kings and conquerors may fight when they have fears, they will not fight when they have them not? This morality allows too much latitude to the passions, to retain any practical restraint upon them. And a morality that will not be practised, I had almost said, that cannot be practised, is an useless morality. It is a *theory* of morals. We want clearer and more exclusive rules; we want more obvious and immediate sanctions. It were in vain for a philosopher to say to a general who was burning for glory, 'You are at liberty to engage in the war, provided you have suffered, or fear you will suffer an injury—otherwise Christianity prohibits it.' He will tell him of twenty injuries that have been suffered, of a hundred that have been attempted, of a thousand that he fears. What answer can the philosopher make?

If these are the proper standards of just war, there will be little difficulty in proving any war to be just, except that of simple aggression; and by the rules of this morality, the aggressor is

difficult of discovery, for he whom we choose to fear, may say he had previous fear of us, and that his fear prompted the hostile symptoms which made us fear again. The truth is, that to attempt to make any distinctions upon the subject, is vain. War must be wholly forbidden, or allowed without restriction to defence; for no definitions of lawful and unlawful war, will be, or can be, attended to. If the principles of Christianity, in any case, or for any purpose, allow armies to meet and slaughter one another, her principles will never conduct us to the period which prophecy has assured us they shall produce. There is no hope of eradicating war, but by a total abandonment of it.

The positions, then, which we endeavor to establish are these: 1. That those considerations which operate as General Causes of War, are commonly such as Christianity condemns.—2. That the Effects of War are, to a very great extent, prejudicial to the moral character of a people, and to their social and political welfare.—3. That the General Character of Christianity is wholly incongruous with war, and that its General Duties are incompatible with it.—4. That some of the express Precepts and Declarations of the Christian Scriptures virtually forbid it.—5. That the Primitive Christians believed that Christ had forbidden war; and that some of them suffered death in affirmance of this belief.—6. That God has declared in Prophecy, that war shall eventually be eradicated from the earth; and that this eradication will be effected by Christianity, by the influence of its *present* Principles.—7. That, as we shall next prove, those who have refused to engage in war, in consequence of believing it inconsistent with Christianity, have found that Providence has protected them.

Now, the establishment of any considerable number of these positions is sufficient for our argument. The establishment of the whole forms a body of evidence, to which I am not able to believe that an inquirer, to whom the subject was new, would be able to withhold his assent. But whatever may be the determination upon this question, surely it is reasonable to try the experiment, whether security cannot be maintained without slaughter. Whatever the reasons for war, it certainly produces enormous mischief. Even waiving the obligations of Christianity, we have to choose between evils that are certain, and evils that are doubtful; between the actual endurance of a great calamity, and the possibility of a less. It certainly cannot be proved, that Peace would not be the best policy; and, since we know that the present system is bad, it were reasonable and wise to try whether the other is not better. Whenever a people shall pursue, steadily and uniformly, the pacific morality of the gospel, and shall do this from the pure motive of obedience, there is no reason to fear that they would experience any evils such as we now endure, or that they would not find that the surest, and the only rule of wisdom, of safety, and of expediency, is to maintain the spirit of Christianity in every circumstance of life.

EFFICACY OF PACIFIC PRINCIPLES.

BY JONATHAN DYMOND.

THE duties of Christianity require irrisistance ; and surely it is reasonable to believe, even without a reference to experience, that God will make our irrisistance subservient to our interests ; that, if he requires us not to be concerned in war, he will preserve us in peace, nor desert those who have abandoned all protection but his. If we refer to experience, we shall find that the reasonableness of this confidence is confirmed. Thousands have confided in Heaven in opposition to all their apparent interests ; but of these thousands has one eventually repented his confidence, or reposed in vain ? “ He that will lose his life for my sake, and the gospel’s, the same shall find it.” If it be said we take futurity into the calculation in our estimate of *interest*, I answer, so we ought. Who is the man that would exclude futurity, or what are his principles ? I do not comprehend the foundation of these objections against a reference to futurity which are thus flippantly made. Are we not immortal beings ? Have we not interests beyond the present life ? It is a deplorable temper of mind, which would diminish the frequency or the influence of our references to futurity. Yet, even in reference only to the present state of existence, I believe we shall find that the testimony of experience is, that forbearance is most conducive to our interests. “ If a man’s ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him.”

The reader of American history will recollect, that in the beginning of the last century, a desultory and most dreadful warfare was carried on by the natives against the European settlers, a warfare that was provoked, as such warfare has almost always originally been, by the injuries and violence of the Christians. The mode of destruction was secret and sudden. The barbarians sometimes lay in wait for those who might come within their reach on the highway or in the fields, and shot them without warning ; and sometimes they attacked the Europeans in their houses, “ scalping some, and knocking out the brains of others.” From this horrible warfare, the inhabitants sought safety by abandoning their homes, and retiring to fortified places, or to the neighborhood of garrisons ; and those whom necessity still compelled to pass beyond the limits of such protection, provided themselves with arms for their defence. But amidst this dreadful desolation and universal terror, the *Society of Friends*, who were a considerable proportion of the whole population, were steadfast to their principles. They would neither retire to garrisons, nor provide themselves with arms. They remained openly in the country, whilst the rest were flying to the forts.

They still pursued their occupations in the fields or at their homes, without a weapon either for annoyance or defence. And what was their fate? They lived in security and quiet. The habitation which, to his armed neighbor, was the scene of murder and the scalping knife, was to the unarmed Quaker a place of safety and of peace.

Three of the Society, however, were killed. And who were they? They were three who abandoned their principles. Two of these victims were men who, in the simple language of the narrator, "used to go to their labor without any weapons, and trusted to the Almighty, and depended on his providence to protect them (it being their principle not to use weapons of war to offend others, or to defend themselves); but the spirit of distrust taking place in their minds, they took weapons of war to defend themselves, and the Indians who had seen them several times without them, and left them alone, saying they were peaceable men, and hurt nobody, therefore they would not hurt them, now seeing them have guns, and supposing they designed to kill the Indians, they therefore shot the men dead." The third whose life was sacrificed, was a woman who "had remained in her habitation," not thinking herself warranted in going "to a fortified place for preservation, neither she, her son, nor daughter, nor to take thither the little ones; but the poor woman after some time began to let in a slavish fear, and advised her children to go with her to a fort not far from their dwelling." She went; and shortly afterwards the Indians lay by the way, and killed her.

Barclay, the celebrated Apologist, from whose Anecdotes these extracts are obtained, was attacked by a highwayman. He made no other resistance than a calm expostulation. The felon dropped his presented pistol, and offered no farther violence. A Leonard Fell was assaulted by a highway robber, who plundered him of his money and his horse, and afterwards threatened to blow out his brains. Fell solemnly spoke to the robber on the wickedness of his life. The man was astonished; he declared he would take neither his money nor horse, and returned both.

The fate of the Quakers during the rebellion in Ireland was nearly similar. It is well known that the rebellion was a time not only of open war, but of cold-blooded murder of the utmost fury of bigotry, and the utmost exasperation of revenge. Yet the Quakers were preserved even to a proverb; and when strangers passed through the streets of ruin, and observed a house standing uninjured and alone, they would sometimes point, and say, "That doubtless is the house of a Quaker."

It were to no purpose to say, that these facts form an exception to a general rule. The exception consists in the *trial* of the experiment of irresistance, not in its *success*. Neither were it to any purpose to say, that the savages of America, or the desperadoes of Ireland spared the Quakers because they were previously known to be an unoffending people, or because the Quakers had previously gained their love by forbearance or good offices. We concede all this; it is the very argument which we maintain.

We say that a uniform, undeviating regard to the peaceable obligations of Christianity becomes the safeguard of those who practise it. We venture to maintain that no reason whatever can be assigned why the fate of the Quakers would not be the fate of *all* who should adopt their conduct. If there be such a reason, let us hear it. The American and Irish Quakers were, to the rest of the community, what one nation is to a continent. We do not say, that if a people should be assailed, and should on a sudden choose to declare that they would try whether Providence would protect them—of such a people, we do not say that they would experience protection, and none of them be killed. But we say the evidence of experience is, that a people who habitually regard the obligations of Christianity in their conduct towards other men, and steadfastly refuse, to engage in acts of hostility, will experience protection in their peacefulness, and it matters nothing to the argument, whether we refer that protection to the immediate agency of Providence, or to the influence of such conduct upon the minds of men.

Such has been the experience of the unoffending and unresisting in individual life. A national example of a refusal to bear arms has been exhibited only once to the world; but that one example has proved, all that humanity could desire, and all that skepticism could demand, in favor of our argument. Pennsylvania was colonized by men who believed that war is absolutely incompatible with Christianity, and therefore resolved not to practise it. Having determined not to fight, they maintained no soldiers, and possessed no arms. They planted themselves in a country surrounded by savages who knew they were unarmed. Plunderers might have robbed them without retaliation, and armies might have slaughtered them without resistance. If they did not give a temptation to outrage, no temptation could be given. But these were the people who possessed their country in security, whilst those around them were trembling for their existenee. This was a land of peace, whilst every other was a land of war. The conclusion is inevitable, although it is extraordinary—they were in no need of arms because they would not use them.

These Indians were sufficiently ready to commit outrages upon other states, and often visited them with that sort of desolation and slaughter, which might be expected from men whom civilization had not reclaimed from cruelty, and whom religion had not awed into forbearance. "But," says Clarkson, "whatever the quarrels of the Indians were with others, they uniformly respected, and held as it were sacred, the territories of William Penn." "The Pennsylvanians," says Oldmixon, "never lost man, woman or child by them, which neither the colony of Maryland, nor that of Virginia could say, no more than the great colony of New England."

The security and quiet of Pennsylvania was not a transient freedom from war, such as might accidentally happen to any nation. She continued to enjoy it "for more than seventy years,"

says Proud, "and subsisted in the midst of six Indian nations without so much as a militia for her defence." "The Pennsylvanians," observes Clarkson, "became safe without the ordinary means of safety. The constable's staff was the only instrument of authority amongst them for the greater part of a century; and never, during the administration of Penn, or that of his proper successors, was there a quarrel or a war."

And when was the security of Pennsylvania molested, and its peace destroyed? When the men who had directed its counsels, and who would not engage in war, were outvoted in its legislature; when they who supposed that there was greater security in the sword than in Christianity, became the predominating body. From that hour, the Pennsylvanians transferred their confidence in Christian principles to a confidence in their arms; and from that hour to this, they have been subject to war.

Such is the evidence derived from a national example of the consequences of a pursuit of the Christian policy in relation to war. Here are a people who absolutely refused to fight, and incapacitated themselves for resistance by refusing to possess arms; yet this was the people whose land amidst surrounding broils and slaughter, was selected as a land of security and peace. The only national opportunity which the virtue of the Christian world has afforded us of ascertaining the safety of relying upon God for defence, has determined that it is safe.

If such evidence do not satisfy us of the expediency of confiding in God, what evidence do we ask, or what can we receive? We have his promise that he will protect those who abandon their seeming interests in the performance of his will, and we have the testimony of those who have confided in him, that he has protected them. Can the advocate of war produce one single instance in all history of a person who had given an unconditional obedience to the will of heaven, and who did not find that his conduct was wise as well as virtuous, that it accorded with his interests as well as with his duty? We ask the same question respecting the obligations to irrisistance. Where is the man who regrets, that in observance of the forbearing duties of Christianity, he consigned his preservation to the superintendence of God? And the solitary national example that is before us, confirms the testimony of private life; for there is sufficient reason for believing, that no nation in modern ages has possessed so large a portion of virtue or happiness as Pennsylvania, before it had seen human blood.

What, then, is the duty of one who believes all war unchristian; but whose governors engage in war, and demand his service? *He should mildly and temperately, yet firmly refuse to serve.* If you believe Christ has prohibited slaughter, let nothing induce you to join in it; and the time will come when even the world will honor you as contributors to the work of Human Reformation.

RIGHTS OF SELF-DEFENCE.

BY JONATHAN DYMOND.

THE right of defending ourselves against violence is easily deducible from the law of nature. There is, however, little need to deduce it, because mankind are at least *sufficiently* persuaded of its lawfulness. The question now most needful to discuss, is, whether every action whatever is lawful, provided it is necessary to the preservation of life? They who maintain the affirmative, maintain a great deal; for they maintain that, whenever life is endangered, all rules of morality are, as it respects the individual, suspended, annihilated,—every moral obligation is taken away by the single fact, that life is threatened.

Yet the language ordinarily held upon the subject, implies the supposition of all this. "If our lives," says Grotius, "are threatened with assassination or open violence from the hands of robbers or enemies, *any* means of defence would be allowed and laudable." "There is," says Paley, "one case in which *all* extremities are justifiable, namely, when our life is assaulted, and it becomes necessary for our preservation to kill the assailant." If *any* means of defence are laudable, if *all* extremities are justifiable, then they are not confined to acts of resistance against the assailing party. There may be other conditions upon which life may be preserved, than that of violence towards *him*. Some ruffians seize a man in the highway, and will kill him unless he will conduct them to his neighbor's property, and assist them in carrying it off. May this man unite with them in the robbery, in order to save his life, or may he not? If he may, what becomes of the law, Thou shalt not steal? If he may not, then *not every means* by which a man may preserve his life, is laudable or allowed. We have found an exception to the rule. There are twenty other wicked things which violent men may make the sole condition of not taking our lives. Do all wicked things become lawful because life is at stake? If not, such propositions as those of Grotius and Paley are untrue.

A pagan has unalterably resolved to offer me up in sacrifice on the morrow, unless I will acknowledge the deity of his gods, and worship them. The Christian must regard these acts as being, under every possible circumstance, unlawful. The night offers me an opportunity of assassinating him. Now I am placed in precisely the same situation, with respect to this man, as a traveller is with respect to a ruffian with a pistol. Life in both cases depends on killing the offender. Both are acts of self-defence. Am I at liberty to assassinate this man? Surely not. Here then is a case in which I may not take life in order to save my own. If any one doubts whether the assassination would be unlawful, let him consider whether an Apostle would have committed it in such a case.

Here, at any rate, the heart of every man answers, No. And mark the reason;—because every man perceives that the act would have been palpably inconsistent with the Apostolic character, or, which is the same thing, with a *Christian* character.

Or put such a case in a somewhat different form. A furious Turk holds a scimitar over my head, and declares he will instantly despatch me, unless I adjure Christianity, and acknowledge the divine legation of “the prophet.” Now, there are two supposable ways in which I may save my life; one by contriving to stab the Turk, and one “by denying Christ before men.” You say I am not at liberty to deny Christ, but I am at liberty to stab the man. *Why* am I not at liberty to deny him? Because Christianity forbids it. Then we require you to show that Christianity does *not* forbid you to take his life. Our religion pronounces both actions to be wrong. You say that under these circumstances the *killing* is right. Where is your proof? What is the ground of your distinction? But, whether it can be adduced, or not, our immediate argument is established,—that there are *some* things which it is not lawful to do in order to preserve our lives. This conclusion has indeed been practically acted upon. A company of inquisitors and their agents are about to conduct a good man to the stake. If he could by any means destroy these men, he might save his life. It is a question, therefore, of self-defence. Supposing these means to be within his power; supposing he could contrive a mine, and, by suddenly firing it, blow his persecutors into the air, would it be lawful and Christian thus to act? No. The common judgments of mankind respecting the right temper and conduct of the martyr, pronounce it to be wrong. The conclusion, therefore, again is, that all extremities are *not* allowable in order to preserve life; that *there is a limit to the right of self-defence*.

It would be to no purpose to say, that in some of these instances *religious* duties interfere with and limit the right of self-defence. Religious duties and moral duties are identical in point of obligation, for they are imposed by one authority. Religious duties are not obligatory for any other reason than that which attaches to moral duties also, namely, the will of God. He who violates the moral law, is as truly unfaithful in his allegiance to God, as he who denies Christ before men. So that we come at last to one single and simple question, whether taking the life of a person who threatens ours, is or is not compatible with the moral law. We refer for an answer to the broad principles of Christian piety and Christian benevolence; that piety which reposes habitual confidence in the Divine Providence, and an habitual preference of futurity to the present time; and that benevolence which not only loves our neighbors as ourselves, but feels that the Samaritan or the *enemy* is a neighbor. There is no conjuncture in which the exercise of this benevolence may be suspended; none in which we are not required to maintain and practise it. Whether want implores our compassion, or ingratitude returns ills for our kindness; whether a

fellow-creature is drowning in a river, or assailing us on the highway; every where, and under all circumstances, the duty remains.

Is killing an assailant, then, *within* or *without* the limits of this benevolence? As to the man, it is evident that no good-will is exercised towards him by shooting him through the head. Who indeed will dispute that, before we can destroy him, benevolence towards him must be excluded from our minds? We not only exercise no benevolence ourselves, but preclude him from receiving it from any human heart; and, which is a serious item in the account, we cut him off from all possibility of reformation. Is this an act that accords, and is congruous, with Christian love?

But an argument has been attempted here. "That we may kill the assailant," says Paley, "is evident in a state of nature, unless it can be shown that we are bound to prefer the aggressor's life to our own, that is to say, to love our enemy *better* than ourselves; which can never be a debt of justice, nor any where appears to be a duty of charity." The answer is, that, although we may not be required to love our enemy *better* than ourselves, we are required to love him *as* ourselves; and therefore, in the supposed case, it would still be a question equally balanced, which life ought to be sacrificed; for it is quite clear, that if we kill the assailant, we love him *less* than ourselves, which does seem to militate against a duty of charity. But the truth is, that he who, from motives of obedience to the will of God, spares the aggressor's life even to the endangering of his own, does exercise love both to the aggressor and to himself *perfectly*; to the aggressor, because by sparing his life, we give him the opportunity of repentance and amendment; to himself, because every act of obedience to God is perfect benevolence towards ourselves; it is consulting and promoting our most valuable interests; it is propitiating the favor of him who is emphatically "a rich rewarder." So that the question remains as before, not whether we shall love our enemy better than ourselves, but whether Christian principles are acted upon in destroying him; and if they are not, whether we should prefer Christianity to ourselves,—whether we should be willing to lose our life for Christ's sake and the gospel's.

And, after all, if it were granted that a person is at liberty to take an assailant's life, *in order to preserve his own*, how is he to know, in the majority of instances, whether his own would be taken? When a man breaks into a person's house, and this person shoots him, we are not to be told that the man was killed "in defence of life." Or go a step further, and a step further still, by which the intention of the robber to commit personal violence, or inflict death, is more and more probable; you must at last shoot him in uncertainty whether your life was endangered or not. Besides, you can withdraw, you can fly. But perhaps you exclaim, "Fly! fly, and leave my property unprotected!" Yes, unless you mean to say that preservation of property, as well as preservation of life, makes it lawful to kill an offender. This were to adopt a new and a very different proposition; but a proposition

which I suspect cannot be separated in practice from the former. He who affirms that he may kill another in order to preserve his life, and may endanger his own life in order to protect his property, does in reality affirm that he may kill another in order to preserve his property. But such a proposition no one surely will tolerate. The laws of the land do not admit it, but require that we should be tender even of the murderer's life, and fly rather than destroy it.

The conclusion, then, is, that he who kills another, even in self-defence, does not do it in the exercise of Christian dispositions, in conformity with the Christian law. But this is very far from concluding, that no resistance may be made to aggression. We may make, and ought to make, a great deal. It is the duty of the civil magistrate to repress the violence of one man towards another; and consequently it is the duty of the individual, when the civil power cannot operate, to endeavor to repress it himself. Many kinds of resistance to aggression come strictly within the fulfilment of the law of benevolence. He who, by securing or temporarily disabling a man, prevents him from committing an act of great turpitude, is certainly his benefactor; and if he be thus reserved for justice, the benevolence is great both to him and to the public. It is an act of much kindness to a bad man to secure him for the penalties of the law; or it *would be* such, if penal law were in the state in which it ought to be, and to which it appears to be making some approaches. It would then be very probable that the man would be reformed; and this is the greatest benefit both to him and the community.

The exercise of Christian forbearance towards violent men is not tantamount to an invitation of outrage. Cowardice is one thing; this forbearance is another. The man of true forbearance is of all men the least cowardly. It requires courage in a greater degree and of a higher order, to practise it when life is threatened, than to draw a sword, or fire a pistol. No; it is the peculiar privilege of Christian virtue to approve itself even to the bad. There is something in the nature of its calmness, and self-possession, and forbearance, which obtains, nay, almost commands, regard and respect. How different the effect upon the violent tenants of Newgate, the hardihood of a turnkey, and the mild courage of an Elizabeth Fry! Experience, incontestable experience has proved that the minds of few men are so depraved or desperate as to prevent them from being *influenced* by real Christian conduct. Let him who advocates taking the life of an aggressor, first show that all other means of safety are vain, that bad men, notwithstanding the exercise of true Christian forbearance, persist in their purposes of death; then he will have adduced an argument in favor of taking their lives, which will not indeed be conclusive, but which will approach nearer to conclusiveness than any that has yet been adduced.

WAR A TRIAL BY BATTLE.*

BY CHARLES SUMNER.

WAR is a public, armed contest between nations in order to establish justice between them. Lieber calls it "a mode of obtaining *rights*;" Vattel defines it as "that state in which we *prosecute* our *rights* by *force*;" and Lord Bacon describes it as "one of the highest trials of right, when princes and states put themselves upon the justice of God for the deciding of their controversies by such success as it shall please him to give on either side." No war can arise among Christian nations except to determine an asserted right. The wars usually but falsely called *defensive*, are appeals for justice to force, endeavors to redress evils by force. They spring from the sentiment of vengeance or honor. They inflict evil for evil, and vainly essay to overcome evil by evil. If, as has been happily said, because a man refuses to pay a just debt, I go to his house, and beat him, that is not self-defense; but the object proposed in 1834 by war with France, was only to secure from her the payment of five millions of dollars. It is a mockery to call such contests defensive war.

But war is utterly ineffectual to secure or advance the object at which it aims. The misery it excites, contributes to no end, helps to establish no right, and therefore does in no respect determine justice between contending nations.

This inference results from the very nature of war. It is a resort to force, whereby each nation strives to overpower the other; a temporary adoption by men of the character of wild beasts, emulating their ferocity, rejoicing like them in blood, and seeking, as with a lion's paw, to hold an asserted right. This character of war is somewhat disguised in more recent days; but the early poets, in the unconscious simplicity of the world's childhood, make this strikingly apparent. All the heroes of Homer are likened in their rage to the ungovernable fury of animals; and Hector himself, in whom cluster the highest virtues of polished war, is called "the tamer of horses." Even our own Shakspeare makes Henry V. say to his troops,

"When the blast of war blows in our ears,
Then imitate the action of the tiger."

The fruitlessness and vanity of war, moreover, appear in its actual results. After long struggles, in which each nation has inflicted and received incalculable injury, peace has been gladly obtained on the basis of the condition of things before the war—*status ante bellum*. Let me refer for an example to our last war with Great Britain, the professed object of which was to obtain

* This tract is taken from Mr. Sumner's Oration before the City Authorities of Boston, July 4, 1845, on "*The True Grandeur of Nations.*"—G. C. B.

from the latter power a renunciation of her claim to impress our seamen. The greatest number of American seamen ever officially alleged to be compuisorily serving in the British navy, was about eight hundred. To overturn this injustice, the whole country was doomed, for more than three years, to the accursed blight of war. Our commerce was driven from the seas; the resources of the land were drained by taxation; villages on the Canadian frontier were laid in ashes; the metropolis of the Republic was captured, while gaunt distress raged every where within our borders. Weary with this rude trial, our Government appointed Commissioners to treat for Peace, under these instructions: "Your first duty will be to conclude peace with Great Britain, and you are authorized to do it, *in case* you obtain a satisfactory stipulation against impressment, one which shall secure under our flag protection to the crew. If this encroachment of Great Britain is not provided against, *the United States have appealed to arms in vain.*" Afterwards, in despair of extorting from Great Britain a relinquishment of the unrighteous claim, and foreseeing only an accumulation of calamities from an inveterate prosecution of the war, our Government directed their negotiators, in concluding a Treaty of Peace, "*to omit any stipulation on the subject of impressment.*" The instructions were obeyed, and the Treaty that once more restored to us the blessings of Peace, which we had rashly cast away, and which the country hailed with an intoxication of joy, contained no allusion to the subject of impressment; nor'did it provide for the surrender of a single American sailor detained in the service of the British navy, and thus, by the confession of our own Government, "the United States had appealed to arms IN VAIN."

All this is the natural result of an appeal to war in order to establish *justice*. Justice implies the exercise of the judgment in the determination of *right*. Now, war not only supersedes the judgment, but delivers over the results to superiority of *force*, or to *chance*. Who can measure beforehand the currents of the heady fight? We speak of the chances of battle; even soldiers speak of it as a game. The Great Captain of our age, in a formal address to his officers on entering Russia, says: "In war, *fortune* has an equal share with ability in procuring success." The mighty victory of Marengo, the accident of an accident, wrested unexpectedly at the close of the day from a foe who at an earlier hour was successful, must have taught him the uncertainty of war. Afterwards, in the bitterness of his spirit, when his immense forces had been shivered, and his triumphant eagles driven back with broken wing, he exclaimed, in that remarkable conversation recorded by the Abbe de Pradt: "Well! this is war. High in the morning,—low enough at night. From a triumph to a fall is often but a step." The military historian of the Peninsular campaigns, says: "*Fortune* always asserts her supremacy in war, and often from a slight mistake, such disastrous consequences flow, that in every age and in every nation, the *uncertainty* of wars has been proverbial." In another place, when considering the conduct of Wellington, he says: "A few hours' delay, an accident, a turn of

fortune, and he would have been foiled! Ay! but this is war, *always dangerous and uncertain*, an ever-rolling wheel, and armed with scythes." And can intelligent man look for justice to an ever-rolling wheel armed with scythes?

But the most interesting illustration of war as dependent upon chance, is to be found in the history of the private wars, and particularly of the judicial combat, or *trial by battle*, in the dark ages. The object was precisely the professed object of modern war, the determination of justice. It would be interesting and instructive to trace the curious analogies between this early ordeal by battle, and the great ordeal of war. Like the other ordeals, by burning ploughshares, by holding hot iron, by dipping the hand in hot water, or hot oil, they are both a presumptuous appeal to Providence, under an apprehension and hope, that Heaven will give the victory to him who has the right. The monstrous usage of trial by battle prevailed in the early modern centuries throughout Europe; it was a part of the common law of England; and, though it fell into disuse, overruled by the advancing spirit of civilization, still, to the disgrace of the English law, it was not legislatively abolished, until in 1817 the right to it had been distinctly claimed in Westminster Hall. Abraham Thornton, on appeal against him for murder, when brought into court, pleaded as follows: "Not guilty, and I am ready to defend the same by my body;" and, thereupon taking off his glove, he threw it upon the floor of the court. The appellant, not choosing to submit to this trial, abandoned his proceedings; and in the next session of Parliament, trial by battle was abolished in England.

To an early monarch of France belongs the honor of first interposing the royal authority for the entire suppression within his jurisdiction of this impious usage, so universally adopted, so dear to the nobility, and so profoundly rooted in the institutions of the Feudal Age. The soul of St. Louis, tremblingly sensitive to questions of right, was shocked by the judicial combat. In his sight, it was a sin thus to *tempt God* by demanding of him a miracle whenever judgment was to be pronounced. In 1260 he assembled a parliament, where he issued the ordinance: "*We forbid to all persons throughout our dominions the trial by battle*; instead of battles, we establish proofs by witnesses; we do not take away the other good and loyal proofs which have been used in lay courts to this day; but **THESE BATTLES WE ABOLISH IN OUR DOMINIONS FOREVER.**"

Honor and blessings attend the name of this truly Christian king, who began a long and illustrious reign by restoring a portion of the conquests of his predecessor, saying, "I know that the king of England has lost by conquest the land I hold; and the land I give him, I give only to put love between my children and his children, who are cousin-germans; and it seems to me that what I thus give, I employ to good purpose!" Honor to him who never grasped by force or cunning any new acquisition; who never sought advantage from the turmoils and dissensions of his neighbors, but studied to allay them; who, first of Christian princes, rebuked

the spirit of war, saying to those who would have him profit by the dissensions of his neighbors, "Blessed are the peace-makers."

The history of the trial by battle will illustrate the chances of war, and the consequent folly and wickedness of submitting any question to its arbitrament. But we are aware that this monstrous and impious usage is still openly avowed as a proper mode of determining justice between nations. At this moment, when the noon-day sun of civilization seems to the contented souls of many to be standing still in the heavens as upon Gibeon, the relations between nations are governed by the same rules of barbarous, brutal force, which once prevailed between individuals. The dark ages have not passed away; Erebus and black Night, born of Chaos, still brood over the earth; nor shall we hail the clear day, until the mighty hearts of the nations shall be touched, as those of children, and the whole earth, individuals and nations alike, shall acknowledge *one and the same rule of Right*.

Who has told you, fond man! to regard that as a glory when performed by a nation, which is condemned as a crime and a barbarism, when committed by an individual? In what vain conceit of wisdom and virtue, do you find this incongruous morality? Where is it declared that God, who is no respecter of persons, is a respecter of multitudes? Man is immortal; but States are mortal. He has a higher destiny than States. Shall States be less amenable to the great moral laws? Each individual is an atom of the mass. Must not the mass be like the individuals of which it is composed? Shall the mass do what individuals may not do? No; the same moral laws which govern individuals, govern masses. The *Rule of Right*, which binds the single individual, binds two or three when gathered together—binds conventions and congregations of men—binds villages, towns and cities—binds states, nations and empires—clasps the whole human family in its seven-fold embrace; nay more, it binds the angels of heaven, the Seraphim, full of love, the Cherubim, full of knowledge.

We are struck with horror at the report of a single murder; we seek the murderer, and the law puts forth all its energies to secure his punishment. Viewed in the clear light of truth, what are war and battle but organized murder; murder of malice afore-thought; in cold blood; through the operation of an extensive machinery of crime; with innumerable hands; at incalculable cost of money; through subtle contrivances of cunning and skill; or by the savage, brutal assault? Was not the Scythian right, when he said to Alexander, "Thou boastest, that the only design of thy marches is to extirpate robbers; thou thyself art the greatest robber in the world?"

When shall the St. Louis of the nations arise—the Christian ruler or Christian people, who shall proclaim to the whole earth, that henceforward the *great trial by battle* shall cease forever; that it is the duty and policy of nations to establish love between each other; and in all respects, at all times, towards all persons, as well their own people, as the people of other lands, to be governed by the sacred rules of right, as between man and man? May God speed the coming of that day!

THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS:

OR THE

INFLUENCES WHICH UPHOLD THE CUSTOM OF WAR.*

BY CHARLES SUMNER.

I PROPOSE to inquire what are the true objects of national ambition—what is truly national glory, national honor—WHAT IS THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS. IN OUR AGE THERE CAN BE NO PEACE THAT IS NOT HONORABLE; THERE CAN BE NO WAR THAT IS NOT DISHONORABLE. The true honor of a nation is to be found only in deeds of justice, and in the happiness of its people, all of which are inconsistent with war. In the clear eye of Christian judgment, vain are its victories, infamous are its spoils. He is the true benefactor, and alone worthy of honor, who brings comfort where before was wretchedness; who dries the tear of sorrow; who pours oil into the wounds of the unfortunate; who feeds the hungry, and clothes the naked; who unlooses the fetters of the slave; who, by words or actions, inspires a love for God and for man. This is the Christian hero; this is the man of honor in a Christian land. Well may old Sir Thomas Browne exclaim, “the world does not know its greatest men;” for thus far it has chiefly discerned the violent brood of battle, the armed men springing up from the dragon’s teeth sown by Hate, and cared little for the truly good men, children of Love, Cromwells guiltless of their country’s blood, whose steps on earth have been as noiseless as an angel’s wing.

It is not to be disguised, that these views differ from the generally received opinions of the world down to this day. The voice of man has been given mostly to the praise of military chieftains, and the honors of victory have been chanted even by the lips of woman. The mother, while rocking her infant on her knees, has stamped on his tender mind, at that age more impressible than wax, the images of war; she has nursed his slumbers with its melodies; she has pleased his waking hours with its stories; and selected for his playthings the plume and the sword. The child is father to the man; and who can weigh the influence of these early impressions on the opinions of later years? The mind which trains the child is like the hand which commands the end of a long lever; a gentle effort at that time suffices to heave the enormous weight of succeeding years. As the boy advances to youth, he is fed, like Achilles, not only on honey and milk, but on bear’s flesh and lion’s marrow. He draws the nutriment of his soul from a literature, whose beautiful fields have been moistened by human blood.

And when the youth becomes a man, his country invites his

* Taken mainly from the fourth topic in Mr. S.’s Oration before the City Authorities of Boston, July 4, 1845.—G. C. B.

services in war, and holds before his bewildered imagination the highest prizes of honor. For him is the pen of the historian, and the verse of the poet. His soul swells at the thought, that he also is a soldier; that his name shall be entered on the list of those who have borne arms in the cause of their country; and, perhaps, he dreams, that he too may sleep, like the Great Captain of Spain, with a hundred trophies over his grave. But the contagion spreads among us beyond those bands on whom is imposed the positive obligation of law. Respectable citizens volunteer to look like soldiers, and to affect in dress, in arms and deportment, what is called "the pride, pomp and circumstance of glorious war." We all breathe the malaria of war, and the literature of every age and country is steeped in its spirit. The world has supped so full with battles, that all its inner modes of thought, and many of its rules of conduct, seem to be incarnadined with blood, as the bones of swine fed on madder, are said to become red.

But I pass from this most fruitful theme, and hasten to other topics. I propose to consider very briefly some of *those prejudices and influences which are most powerful in keeping alive the delusion of war.*

1. One of these is the prejudice to a certain extent in its favor founded on the *belief in its necessity.* The consciences of all good men condemn it as a crime, a sin; even the soldier confesses that it is to be resorted to only in the last necessity. But a benevolent and omnipotent God cannot render it *necessary* to commit a crime. When war is called a necessity, it is meant, of course, that its object cannot be gained in any other way; but I think it demonstrable, that the professed object of war, which is justice between nations, is in no respect promoted by war; that force is not justice, nor in any way conducive to justice; that the eagles of victory can be the emblems only of successful force, not of established right. Justice can be obtained only by the exercise of the reason and judgment; but these are silent in the din of arms. Justice is without passion; but war lets loose all the worst passions of our nature.

The various modes, which have been proposed for the determination of disputes between nations, are Negotiation, Arbitration, Mediation, and a Congress of Nations; all of them practicable, and calculated to secure peaceful justice. Let it not be said, then, that war is a *necessity*; and may our country aim at the true glory of taking the lead in the recognition of these, as the only proper modes of determining justice between nations!

2. Another prejudice in favor of war is founded on *the practice of nations*, past and present. There is no crime or enormity in morals, which may not find the support of human example; but it is not to be urged in our day, that we are to look for a standard of duty in the conduct of vain, mistaken, fallible man. It is not in the power of man, by any subtle alchemy, to transmute wrong into right. Because war is according to the practice of the world, it does not follow that it is right. For ages the world worshipped false gods; but these gods were not the less false, because all

bowed before them. At this moment the larger portion of mankind are Heathen; but Heathenism is not true. It was once the practice of nations to slaughter prisoners of war; but even the spirit of war recoils now from this bloody sacrifice. In Sparta, theft, instead of being execrated as a crime, was dignified into an art and an accomplishment, and as such admitted into the system of youthful education; and even this debasing practice, established by local feeling, is enlightened, like war, by an instance of unconquerable firmness, which is a barbaric counterfeit of virtue. The Spartan youth, who allowed the fox concealed under his robe to eat into his heart, is an example of mistaken fortitude, not unlike that which we are asked to admire in the soldier.

But it is often said, "let us not be wiser than our fathers." Rather let us try to excel our fathers in wisdom. Let us imitate what in them was good; but let us not bind ourselves, as in the chains of Fate, by their imperfect example. Examples are to be followed only when they accord with the suggestions of duty. We have lived to little purpose, if we are not wiser than the generations that have gone before us. It is the grand distinction of man that he is a progressive being; that his reason at the present day is not merely the reason of a single human being, but that of the whole human race, in all ages from which knowledge has descended, in all lands from which it has been borne away. We are the heirs to an inheritance of knowledge, which has been accumulating from generation to generation. The child is now taught at his mother's knee what was far beyond the ken of the most learned of other days. Antiquity is the real infancy of man; we are the true Ancients. The single lock on the battered forehead of Old Time, is thinner now than when our fathers attempted to grasp it; the hour-glass has been turned often since. Let us cease, then, to look for a lamp to our feet, in the feeble tapers that glimmer in the sepulchres of the Past. Rather let us hail those ever-burning lights above, in whose beams is the brightness of noon-day!

3. I allude with diffidence, but in the spirit of frankness, to the influence which war has derived from the *Christian Church*. When Constantine on one of his marches, at the head of his army, beheld the luminous trophy of the cross in the sky right above the meridian sun, inscribed with these words, *By this conquer*, had his soul been penetrated by the true spirit of Him whose precious symbol it was, he would have found in it no inspiration to the spear and the sword. He would have received the lesson of self-sacrifice, as from the lips of the Savior, and would have learned that it was not by earthly weapons that any true victory was to be won. *By this conquer*; that is, by patience, suffering, forgiveness of evil, by all those virtues of which the cross is the affecting token, *conquer*; and the victory shall be greater than any in the annals of Roman conquest.

The Christian Church, after the first centuries of its existence, failed to discern the peculiar spiritual beauty of the faith which it professed. Like Constantine, it found new incentives to war in the religion of Peace; and such to a great extent has been its

character even to our own day. The Pope of Rome, the asserted head of the nominal church, assumed the command of armies, often mingling the thunders of battle with those of the Vatican. The dagger which projected from the sacred vestments of the Archbishop de Retz, as he appeared in the streets of Paris, was called by the people, "the Archbishop's Prayer-Book." We read of mitred prelates in armor of proof; the sword of knighthood was consecrated by the church; and priests were often the expert masters in military exercises. I have seen at the gates of the Papal Palace in Rome, a constant guard of Swiss soldiers; I have seen, too, in our own streets a show as incongruous and as inconsistent, a pastor of a Christian church parading as the chaplain of a military array! Ay! more, we have heard from an eminent Christian divine, a sermon in which we are encouraged to *serve the God of Battles, and, as citizen soldiers, to fight for Peace!*

And who is the God of Battles? It is Mars; man-slaying, blood-polluted, city-smiting Mars! Him we cannot adore. It is not He who binds the sweet influences of the Pleiades, and looses the bands of Orion; who causes the sun to shine on the just and the unjust; who tempers the wind to the shorn lamb; who distils the oil of gladness upon every upright heart; the fountain of Mercy and Goodness, the God of Justice and Love. The God of Battles is not the God of Christians; to him can ascend none of the prayers of Christian thanksgiving; for him there can be no words of worship in Christian temples, no swelling anthem to peal the note of praise.

There is now floating in this harbor a ship of the line of our country. Many of you have, perhaps, pressed its deck, and observed with admiration the completeness which prevails in all its parts; its lithe masts, and complex net-work of ropes; its thick wooden walls, within which are more than the soldiers of Ulysses; its strong defences, and its numerous dread and rude-throated engines of war. There each Sabbath, amidst this armament of blood, while the wave comes gently plashing against the frowning sides, from a pulpit supported by a cannon, or by the side of a cannon, in repose now, but ready to awake its dormant thunder, charged with death, a Christian preacher addresses the officers and crew! May his instructions carry strength and succor to their souls! But he cannot pronounce in such a place, those highest words of the Master he professes, "Blessed are the Peace-makers; Love your Enemies; Render not evil for evil." Like Macbeth's Amen, they must stick in his throat. This strange and unblessed conjunction of the clergy with war, has had no little influence in blinding the world to the truth now beginning to be recognized, that *Christianity forbids war in all cases.*

One of the beautiful pictures, adorning the dome of a Church in Rome, by that master of art, whose immortal colors breathe as with the voice of a Poet, the Divine Raffaele, represents Mars, in the attitude of war, with a drawn sword uplifted, and ready to strike, while an unarmed Angel from behind, with gentle but irresistible force, arrests and holds the descending arm. Such is the

true image of Christian duty ; nor can I readily perceive the difference in principle between those ministers of the Gospel, who themselves gird on the sword, as in the olden time, and those others who, unarmed, and in customary suit of solemn black, lend the sanction of their presence to the martial array, or to any form of preparation for war. The drummer who pleaded that he did not fight, was held more responsible for the battle than the mere soldier ; for it was the sound of his drum that inflamed the flagging courage of the troops.

4. From the prejudices engendered by the Church, I pass to the prejudices engendered by the army itself. I allude directly to what is called the *point of honor*, early child of chivalry, the living representative in our day of an age of barbarism. It is difficult to define what is so evanescent, so impalpable, so chimerical, so unreal ; and yet which exercises such power over many men, and controls the relations of states. As a little water which has fallen into the crevice of a rock, under the congelation of winter swells till it bursts the thick and stony fibres ; so a word, or a slender act, dropping into the heart of man, under the hardening influence of this pernicious sentiment, dilates till it rends in pieces the sacred depository of human affections, while Hate and the demon Strife, no longer restrained, are let loose abroad. The musing Hamlet saw the strange and unnatural power of this sentiment, when his soul pictured to his contemplations

——the army of such mass and charge,
Led by a delicate and tender prince,
Exposing what is mortal and unsure
To all that fortune, death and danger, dare
Even for an egg-shell ;

and when he says, with a point which has given to this sentiment its strongest and most popular expression,

——Rightly to be great
Is not to stir without great argument ;
*But greatly to find quarrel in a straw
When honor's at the stake.*

And when is honor at stake ? Only where justice and happiness are at stake ; it can never depend on an egg-shell, or a straw ; it can never depend on an impotent word of anger or folly, not even if that word be followed by a blow. In fine, true honor is to be found in the highest moral and intellectual excellence, in the dignity of the human soul, in its nearest approach to those qualities which we reverence as the attributes of God. Our community frowns with indignation upon the profaneness of the duel which has its rise in this irrational point of honor ; but are they aware that they themselves indulge the sentiment on a gigantic scale, when they recognize what is called the *honor* of the country, as a proper ground for war ? We have already seen that justice is in no respect promoted by war ; is true honor promoted where justice is not ?

But the very word honor, as used by the world, does not express any elevated sentiment. How infinitely below the sentiment of duty !

It is a word of easy virtue, that has been prostituted to the most opposite characters and transactions. From the field of Pavia, where France suffered one of the greatest reverses in her annals, Francis writes to his mother, "all is lost except *honor*." At a later day, the renowned cook, the grand Vatel, in a paroxysm of grief and mortification at the failure of two dishes expected on the table, exclaimed, "I have lost my *honor*." Montesquieu places it in direct contrast with virtue. He represents what he calls the prejudice of honor as the animating principle of monarchy, while virtue is that of a republic, saying that in well governed monarchies almost every body will be a good citizen, but it will be rare to meet with a really good man. By an instinct that points to the truth, we do not apply this term to the high columnar virtues which sustain and decorate life, to parental affection, to justice, to the attributes of God. We do not speak of an honorable father, an honorable mother, an honorable judge, an honorable angel, an honorable God. In such sacred connections we feel, beyond the force of any argument, the vulgar and debasing character of the sentiment to which it refers.

The degrading rule of honor is founded in the supposed necessity of resenting by force a supposed injury, whether by word or act. But suppose such an injury is received, sullyng, as is falsely imagined, the character; is it wiped away by descending to the brutal level of its author? "Could I wipe your blood from my conscience as easily as I can this insult from my face," said a Marshal of France, greater on this occasion than on any field of fame, "I would have laid you dead at my feet." It is Plato, reporting the angelic wisdom of Socrates, who declares in one of those beautiful dialogues, which shine with stellar light across the ages, that *it is more shameful to do a wrong than to receive a wrong*. And this benign sentiment commends itself alike to the Christian who is told to render good for evil, and to the universal heart of man. But who that confesses its truth, can vindicate a resort to force for the sake of honor? Better far to receive the blow that a false morality has thought degrading; than that it should be revenged by force. Better that a nation should submit to what is wrong, rather than vainly seek to maintain its honor by the great crime of war.

The modern point of honor does not find a place in warlike antiquity. Themistocles at Salamis did not send a cartel to the Spartan commander, when threatened by a blow. "Strike, but hear," was the response of that firm nature which felt that true honor was to be gained only in the performance of duty. It was in the depths of modern barbarism, in the age of chivalry, that this sentiment shot up in the wildest and most exuberant fancies; not a step was taken without reference to it; no act was done which had not some point tending to "the bewitching duel," and every stage in the combat, from the ceremonies of its beginning to its deadly close, were measured by this fantastic law. The Chevalier Bayard, the cynosure of chivalry, the knight without fear, and without reproach, in a contest with the Spaniard Don Alonzo de Soto

Mayor, by a feint struck him such a blow in the throat, that despite the gorget, the weapon penetrated four fingers deep. The wounded Spaniard grasped his adversary, and, struggling with him, they both rolled on the ground, when Bayard, drawing his dagger, and thrusting its point in the nostrils of the Spaniard, exclaimed, "Senor Alonzo, surrender, or you are a dead man!" A speech which appeared superfluous, as Don Diego de Guignones, his second, exclaimed, "Senor Bayard, he is dead; you have conquered." Bayard, says the chronicler, would have given one hundred thousand crowns to spare his life; but, he now fell upon his knees, kissed the ground three times, and then dragged his dead enemy out of the camp, saying to the second of his fallen foe, "Senor Don Diego, have I done enough?" To which the other piteously replied, "too much, Senor, for the *honor* of Spain!" when Bayard very generously presented him with the corpse, although it was his right, by the laws of *honor*, to do whatever he thought proper with it; an act which is highly commended by Brantome, who thinks it difficult to say which did him most *honor*—not having ignominiously dragged the body like the carcass of a dog by a leg out of the field, or having condescended to fight while laboring under an ague!

Let us not draw a great rule of conduct from such a period. Let the point of honor stay with the daggers, the swords and the weapons of combat, by which it was guarded; let it appear only with its inseparable companions, the bowie-knife and the pistol! Be ours a standard of conduct having its sources in the loftiest attributes of man, in truth, in justice, in duty; and may this standard, which governs our relations to each other, be recognized among the nations! When shall we behold the dawning of that happy day, harbinger of infinite happiness beyond, in which nations shall feel that it is better to receive a wrong than to do a wrong?

5. There is still another influence which stimulates war, and interferes with the natural attractions of Peace; I refer to a selfish and exaggerated *love of country*. Our minds, nursed by the literature of antiquity, have imbibed the narrow sentiment of heathen patriotism. Exclusive love for the land of birth was a part of the religion of Greece and Rome. It is an indication of the lowness of their moral natures, that this sentiment was so exclusive. The beautiful genius of Cicero, at times instinct with truth almost divine, did not ascend to that highest heaven where is taught, that all mankind are neighbors and kindred, and that the relations of fellow-countryman are less holy than those of fellow-man. To the love of universal man may be applied those words by which the great Roman elevated his selfish patriotism to a virtue, when he said, that *country alone embraced all the charities of all*. Attach this admired phrase for a moment to the single idea of country; and you will see how contracted are its charities compared with the world-wide circle of Christian love whose neighbor is the suffering man, though at the farthest pole. Such a sentiment would dry up those fountains of benevolence which now diffuse themselves in precious waters in distant unenlightened lands, bearing the bless-

ings of truth to the icy mountains of Greenland, and the coral islands of the Pacific sea.

It has been a part of the policy of rulers to encourage this exclusive patriotism; and the people of modern times have each inherited the feeling of Antiquity. I do not know that any one nation is in a condition to reproach the other with this patriotic selfishness. All are selfish. An officer of our Navy has gone beyond all Greek, all Roman example. "Our country, *be she right or wrong*," was his exclamation; a sentiment dethroning God, and enthroning the devil, whose flagitious character should be rebuked by every honest heart. "Our country, our whole country, and *nothing but our country*," are other words, which have often been painted on banners, and echoed by the voices of innumerable multitudes. Cold and dreary, narrow and selfish, would be this life, if *nothing but one country* occupied our souls; if the thoughts that wander through eternity, if the infinite affections of our nature, were restrained to that spot of earth where we have been placed by the accident of birth.

I do not inculcate an indifference to country. We incline, by a natural sentiment, to the spot where we were born, to the fields which witnessed the sports of childhood, to the seat of youthful studies, and to the institutions under which we have been trained. The finger of God writes in indelible colors all these things upon the heart of man, so that in the dread extremities of death, he reverts in fondness to early associations, and longs for a draught of cold water from the bucket in his father's well. This sentiment is independent of reflection, for it begins before reflection, grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength. It is blind in its nature; and it is the duty of each of us to take care that it does not absorb the whole character. We find that God has not placed us on this earth alone; that there are other nations, equally with us, children of his protecting care. It is not because I love country less, but Humanity more, that I plead the cause of a higher and truer patriotism. Remember that you are men, by a more sacred bond than you are citizens; that you are children of a common Father more than you are Americans.

Viewing, then, the different people on the globe, as all deriving their blood from a common source, and separated only by the accident of mountains, rivers and seas, into those distinctions around which cluster the associations of country, we must regard all the children of the earth as members of the great human family. Discord in this family is treason to God; while all war is nothing else than *civil war*. The soul stands aghast, as we contemplate fields drenched in fraternal gore, where the happiness of homes has been shivered by the unfriendly arms of neighbors, and where kinsmen have sunk beneath the cold steel that was nerved by a kinsman's hand. This is civil war, which stands forever accursed in the calendar of time; but the Muse of History, in the faithful record of the future transactions of nations, inspired by a new and loftier justice, and touched to finer sensibilities, shall extend to the general sorrows of Universal Man the sympathy which has been profusely

shed for the selfish sorrow of country, and shall pronounce *all war to be civil war, and the partakers in it as traitors to God, and enemies to man.*

6. I might here ; pause but there is one more consideration which yields to none in importance ; perhaps it is more important than all. It is at once cause and effect ; the cause of much of the feeling in favor of war, and the effect of this feeling. I refer to the costly *preparations* for war in time of peace.

I do not propose to dwell upon the immense cost of war itself. That will be present to the minds of all in the mountainous accumulations of debt, piled like Ossa upon Pelion, with which Europe is pressed to the earth. According to the most recent tables to which I have had access, the public debt of the different European States, so far as it is known, amounts to the terrific sum of \$6,387,-000,000, all of this the growth of War. It is said that there are throughout these states, 17,900,000 paupers, or persons subsisting at the expense of the country, without contributing to its resources. If these millions of the public debt, forming only a part of what has been wasted in war, could be appropriated among these poor, it would give to each of them \$375, a sum which would place all above want, and which is about equal to the average value of the property of each inhabitant of Massachusetts.

The public debt of Great Britain amounted to \$4,265,000,000 in 1839 ; all of this the growth of War since 1688 ! This amount is about equal to the sum total, according to the calculations of Humboldt, of all the treasures which have been reaped from the harvest of gold and silver in the mines of Spanish America, including Mexico and Peru, since the first discovery of our hemisphere by Christopher Columbus ! It is much larger than the amount of all the precious metals, which at this moment form the circulating medium of the world ! It is said rashly by some persons, who have given little attention to this subject, that all this expenditure was good for the people ; but these persons do not bear in mind that it was not bestowed on any *useful* object. It was wasted. The aggregate capital of all the joint stock companies in England, of which there was any known record in 1842, embracing canals, docks, bridges, insurance companies, banks, gas-lights, water, mines, railways, and other miscellaneous objects, was about \$835,000,000 ; a sum which has been devoted to the welfare of the people, but how infinitely less in amount than the War Debt ! For the six years ending in 1836, the average payment for the interest on this debt was about \$140,000,000 annually. If we add to this sum, \$60,000,000 during this same period paid annually to the army, navy and ordnance, we shall have \$200,000,000 as the annual tax of the English people, to pay for former wars, and to prepare for new. During this same period there was an annual appropriation of only \$20,000,000 for all the civil purposes of the government. It thus appears that *War* absorbed ninety cents of every dollar that was pressed by heavy taxation from the English people, who almost seem to sweat blood ! The remaining ten cents sufficed to maintain the splendor of the throne, the administration

of justice, and the diplomatic relations with foreign powers, in short, all the proper objects of a Christian State.

Let us now look exclusively at the *preparations for war in time of peace*. It is one of the miseries of war that even in peace its evils continue to be felt by the world beyond any other evils by which poor suffering humanity is oppressed. At this moment the Christian nations, worshipping a symbol of common brotherhood, live as in entrenched camps, in which they keep armed watch to prevent surprise from each other.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at any exact estimate of the cost of these preparations, ranging under four different heads;—the standing army, the navy, the fortifications and ordnance, and the militia or irregular troops.

The number of soldiers now keeping the peace of European Christendom, as a *standing army*, without counting the Navy, is upwards of two millions. Some estimates place it as high as three millions. The army of Great Britain exceeds 300,000 men; that of France 350,000; that of Russia 730,000, and is reckoned by some as high as 1,000,000; that of Austria about 275,000; that of Prussia 150,000. Taking the smaller number, suppose these two millions to require for their annual support an average sum of only \$150 each, the result would be \$300,000,000, for their sustenance alone; and reckoning one officer to ten soldiers, and allowing to each of the latter an English shilling a day, or \$87 a year, for wages, and to the former an average salary of \$500 a year, we should have for the pay of the whole no less than \$256,000,000, or an appalling sum total for both sustenance and pay of \$556,000,000. If the same calculation be made, supposing the forces to amount to three millions, the sum total will be \$835,000,000! But to this enormous sum another still more enormous must be added on account of the loss sustained by the withdrawal of two millions of hardy, healthy men, in the bloom of life, from useful, productive labor. It has been supposed that it costs an average of \$500 to rear a soldier; and that the value of his labor if devoted to useful objects would be \$150 a year. The Christian Powers, therefore, in setting apart two millions of men, as soldiers, sustain a loss of \$1,000,000,000 on account of their training; and \$300,000,000 annually, on account of their labor. So much for the cost of the standing army of European Christendom in time of Peace.

Glance now at the *Navy* of European Christendom. The Royal Navy of Great Britain consists at present of 556 ships of all classes; and the number of hands employed in 1839, was 34,465.—The Navy of France, though not comparable in size with that of England, is of vast force. In 1837 it was fixed in time of peace at 40 ships of the line, 50 frigates, 40 steamers, and 190 smaller vessels; and the amount of crews in 1839, was 20,317 men.—The Russian Navy consists of two large fleets in the Gulf of Finland, and the Black Sea; but the exact amount of their force and their available resources, has been a subject of dispute amongst naval men and politicians. Some idea may be formed of the size of the navy from the number of hands employed, altogether 50,600 in

1837.—The Austrian Navy consisted in 1837, of 8 ships of the line, 8 frigates, 4 sloop, 6 brigs, 7 schooners or galleys, and a number of smaller vessels; the number of men in its service in 1839, was 4,547.—The Navy of Denmark consisted at the close of 1837, of 7 ships of the line, 7 frigates, 5 sloops, 6 brigs, 3 schooners, 5 cutters, 58 gun-boats, 6 gun-rafts, and 3 bomb vessels, requiring about 6,500 men to man them.—The Navy of Sweden and Norway consisted recently of 238 gun-boats, 11 ships of the line, 8 frigates, 4 corvettes, 6 brigs, with several smaller vessels.—The Navy of Greece consists of 32 ships of war, carrying 190 guns, and 2,400 men.—The Navy of Holland in 1839 consisted of 8 ships of the line, 21 frigates, 15 corvettes, 21 brigs, and 95 gun-boats. It is impossible to give any accurate idea of the immense cost of all these mighty preparations for war. It is melancholy to contemplate such gigantic means, applied by European Christendom to the erection of these superfluous wooden walls in time of Peace!

In the *fortifications and arsenals* of Europe, crowning every height, commanding every valley, and frowning over every plain and every sea, wealth has been sunk which is beyond calculation. Who can tell the immense sums that have been expended in hollowing out, for the purposes of defence, the living rock of Gibraltar? Who can calculate the cost of all the preparations at Woolwich, its 27,000 cannons, and its hundreds of thousands of small arms? France alone contains upwards of one hundred and twenty fortified places! And it is supposed that the yet unfinished fortifications of Paris have cost upwards of *fifty millions of dollars!*

The cost of the *militia* or irregular troops, the Yeomanry of England, the National Guards of Paris, and the *Landwehr* and *Landsturm* of Prussia, must add other incalculable sums to these enormous amounts.

Turn now to the *United States*. Enormous as are the expenses of this character in Europe, those in our country are still greater in proportion to the other expenditures of the Federal Government. The average expenditures of the latter for the six years ending with 1840, exclusive of payments on account of debt, were \$26,474,892; of this sum, the average appropriation each year for military and naval purposes amounted to \$21,328,903, being eighty per cent. of the whole amount! The remaining twenty cents suffices to maintain the Government, the administration of justice, our relations with foreign nations, the light-houses which shed their cheerful signals over the rough waves which beat upon our long and indented coast, from the Bay of Fundy to the mouth of the Mississippi. The military expenditures, exclusive of payments on the debts, are in proportion to the whole expenditure of Government, in Austria, as 33 per cent., in France, as 38 per cent., in Prussia, as 44 per cent., in Great Britain, as 74 per cent., in the UNITED STATES, as 80 per cent.! Besides all this, the expenses of the militia throughout the country have been placed by Judge Jay (1842) at \$50,000,000 a year!

By a table of the expenditures of the United States, exclusive of payments on account of the Public Debt, it appears, that, in the

fifty-three years from the formation of our present Government in 1789 down to 1843, there have been \$246,620,055 spent for civil purposes, comprehending the expenses of the executive, the legislative, the judiciary, the post-office, light houses, and intercourse with foreign governments. During the same period there have been \$368,526,594 devoted to the military establishment, and \$170,437,684 to the naval establishment; the two, forming an aggregate of \$538,964,278. Deducting from this sum the appropriations during three years of war, we shall find that more than *four hundred millions* were absorbed by vain preparations in time of peace for war. Add to this amount a moderate sum for the expenses of the militia during the same period, at an average of \$25,000,000 a year, and we shall have the enormous sum of \$1,335,000,000 to be added to the \$400,000,000; the whole amounting to *seventeen hundred and thirty-five millions* of dollars, all sunk in mere *peaceful preparations for war*; more than *seven times* as much as was dedicated by the Government, during the same period, to all other purposes whatsoever!

From this serried array of figures the mind instinctively retreats; but, if we compare some particular part of them with figures representing other interests in the community, they will present a front still more dread.

Within a short distance of this city, stands an institution of learning, which was one of the earliest cares of the early forefathers of the country, the conscientious Puritans. Favored child of an age of trial and struggle, carefully nursed through a period of hardship and anxiety, endowed at that time by the oblations of men like Harvard, sustained from its first foundation by the paternal arm of the Commonwealth, by a constant succession of munificent bequests, and by the prayers of all good men, the University at Cambridge now invites our homage as the most ancient, the most interesting and the most important seat of learning in the land; possessing the oldest and most valuable library, one of the largest museums of mineralogy and natural history, a School of Law, a School of Divinity, one of the largest and most flourishing Schools of Medicine in the country—besides these, a general body of teachers, twenty-seven in number, many of whose names help to keep the name of the country respectable in every part of the globe where science, learning and taste are cherished—the whole presided over at this moment by a gentleman early distinguished in public life by his unconquerable energies and his masculine eloquence, at a later period by the unsurpassed ability with which he administered the affairs of our city, now, in a green old age, full of years and honors, prepared to lay down his present high trust. Such is Harvard University; and as one of the humblest of her children, happy in the recollection of a youth nurtured in her classic retreats, I cannot allude to her without an expression of filial affection and respect. Yet her whole available property, the various accumulations of more than two centuries of generosity, amounts only to \$703,175.

There now swings idly at her moorings in this harbor, a ship of

the line, the Ohio, carrying ninety guns, finished in 1836 for \$547,888, repaired only two years afterwards for \$223,012; with an armament which has cost \$53,945; making an amount of \$834,845, as the actual cost of that single ship; more than \$100,000 beyond all the available accumulations of the richest and most ancient seat of learning in the land! Choose ye, my fellow citizens, between the two caskets—that wherein is the loveliness of knowledge and truth, or that which contains the carrion death.—Let us pursue the comparison still further. The account of the expenditures of the University during the last year, for the general purposes of the College, the instruction of the Undergraduates, and for the Schools of Law and Divinity, amounts to \$45,949. The cost of the Ohio for one year in salaries, wages and provisions, is \$220,000; being \$175,000 more than the annual expenditures of The University; more than *four times* as much. For the annual sum which is lavished on one ship of the line, *four* Institutions, like Harvard University, might be sustained throughout the country! The pay of the Captain of a ship like the Ohio, is \$4,500, when in service, and \$3,500, when on leave of absence, or off duty. The salary of the President of Harvard University is \$2,205, without leave of absence, and never being off duty!

If the large endowments of Harvard University are dwarfed by a comparison with the expense of a single ship of the line, how much more must it be so with those of other institutions of learning and beneficence, less favored by the bounty of many generations. The average cost of a sloop of war is \$315,000; more, probably, than all the endowments of those twin stars of learning, in the Western part of Massachusetts, the Colleges at Williamstown and Amherst, and of that single star in the East, the guide to many ingenuous youth, the seminary at Andover. The yearly cost of a sloop of war in service is about \$50,000; more than the annual expenditures of these three Institutions combined. I might press the comparison with other Institutions of beneficence; with the annual expenditures for the Blind,—that noble and successful charity,—amounting to \$12,000; and the annual expenditures for the Insane of the Commonwealth, another charity dear to humanity, amounting to \$27,844. Take all the Institutions of learning and beneficence, the precious jewels of the Commonwealth, the schools, colleges, hospitals and asylums; and the sums by which they have been purchased and preserved, are trivial and beggarly, compared with the treasures squandered within the borders of Massachusetts in vain preparations for war. There is the Navy Yard at Charlestown, with its stores on hand, all costing \$4,741,000; the fortifications in the harbors of Massachusetts, in which have been sunk already incalculable sums, and in which it is now proposed to sink \$3,853,000 more; and besides, the Arsenal at Springfield, containing in 1842, 175,118 muskets, valued at \$2,999,998, and which is fed by an annual appropriation of about \$200,000.

Look for a moment at the administration of justice. Perhaps no part of our system is regarded with more pride and confidence by the enlightened sense of the country. To this, indeed, all the

other concerns of Government, all its complications of machinery, are in a manner subordinate, since it is for the sake of justice that men come together in states, and establish laws. What part of the Government can compare in importance with the federal Judiciary, that great balance-wheel of the Constitution, controlling the relations of the States to each other, the legislation of Congress and of the States, besides private interests to an incalculable amount? Nor can the citizen, who discerns the true glory of his country, fail to recognize in the judicial labors of MARSHALL, now departed, and in the immortal judgments of STORY, a higher claim to admiration and gratitude than can be found in any triumph of battle. The expenses of the administration of Justice, throughout the United States, under the Federal Government, in 1842, embracing the salaries of the judges, the cost of juries, court-houses and all officers thereof, in short, all the outlay by which Justice is carried to every man's door, amounted to \$560,990; a larger sum than is usually appropriated for this purpose, but how insignificant compared with the demands of the army and navy! Such are a few illustrations of the tax which the nations of the world, and particularly our own country, impose on the people, in time of profound peace, for no purpose of good, but only in obedience to the spirit of war.

And what is the use of our Standing Army? It has been a principle of freedom, during many generations, to avoid a standing army; and one of the complaints in the Declaration of Independence was, that George III. had quartered large bodies of troops in the colonies. For the first few years after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, before our power was assured, before our name had become respected in the family of nations, under the administration of Washington, a small sum was deemed ample for the military establishment of the United States. It was only when the country, at a later day, had been touched by the insanity of war, that it surrendered to military prejudices, and, abandoning the true economy of a Republic, cultivated a military spirit, and lavished the means, which it begrudged to the purposes of Peace, in vain preparation for War. It may now be said of the army of the United States, as Dunning said of the prerogatives of the crown, it has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished. At this moment there are more than fifty-five military posts in the country. Of what use is the detachment of the second regiment of Artillery in the quiet town of New London, Conn.? Of what use is the detachment of the first regiment of Artillery in that pleasant resort of fashion, Newport? No person, who has not lost sensibility to the dignity of human nature, can observe, without mortification, the discipline, the drilling, the marching and countermarching, the putting guns to the shoulder, and the dropping them to the earth, which fill the lives of the poor soldiers, and prepare them to become the mere inanimate parts of a mere *machine*, to which the great living master of the art of war has likened an army. And this sensibility must be much more offended when he beholds a number of the ingenuous youth of the country, under the auspices

of the Government, amidst the bewitching scenery of West Point, an establishment upon which has been (1845) lavished \$4,002,901, trained to these same farcical and humiliating exercises. It is time that the people should declare the army to be an utterly useless branch of the public service; not merely useless, but a seminary of idleness and vice, breeding manners uncongenial with our institutions, shortening the lives of those whom it enlists, and maintained at an expense which far surpasses all that is bestowed on all the civil purposes of the Government.

But I hear the voice of some defender of this abuse, some upholder of this "rotten borough" of our Constitution, crying, the army is needed for the defence of the country! As well might you say, that the shadow is needed for the defence of the body; for what is the army of the United States but the feeble shadow of the power of the American people? In placing the army on its present footing, so small in numbers compared with the forces of the great European States, our Government has tacitly admitted its superfluousness as a means of defence. Moreover, there is one plea for standing armies in Europe which cannot prevail here. They are supposed to be needed by Governments which do not proceed from the popular voice, to sustain their power. The monarchs of the Old World, like the chiefs of the ancient German tribes, are upborne on the shields of the soldiery. Happily with us the Government springs from the hearts of the people, and needs no janizaries for its support. It remains only to declare distinctly that the country will repose, in the consciousness of right, without the wasteful excess of supporting soldiers, lazy consumers of the fruits of the earth, who might do the State good service in the various departments of useful industry.

What is the use of our Navy? Its annual expense for several years has been upwards of six millions of dollars. For what purpose is this paid? Not for the apprehension of pirates; for frigates and ships of the line are of too great bulk to be of service for this purpose. Not for the suppression of the Slave Trade; for, under the stipulations with Great Britain, we employ only eighty guns in this holy alliance. Not to protect our coasts; for all agree that our few ships would form an unavailing defence against any serious attack. Not for these purposes, all will admit; *but for the protection of our Navigation!* This is not the occasion for minute calculations; but suffice it to say, that the annual profits of our whole mercantile marine does not equal the annual expenditures of our Navy!

In objecting to the Navy, I wish to limit myself to the Navy as an asserted arm of national defence. So far as it may be necessary as a part of the *police* of the seas to purge them of pirates, and, above all, to defeat the hateful traffic in human flesh, it is a proper arm of government. The free cities of Hamburg and Bremen, survivors of the great Hanseatic League, with a commerce that whitens the most distant seas, are without a single ship of war. Let the United States be willing to follow their wise example, and abandon an institution which has already become a vain and most expensive toy!

What is the use of our Fortifications? We have already seen the enormous sums locked in the dead hands, in the odious mortmain, of their everlasting masonry. This is in the hope of saving the country thereby from the horrors of conquest and bloodshed. Let us then suppose the case of a war, unjust and unchristian it must be, between our country and one of the great powers of Europe. In such a war, what would be the effect of these fortifications? Clearly to invite the attack which they would in all probability be inadequate to defeat. It is a rule now recognized even in the barbarous code of war, that non-combatants shall not in any way be molested, and that the property of private persons shall in all cases be held sacred. So firmly did the Duke of Wellington act upon this rule, that throughout the murderous campaigns of Spain, and afterwards when he entered France, flushed with the victory of Waterloo, he directed that his army should pay for all provisions, and even for the forage of their horses. The war is carried on against public property,—against fortifications, navy-yards and arsenals. But if these do not exist, there can be no aliment, no fuel for the flame. Every new fortification and every additional gun in our harbor is, therefore, not a safeguard, but a source of danger to our city. Better throw them into the sea, than madly allow them to draw to our homes the lightning of battle!

What is the use of our Militia? This immense system spreads over the whole country, sucking its best life-blood, the unbought energies of the youth. The same farcical discipline, shouldering arms, and carrying arms, which we have observed in the soldier, absorbs their time, though to a much less degree than in the regular army. We read with astonishment of the painted flesh, and uncouth vestments of our progenitors, the ancient Britons; the generation will soon come that will regard with equal wonder the pictures of their ancestors, closely dressed in padded and well-buttoned coats of blue, “besmeared with gold,” surmounted by a huge mountain-cap of shaggy bear-skin, and with a barbarous device, typical of brute force, a tiger, painted on oil-skin, tied with leather to their backs! In the streets of Pisa, the galley-slaves are compelled to wear dresses stamped with the name of the crime for which they are suffering punishment, as theft, robbery, murder. It is not a little strange, that Christians, living in a land “where bells have tolled to church,” should voluntarily adopt devices which, if they have any meaning, recognize the example of beasts as worthy of imitation by man. The militia is now most often spoken of as an important part of the *police* of the country. I would not undervalue the blessings to be derived from an active, efficient, ever-wakeful police; I believe that such a police has been long required in our country; but the militia, composed of youth of undoubted character, though of untried courage, is clearly inadequate for this purpose. No person, who has seen them in an actual riot, can hesitate in this judgment. A very small portion of the means which are absorbed by the militia, would provide a police competent to all the emergencies of domestic disorder and violence.

The sentiment, *in peace prepare for war*, has been transmitted from

distant ages when brute force prevailed. It is the terrible inheritance the *damnosa hereditas*, which painfully reminds the people of our day of their relations with the Past. It belongs to the rejected dogmas of barbarism. It is the child of suspicion, and the forerunner of violence. Having in its favor the almost uninterrupted usage of the world, it possesses a hold on the common mind, which is not easily unloosed. And yet the conscientious soul cannot fail, on careful observation, to detect its most mischievous fallacy—a fallacy which dooms nations to annual tributes in comparison with which all that have been extorted by conquests, are as the widow's mite by the side of Pharisaical contributions. So true is what Rousseau said, and Guizot has since repeated, "that a bad principle is far worse than a bad fact;" for the operations of the one are finite, while those of the other are infinite. I speak of this principle with earnestness; for I believe it to be erroneous and false, unworthy of an age of light, and disgraceful to Christians. I have called it a principle; but it is a mere *prejudice*, in obeying which we imitate the early mariners who steered from headland to headland, and hugged the shore, unwilling to venture upon the broad ocean where their guide should be the luminaries of heaven.

Preparations for war in time of peace are pernicious on two grounds; first, because they inflame the people who make them, exciting them to deeds of violence which otherwise would be most alien to their minds; and secondly, because, having their origin in the low motive of distrust and hate, they inevitably, by a sure law of the human mind, excite a corresponding feeling in other nations. Thus they are in fact not the *preservers of peace*, but the *provokers of war*.

In illustration of the first of these grounds, it will occur to every inquirer, that the possession of power is always in itself dangerous; that it tempts the purest and highest natures to self-indulgence; that it can rarely be enjoyed without abuse. History teaches that the nations possessing the greatest military forces, have always been the most belligerent; while the feebler powers have enjoyed, for a longer period, the blessings of Peace. The din of war resounds throughout more than seven hundred years of Roman History, with only two short lulls of repose; while smaller states, less potent in arms, and without the excitement to quarrels on this account, have enjoyed long eras of Peace. It is not in the history of nations only, that we find proofs of this law; the experience of private life, in all ages, confirms it. The *wearing of arms* has always been a provocative to combat. It has excited the spirit, and furnished the implements of strife. As we revert to the progress of society in modern Europe, we find that the odious system of private quarrels, of hostile meetings even in the street, continued so long as men persevered in the habit of wearing arms. Innumerable families were thinned by death received in these hasty and often unpremeditated encounters; and the lives of scholars and poets were often exposed to their rude chances. Marlowe, "with all his rare learning and wit," perished ignominiously under the weapon of an unknown adversary; and Savage, whose genius

and misfortune inspired the friendship and the eulogies of Johnson, was tried for murder committed in a sudden broil. "The expert swordsman," says Mr. Jay, "the practised marksman, is ever more ready to engage in personal combats, than the man who is unaccustomed to the use of deadly weapons. In those portions of our country where it is supposed essential to personal safety to go armed with pistols and bowie-knives, mortal affrays are so frequent as to excite but little attention, and to secure, with rare exceptions, impunity to the murderer; whereas, at the North and East, where we are unprovided with such facilities for taking life, comparatively few murders of the kind are perpetrated. We might, indeed, safely submit the decision of the principle we are discussing to the calculations of pecuniary interest. Let two men, equal in age and health, apply for an insurance on their lives; one known to be ever armed to defend his honor and his life against every assailant; and the other a meek, unresisting Quaker. Can we doubt for a moment which of these men would be deemed by the Insurance Company most likely to reach a good old age?"

The second of these grounds is a part of the unalterable nature of man. It is an expansion of the old Horatian adage *Si vis me flere, dolendum est primum ipsi tibi*; if you wish me to weep, you must yourself weep first. So are we all knit together that the feelings in our own bosom awaken corresponding feelings in the bosoms of others; as harp answers to harp in its softest vibrations; as deep responds to deep in the might of its passions. What within us is good, invites the good in our brother; generosity begets generosity; love wins love; Peace secures Peace; while all within us that is bad, challenges the bad in our brother; distrust engenders distrust; hate provokes hate; War arouses War. Life is full of illustrations of this beautiful law. Even the miserable maniac, in whose mind the common rules of conduct are overthrown, confesses its overruling power, and the vacant stare of madness may be illumined by a word of love. The wild beasts confess it; and what is the interesting story of Orpheus, whose music drew in listening rapture the lions and panthers of the forest, but an expression of this prevailing law?

Literature abounds in illustrations of this principle. Looking back to the early dawn of the world, one of the most touching scenes which we behold, illumined by that Auroral light, is the peaceful visit of the aged Priam to the tent of Achilles to entreat the body of his son. The fierce combat has ended in the death of Hector, whose unhonored corse the bloody Greek has already trailed behind his chariot. The venerable father, after twelve days of grief, is moved to efforts to regain the remains of the Hector he had so dearly loved. He leaves his lofty cedarn chamber, and with a single aged attendant, unarmed, repairs to the Grecian camp by the side of the distant sounding sea. Entering alone, he finds Achilles within his tent, in the company of two of his chiefs. He grasps his knees, and kisses those terrible homicidal hands which had taken the life of his son. The heart of the inflexible, the angry, the inflamed Achilles is touched by the sight which he

beholds, and responds to the feelings of Priam. He takes the suppliant by the hand, seats him by his side, consoles his grief, refreshes his weary body, and concedes to the prayers of a weak, unarmed old man, what all Troy in arms could not win. In this scene the poet, with unconscious power, has presented a picture of the omnipotence of that law of our nature, making all mankind of kin, in obedience to which no word of kindness, no act of confidence, falls idly to the earth.

Among the legendary passages of Roman history, perhaps none makes a deeper impression than that scene, after the Roman youth had been consumed at Allia, and the invading Gauls under Brennus had entered the city, where we behold the venerable Senators of the Republic, too old to flee, and careless of surviving the Roman name, seated each on his curule chair in a temple, unarmed, looking, as Livy says, more august than mortal, and with the majesty of the gods. The Gauls gaze on them as upon sacred images, and the hand of slaughter, which had raged through the streets of Rome, is stayed by the sight of an assembly of unarmed old men. At length a Gaul approaches, and gently strokes with his hands the silver beard of a Senator, who, indignant at the license, smites the barbarian with his ivory staff, which was the signal for general vengeance. Think you, that a band of savages could have slain these Senators, if the appeal to force had not first been made by one of their own number?

I cannot leave these illustrations without alluding particularly to the history of the treatment of the insane. When Pinel first proposed to remove the heavy chains from the raving maniacs of the hospitals of Paris, he was regarded as one who saw visions, or dreamed dreams. His wishes were gratified at last; and the change in the conduct of his patients was immediate; the wrinkled front of evil passions was smoothed into the serene countenance of Peace. The old treatment by force is now universally abandoned; the law of love has taken its place; and all these unfortunates mingle together, unvexed by those restraints which implied suspicion, and therefore aroused opposition. The warring propensities, which once filled with confusion and strife the hospitals for the insane while they were controlled by force, are a dark but feeble type of the present relations of nations, on whose hands are the heavy chains of military preparations, assimilating the world to one great mad-house; while the peace and good-will which now abound in these retreats, are the happy emblems of what awaits the world when it shall have the wisdom to recognize the supremacy of the higher sentiments of our nature; of gentleness, of confidence, of love.

I might also dwell on the recent experience, so full of delightful wisdom, in the treatment of the distant, degraded convicts of New South Wales, showing the importance of confidence and kindness on the part of their overseers, in awakening a corresponding sentiment even in these outcasts, from whose souls virtue seems, at first view, to be wholly blotted out. Thus from all quarters, from the far-off past, from the far-away Pacific, from the verse of the

poet, from the legend of history, from the cell of the mad-house, from the assembly of transported criminals, from the experience of daily life, from the universal heart of man, ascends the spontaneous tribute to the prevailing power of that law, according to which the human heart responds to the feelings by which it is addressed, whether of confidence or distrust, of love or hate.

It will be urged that these instances are exceptions to the general laws by which mankind are governed. It is not so. They are the unanswerable evidence of the real nature of man. They disclose susceptibilities which are general, confined to no particular race of men, to no period of time, to no narrow circle of knowledge and refinement. It is then on the universal and unalterable nature of man, that I place the fallacy of that prejudice, in obedience to which in time of peace we prepare for war.

But Christianity not only teaches the superiority of Love over Force; it positively enjoins the practice of the one, and the rejection of the other. It says, "love your neighbors;" but it does not say, "in time of Peace rear the massive fortification, build the man of war, enlist armies, train the militia, and accumulate military stores to be employed in future quarrels with your neighbors." Its precepts go still further. They direct that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us—a golden rule for the conduct of nations as well as individuals; but how inconsistent with that distrust of others, in wrongful obedience to which nations, in time of Peace, seem to sleep like soldiers on their arms! Its precepts go further still. They enjoin patience, suffering, forgiveness of evil, even the duty of benefiting a destroyer, "as the sandal wood, in the instant of its overthrow, sheds perfume on the axe which fells it." And can a people, in whom this faith is more than an idle word, consent to such enormous sacrifices of money in violation of its plainest precepts?

In response to these views, I hear the skeptical note of some defender of the transmitted order of things, some one who wishes "to fight for Peace," saying, these views are beautiful but visionary; they are in advance of the age; the world is not yet prepared for their reception. To such persons I would say, nothing can be beautiful that is not true; but these views are true, the time is now come for their reception, now is the day, and now the hour. Every effort to impede their progress, arrests the advancing hand on the great dial-plate of human happiness.

The name of Washington is invoked as an authority for a prejudice which Economy, Humanity and Christianity all declare to be false. Mighty and reverend as is his name, more mighty and more reverend is truth. The words of counsel which he gave were in accordance with the spirit of his age,—an age which was not shocked by the slave-trade; but his lofty soul, which loved virtue, and inculcated justice and benevolence, frowns upon the efforts of those who would use his authority as an incentive to war. God forbid that his sacred character should be profanely stretched, like the skin of John Ziska, on a militia drum to rouse the martial ardor of the American people! Look at the practice of Wash-

ington. During his administration, our expenses for the army and the navy fell short of \$11,000,000, or \$1,365,000 a year; while those of the eight years preceding 1844, reached nearly \$164,000,000, or \$20,417,000 a year; an increase of 1500 per cent.!

It is melancholy to consider the impediments which truth encounters on its first appearance. A large portion of mankind avert their countenances from all that is inconsistent with established usage; but the practice of nations can be no apology for a system which is condemned by such principles as I have now considered. Truth enters the world like a humble child, with few to receive her; it is only when she has grown in years and stature, and the purple flush of youthful strength beams from her face, that she is sought and wooed. It has been thus in all ages. Nay, there is often an irritation excited by her presence; and men who are kind and charitable, forget their kindness, and lose their charity towards the unaccustomed stranger. It was this feeling which awarded a dungeon to Galileo, when he declared that the earth moved round the sun; which neglected the great discovery of the circulation of the blood by Harvey; and which bitterly opposed the divine philanthropy of Clarkson, when he first denounced the wickedness of the slave-trade. But the rejected truths of to-day shall become the chief corner-stones to the next generation.

Auspicious omens in the history of the past, and in the present, cheer us for the future. The terrible wars of the French Revolution were the violent rending of the body which preceded the exorcism of the fiend. Since the morning stars first sang together, the world has not witnessed a peace so harmonious and enduring as that which now blesses the Christian nations. Great questions between them, fraught with strife, and, in another age, sure heralds of war, are now determined by arbitration or mediation. Great political movements, which only a few short years ago must have led to forcible rebellion, are now conducted by peaceful discussion. Literature, the press, and various societies, all join in the holy work of inculcating good-will to man. The spirit of humanity now pervades the best writings of every kind; nor can genius ever be so Promethean as when it bears the heavenly fire of love to the hearths of men.

It was Dr. Johnson, in the last age, who uttered the detestable sentiment, that he liked "a good hater;" the man of this age shall say, he likes "a good lover." A poet, whose few verses will bear him on his immortal flight with unflagging wing, has given expression to this sentiment in words of uncommon pathos and power:

"He prayeth well who loveth well
All things, both great and small.
He prayeth best who loveth best
Both man, and bird, and beast;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all."

Every where the ancient law of hate is yielding to the law of love. It is seen in the change of dress; the armor of complete steel was the habiliment of the knight, and the sword was an indispensable

companion of the gentleman of the last century ; but he would be thought a madman or a bully who should wear either now. It is seen in the change in domestic architecture ; the places once chosen for castles or houses, were in the most savage, inaccessible retreats, where the massive structure was reared, destined solely to repel attacks, and to enclose its inhabitants. The monasteries and churches were fortified, and girdled by towers, ramparts and ditches, and a child was often stationed as a watchman, not of the night, but to observe what passed at a distance, and announce the approach of the enemy ! The houses of the peaceful citizens in towns were castellated, often without so much as an aperture for light near the ground, and with loop-holes above, through which the shafts of the cross-bow might be aimed. In the system of fortifications and preparations for war, nations act towards each other in the spirit of distrust and barbarism, which we have traced in the individual, but which he has now renounced. In so doing, they take counsel of the wild boar in the fable, who whetted his tusks on a tree of the forest, when no enemy was near, saying that in time of peace he must prepare for war. But has not the time now come, when man whom God created in his own image, and to whom He gave the heaven-directed countenance, shall cease to look down to the beasts for examples of conduct ?

To Louis Philippe belongs the honest fame of first publishing from the throne (1843) the truth, that Peace is endangered by preparations for War. "The sentiment, or rather the principle," he says, "that in peace you must prepare for war, is one of difficulty and danger ; for while we keep armies to preserve peace, they are, at the same time, incentives and instruments of war. Peace is what all need ; and I think the time is coming when we shall get rid entirely of war in all civilized countries."

To William Penn belongs the distinction, destined to brighten as men advance in virtue, of first in human history establishing the *Law of Love* as a rule of conduct for the intercourse of nations. While he recognized as a great end of government, "to support power in reverence with the people, and to secure the people from abuse of power," he declined the superfluous protection of arms against foreign force, and "aimed to reduce the savage nations by just and gentle manners to the love of civil society and the Christian religion." His serene countenance, as he stands with his followers in what he called the sweet and clear air of Pennsylvania, all unarmed, beneath the spreading elm, forming the great treaty of friendship with the untutored Indians, who fill with savage display the surrounding forest as far as the eye can reach, not to wrest their lands by violence, but to obtain them by peaceful purchase, is to my mind the proudest picture in the history of our country. "The great God," said this illustrious Quaker, in his words of sincerity and truth addressed to the Sachems, "has written his law in our hearts, by which we are taught and commanded to love, and to help, and to do good to one another. It is not our custom to use hostile weapons against our fellow-creatures, for which reason we have come unarmed. Our object is not to do

injury, but to do good. We have met in the broad pathway of good faith and good will, so that no advantage can be taken on either side, but all is to be openness, brotherhood and love; while all are to be treated as of the same flesh and blood." These are, indeed, words of true greatness. "Without any carnal weapons," says one of his companions, "we entered the land, and inhabited therein as safe as if there had been thousands of garrisons." A great man, worthy of the mantle of Penn, the venerable philanthropist, Clarkson, in his life of the founder of Pennsylvania, says, "The Pennsylvanians became armed, though without arms; they became strong, though without strength; they became safe, without the ordinary means of safety. The constable's staff was the only instrument of authority amongst them for the greater part of a century; and never, during the administration of Penn, or that of his proper successors, was there a war or a quarrel."

Here, then, will be found *the true grandeur of nations*—not in extent of territory, nor in vastness of population, nor in wealth; not in fortifications, or armies, or navies; not in the phosphorescent glare of fields of battle; not in Golgothas, though covered by monuments that kiss the clouds; nor yet in triumphs of the intellect alone, in literature, learning, science or art. *The true grandeur of humanity is in MORAL ELEVATION, sustained, enlightened and decorated by the intellect of man*; and the truest tokens of this grandeur in a State are the diffusion of the greatest happiness among the greatest number, and that passionless, God-like Justice, which controls the relations of the State to other States, and to all the people who are committed to its charge. Peace has its own peculiar victories, in comparison with which Marathon, and Bannockburn, and Bunker Hill shall lose their lustre. Our own Washington rises to a truly heavenly stature,—not when we follow him over the ice of the Delaware to the capture of Trenton—not when we behold him victorious over Cornwallis at Yorktown; but when we regard him, in noble deference to justice, refusing the kingly crown which a faithless soldiery proffered, and at a later day upholding the peaceful neutrality of the country, while he received unmoved the clamor of the people wickedly crying for war.

But let us not confine ourselves to barren words in recognition of virtue. Let us, while we recognize the *Law of Right* and the *Law of Love*, aspire to the true glory, and, what is higher than glory, the great good, of taking the lead in disarming the nations. Let us abandon the system of preparation for war in time of peace, as irrational, unchristian, vainly prodigal of expense, and having a direct tendency to excite the very evil against which it professes to guard. Let the enormous means thus released from iron hands, be devoted to labors of beneficence; and the result shall be glorious beyond conception. Then shall the naked be clothed, and the hungry fed; institutions of science and learning shall crown every hill-top; hospitals for the sick, and other retreats for the unfortunate children of the world, for all who suffer in any way, in mind, body or estate, shall nestle in every valley; while the spires of new churches shall leap exulting to the skies. The whole land

shall bear witness to the change ; art shall confess it in the new inspiration of the canvass and the marble ; the harp of the poet shall proclaim it in a loftier rhyme. Above all, the heart of man shall bear witness to it, in the elevation of his sentiments, in the expansion of his affections, in his devotion to the highest truth, in his appreciation of true greatness. The eagle of our country, without the terror of his beak, and dropping the forceful thunderbolt from his pounces, shall soar with the olive of Peace into untried realms of ether nearer to the sun.

To this great work of Peace, let me summon you all ; nor let it be said that the age does not demand it. The mighty conquerors of the Past, from their fiery sepulchres, demand it ; the blood of millions unjustly shed in war crying from the ground, demands it ; the voices of all good men demand it ; the conscience even of the soldier whispers peace. We should lead in this great work. To this should bend the patriotic ardor of the land, the ambition of the statesman, the efforts of the scholar, the pervasive influence of the press, the mild persuasion of the sanctuary, the early teachings of the school. Here, in ampler ether and diviner air, are untried fields for exalted triumphs, more truly worthy the American name, than any snatched from rivers of blood.

It is a beautiful picture in Grecian story, that there was at least one spot, the small Island of Delos, dedicated to the Gods, and kept at all times sacred from war, where the citizens of hostile countries met and united in a common worship. So let us dedicate our broad country ! The Temple of Honor shall be surrounded by the Temple of Concord, so that the former can be entered only through the portals of the latter ; the horn of Abundance shall overflow at its gates ; the angel of Religion shall be the guide over its steps of flashing adamant ; while within JUSTICE, returned to the earth from her long exile in the skies, shall rear her serene and majestic front ; and the future chiefs of the Republic, destined to uphold the glories of a new era, unspotted by human blood, shall be "the first in PEACE, and the first in the hearts of their countrymen."

But while we seek these blissful glories for ourselves, let us strive to extend them to other lands. Let the bugles sound the *Truce of God* to the whole world forever. Let the selfish boast of the Spartan women become the grand chorus of mankind, that they have never seen the smoke of an enemy's camp. Let the iron belt of martial music which now encompasses the earth, be exchanged for the golden cestus of Peace, clothing all with celestial beauty. History dwells with fondness on the reverent homage that was bestowed by massacring soldiers on the spot occupied by the Sepulchre of our Lord. Vain man ! to restrain his regard to a few feet of sacred mould ! The whole earth is the Sepulchre of the Lord ; nor can any righteous man profane any part thereof. Let us recognize this truth, and lay a new stone in the grand Temple of Universal Peace, whose dome shall be as lofty as the firmament of Heaven, as broad and comprehensive as the earth itself.

CLAIMS OF PEACE ON LITERARY MEN.

THE general claims of peace are common to all mankind. Every one that wisely regards his own welfare, as well as every sincere lover of God, his country or his species, must desire the abolition of a custom which has from time immemorial filled the earth with crime and wo. But I will not now attempt to tell how it wastes property and life by wholesale;—how it breaks up families, and lays villages in ruins;—how it plunders cities, desolates provinces, and rolls its waves of blood and devastation over empires;—what sufferings it heaps upon the field of battle, scatters along the march, and crowds into the camp, the siege and the hospital;—how it preys, like a shoal of countless vampyres, on the character and happiness of individuals, communities and nations;—how it checks the progress of knowledge and freedom, of virtue, religion and general improvement;—how it debases the intellect, blunts the conscience, and brutalizes the heart;—how it fosters ignorance, and feeds intemperance, and panders to the basest passions, and makes the resting-place of soldiers and seamen an emblem of Sodom itself;—how it multiplies almost every species of vice and crime imaginable, and taints the moral atmosphere of the whole world;—how it neutralizes the power of the gospel in Christendom, and retards its spread and triumph over the earth;—how fast it ripens mankind for perdition, and sweeps them into the bottomless pit by thousands and millions. Here are topics immensely important; but, passing from all these, I shall now glance only at some that are more or less peculiar to literary men.

1. The very nature of this cause commends it to their special regards. It embraces all the great interests of our race; nor do I see how any inquisitive or generous mind can quietly rest in ignorance of a subject so vast, so interesting in itself, and so closely linked with the welfare of mankind. You can find no theme involving more points of importance in politics, morality or religion. It spreads itself over the entire surface of human nature, and presents some of its most startling developments. It touches the main-springs of human action. It forms the web and woof of all history. It pervades and leavens the literature of every age. It enters into the theory and practice of all governments. It must shape, more or less, every system of ethics and political economy. There is no end to the points which it starts for discussion. It embraces an infinity of facts important as the weal or wo of our whole race, and involves principles which lie at the very foundation of society, morals and religion. It affects the condition, character and interest of all mankind. No nation, no community, not a solitary individual on earth, but is concerned in this subject.

I can hardly conceive any topic more important in its nature, more extensive in its connections and bearings, or more vital to the welfare of individuals and nations.

Here is a vast field well nigh unexplored. The principles of peace, applicable alike to individuals and communities, have never been fully applied to nations; and such an application is regarded by not a few as preposterous and impracticable. Yet something has been done to pave the way for a result so devoutly to be wished. Grotius, in his great work on the *Rights of Peace and War*, led the van of this inquiry, and collected no small part of the materials requisite for such a system of international law as must one day regulate the intercourse of all civilized nations without the sword. Still many points of this code remain untouched, and some of its fundamental principles are neither rightly applied, nor properly understood. Here is a department of jurisprudence the most profound, extensive and important that philosophy ever investigated; and I have often wondered that men of science and letters have given it so small a share of their attention.

Shall such a field be neglected by the studious and the cultivated? It surely deserves their special and most earnest attention. It will richly repay all the labor they may bestow upon it, and will bear a favorable comparison in every respect with any of those to which the scholar gives the full vigor of his powers. You can find none more important in history, mathematics or philosophy, in astronomy or chemistry, in any of the arts or sciences, in any branch of a common or liberal education; and if you spend year after year in learning languages spoken by no nation now on the globe, in tracing the movements of the planetary system, in mastering the dry abstractions of mathematics, in conning the rules of rhetoric, in threading the labyrinths of metaphysical science, or in classifying rocks and stones, pebbles and shells, birds and fishes, reptiles and insects, can you overlook such a subject as the world's entire, perpetual pacification?

2. Another special claim of this cause arises from your capacity for its proper investigation. More than ordinary cultivation is requisite for such a purpose. It is easy to interest common minds in the details of war; but the cause of peace has aspects, relations and bearings, which an intellect either superficial, undisciplined, or poorly furnished, will never be able fully to comprehend. To master such a subject, demands an extent of knowledge, a reach of thought, and habits of inquiry and reflection, possessed only by cultivated minds. Here is a field emphatically their own; and they ought to enter it as pioneers of the people. Scholars must first take hold of peace in earnest, and press its claims on the community, before the millions will wake to its real importance.

3. Glance, moreover, at the mental effects of war. Its iron-handed sway over the minds as well as the bodies of its minions, must give the cause of peace peculiar claims upon intellectual men who demand freedom of thought, speech and action. The mental despotism of war is the worst form of oppression on earth. It allows the soldier neither liberty of speech, nor freedom of in-

quiry, nor the safe, unshackled exercise of his own conscience; it turns him into a mere wheel in the vast machinery of war, and forbids his moving beyond his prescribed sphere in the work of carnage and devastation. It well nigh annihilates all individuality of mind and character. The will of thousands it holds in stern subjection to a single mind, and keeps them in a state of bondage more galling to the soul than that of a Polish serf, a Turkish peasant, or a galley slave.

All history, all observation, confirm these statements. "It has been a generally received opinion," says Franklin in one of his letters to Vaughan, "that a military man is not to inquire whether a war be just or unjust; he is to execute his orders! All princes that are disposed to become tyrants, must probably approve of this opinion, and be willing to establish it; but is it not a dangerous one? On this principle," a principle essential to the war system, "if the tyrant commands his army to attack and destroy not only an unoffending neighbor nation, but even his own subjects, his army is bound to obey. A negro slave in our colonies, being commanded by his master to rob or murder a neighbor, or do any other immoral act, may refuse, and the magistrate will protect him in his refusal. *The slavery of a soldier then is worse than that of a negro.*"

War allows to its agents no real freedom of mind. Lord Wellington once said in a public debate, that no man of religious principles, of such scruples as would interfere with any deeds of atrocity required in this trade of human butchery, should be a soldier; and two British officers, having conscientiously refused to take any part in certain Popish ceremonies which they deemed idolatrous, were tried by a court martial, and cashiered. They appealed to the King; and his organ, in confirming the sentence, observed that, "if religious principles were allowed to be urged by individual officers as a plea for disobedience of orders, the discipline of the army would sustain an injury which might be dangerous to the state."

But the mental tyranny of war is not confined to soldiers; it extends more or less through the nation, and seeks to bring all minds under the control of brute force, and brute courage. It is the coarsest, as well as the cruellest of all despotisms, and presents a startling contrast to the character of a civilized, Christian community. Here is the very genius of pagan barbarism lording it over Christendom itself; and with all our pretensions to intelligence and piety, we very much resemble in this custom the ancient Egyptians bowing down to crocodiles and alligators. War is still the undisputed tyrant of Christendom, its recognized demi-god, with his creed of violence, his precepts of crime, and his logic of lead and steel. It treats man as a brute, and tramples his intellectual manhood in the dust.

Look at the influence of this custom on mind in civil and political matters. It forbids the predominance of intellect and knowledge in the affairs of state. Talent, intelligence, every kind of mental culture, it keeps in the lowest possible scale of estimation, or makes them mere handmaids to its selfish and savage purposes.

Statesmen and philosophers, orators and men of science and letters, it throws into the shade, or chains to its car, or crushes beneath its iron hoof. Bold and brawny hands, the qualities of a tiger or bull-dog, seize the reins of government, and monopolize the political power of the world.

On this point history is decisive. Warriors have generally been permitted to engross the government of mankind; and, with a very few exceptions like Cæsar, you will find them, like Attila and Alaric, Tamerlane, Jenghiz-khan and Achilles, a species of human tigers, skilled in little else than the art of bloodshed, devastation and misery. An Alexander or Napoleon may occasionally take with them on their excursions a naturalist to collect curiosities, a historian to record their exploits, or a poet to sing their praises; but the mass of powerful and cultivated minds, the warrior brings into subserviency to his own aggrandizement, and keeps them in a state of servile, debasing subjection. If you cultivate the arts of peace, talent, knowledge and wisdom will hold the reins of government; but let the people become warlike, and military chieftains would soon drive them all at the point of the bayonet. Review the history of Greece and Rome, of England under Cromwell, of France under Napoleon, of all the republics except our own in the New World; and you will find on this point a superabundance of proof.

In view of such facts, I stand amazed at the disposition of intellectual men to eulogize war and warriors. Still more strange is the encouragement which statesmen lend to war; for they are thus cherishing a serpent that will one day wreath his folds around themselves, and strangle them to death. It is only in peace that their worth can be fully appreciated, or their merits duly rewarded; while in war, or under its influences even in peace, Pompey outpeers Cicero, Cromwell takes precedence of Milton, and the hero of New Orleans or Tippecanoe, with only a modicum of talent or knowledge, leaves the first minds of the land far behind them in the race of popularity and power.

4. Another pledge of their special interest in the cause of peace may be found in the character of literary men. They are generally peaceful; most of the influences acting upon them are pacific; and I can hardly conceive it possible for them to carry the spirit of war into the researches of science, the pursuits of art, or the studies of literature and philosophy. All these are plants of peace, and can flourish only amid its balmy breezes, and beneath its gentle dews and genial sunshine.

Look at the man of science or letters. Peace is his very element. He lives in a peaceful retreat; he breathes a peaceful atmosphere; he is surrounded by peaceful associates; his whole life is a current of peaceful labors and enjoyments. Still more so with the youthful student; his studies, his recreations, all the scenes about him are peaceful. It would seem impossible for such persons to cherish a war-spirit; and from them the cause of peace may well expect an unwonted degree of sympathy and support.

5. But mark the subserviency of this cause to the peculiar interests of scientific and literary men. All their pursuits require peace. War paralyzes, suspends or deranges them all. Peace is the chosen nurse of genius and taste, of philosophy, art and science. They expire in the foul and bloody embraces of war. It sweeps, like a deadly sirocco, across the gardens of intellect and knowledge. You can find no literature, no philosophy, no art or science, except that of human butchery, flourishing beneath its death-shades.

So all history tells us. Recount the names of those whose literary or scientific fame has filled the world; and how few of them won their way to eminence amid the din of war! Where did Newton and Davy make their discoveries, or Locke and Aristotle excogitate their metaphysics, or Pliny, Buffon and Linnæus originate or remodel entire departments of science, or Bacon elicit and embody the great principles of philosophy, or Plato compose his matchless essays, or Demosthenes and Cicero acquire their mastery over the human mind, or Homer himself learn to chant the praises of war in deathless song? On the battle-field, in camps and fleets? No; nearly all the products of their genius, taste and learning were fruits of peace, which war would have crushed in the germ, or nipped in the bud.

Glance at the ravages which this demon of vandalism has made of such products. Whose torch burnt those treasures of knowledge which so many centuries had been accumulating in Egypt? Whose hand seized the noblest monuments of ancient art, and hurled them in fragments to the ground? Whose foot of iron trampled on the statues, and temples, and arches, and columns of Greece and Rome? The richest treasures of learning, the finest works of art, the most splendid productions of taste and genius, war has wantonly destroyed, and seemed to glory in the ruin.

6 War is, also, hostile to the general cultivation of mind. It comes over the mass of society like a thunder-cloud, and conceals the sun of science from their view. It quenches in many the very desire for mental improvement, and absorbs the time and money needed for such a purpose. Where the whole land is a vast muster-field; where every man, not diseased or crippled, is held to military service; where the arrangements for war supersede those for every other object, and keep society in a state of ceaseless commotion or suspense, I see not how any system of common education can be pursued with steady vigor and success. To this rule there may be exceptions, but no contradiction of the principle.

Equally hostile is war to the higher departments of education. Few here pass through a course of liberal studies without an eye to one of the learned professions; but the demands of war, if uninterrupted, would render it quite uncertain whether a youth would be permitted to reach his goal. Where the practice of conscription or impressment prevails; where every young man is liable, at the very age of commencing his studies for a profession, to be dragged into an army or navy for life; where every thing is unsettled, and the vicissitudes of war keep the whole community like

vessels tossed on the ocean in a storm ;—what encouragement can parents have to educate their sons ?

I grant that America has not yet reached the savage practices of impressment and conscription ; but they were seriously proposed in Congress before the close of even our last war (1812,) and, should we embark in frequent or protracted conflicts, they would be found indispensable. They are the necessary feeders of this insatiate, all-devouring Moloch, and must spread its disastrous influence over all the departments of education. It would paralyze the intellect of the nation, and roll back the wheels of general improvement. It would break the main-spring of education, or derange its entire machinery. It would blight more or less every seminary of learning from the highest to the lowest. Our last, as well as our revolutionary war, disbanded some of our colleges, and turned the buildings into barracks. This monster rides rough-shod over all such institutions. It would thin even our Sabbath and common schools, as well as our academies, our colleges, and professional seminaries. The youth destined to these nurseries of intellect and knowledge, would be forced into fleets and camps, or be dragged from the very temples of science to meet the hardships and horrors of war.

Reflect for a moment on the loss of mind and general improvement occasioned by this custom. It does indeed quicken the intellect of a few leaders ; but it is a sort of mental torpedo to the mass of persons in its service. It makes them mere tools, or parts of a vast engine for the destruction of mankind. It is a dead loss of mind to nearly all the purposes for which mind was made ; and, if you review the whole history of war, you will find the sum total of this waste to exceed all calculation. Alexander and Cæsar each kept hundreds of thousands continually in the field ; the armies of Ninus and Semiramis often amounted to more than two millions each ; that of Xerxes exceeded five millions ; the standing forces of Christendom even in a time of peace are about three millions ; and myriads of immortal minds has this custom lost to improvement and society, to God and heaven. The siege of ancient Troy, undertaken for the recovery of a worthless courtesan, blighted not less than 2,000,000 ; the wars of Napoleon, in the short space of fourteen years, crushed more than 5,000,000 in the heart of Christendom ; Jenghiz-khan butchered nearly 32,000,000 in forty-one years ; the wars of the Roman empire, of the Saracens and the Turks, sacrificed 60,000,000 each ; those of the Tartars, 80,000,000 ; those of Africa, 100,000,000 ; and Dick reckons the whole number of its victims from the first, at 14,000,000,000 ! while Burke put them at 35,000,000,000 !! What a fearful, immeasurable waste of immortal minds !

7. Other claims of peace upon literary men result from the general prevalence of a war spirit from their agency heretofore in spreading this poison, and from their ability to neutralize its baleful influence. War has diffused a species of moral malaria over the whole world. Look at the dangers from a literature tainted with its spirit. They cluster thickly along the student's path.

At every step he treads among the scorpions of war; with every breath he inhales its delicious infection; at every turn he is met by its gilded, glorious, bewildering fascinations. Its kaleidoscopes pour upon his eye from every quarter their bright and dazzling images. War besets every avenue to his soul. He is constantly begirt with its influences. They form the atmosphere and aliment of his moral being. The richest banquets of taste and intellect are strongly spiced with the spirit of war. The waters of Helicon are saturated with it. The very nectar and ambrosia of ancient literature are steeped in it. The plague-spots are all over the noblest creations of genius. This moral gangrene cankers the literature of the world, and mars more or less the best specimens of ancient and modern poetry and eloquence, history and philosophy.

Now, if the student must or will peruse such works, does he need no shield or warning against the dangers that lurk on every side of him, no antidote to the moral poison he is continually imbibing? Let him beware; his task is perilous,—very like that of a botanist culling flowers from a garden of death, or an amateur trying to pull a jewel of diamonds from a body all spotted with the plague, or a traveller inhaling Arabian odors wafted on the wings of the Simoom. Every scholar knows these dangers, and should warn his successors. The mania of war has pervaded the world; its mighty spell has bound the master-minds of every age; its atmosphere of death hangs over all the fields of ancient and modern literature; and, inhaled by the student, it is continually tainting the life-blood of his soul. Genius, taste, learning, all have bowed, age after age, before this universal Juggernaut, and poured out their richest offerings on its altar.

This point needs little proof. The literature of the world reeks with war. Scarce a poet or orator, historian or philosopher of Greece or Rome, that did not worship at the shrine of the war-demon, and bequeath to posterity some memorial of his devotion. Nor is the literature even of Christendom free from the same taint; it were easy to fill volumes with specimens of the war-spirit. The student is constantly meeting them in works of taste; nor do I see how the combustible spirit of youth can help taking fire at such scintillations of war; and surely he needs the shield of peace to guard him against this cluster of dangers by which he is surrounded.

War has ever had a fearful ubiquity of influence. The chief business and boast of the world, it has moulded the character of every age and clime. The first minds even of Christendom have been educated under its delusions. The press and the pulpit, the school and the fireside, have conspired to breathe into the young more or less of its spirit, and train them to the admiration and support of the system. They have been taught to look upon it as the great theatre of glory, as an essential part of society and government. All the power of custom, all the authority of age, all the fascinations of beauty, all the sanctions of religion, all the charms

of music and poetry, the utmost efforts of the pen, the pencil and the chisel, have combined to throw a most delusive coloring over its manifold abominations, and thus to beguile the young, the ardent and the gifted into a passionate fondness, or profound respect for war.

But on whom rests the chief responsibility of a result so deplorable? Not on the mass of common minds, for they are only its dupes and victims; but on men of letters as the educators of mankind, and the eulogists of this bloody and barbarous custom. They have been the leading agents in perpetuating its strange, guilty, fatal delusions. Their utmost powers they have tasked to prepare the Circean cup of war. Their genius, learning and taste they have prostituted to its service, and done more than all other classes to keep it alive. They have written its histories; they have composed its songs and ballads; they have emblazoned the warrior's deeds, and trumpeted his fame through the world. They have been the high priests of war to cultivated minds, and breathed its spirit into the literature of every age. Almost every seminary of learning they have made a nursery of war, and filled our libraries with works too well calculated to perpetuate its reign of guilt and terror.

For such wrongs, is not a large atonement due from literary men? This whole war-process must be reversed; and only men of letters can repair or counteract the evil done by their predecessors of a hundred generations. They alone can furnish the needful antidote to the wide-spread poison of war. It is for them to strip off the rich and gorgeous drapery of delusion which genius has thrown over its manifold abominations; for them to dissect its rotten-cored philosophy, to expose its heartless sophistries, and silence its cold-blooded arguments; for them to show its glaring contrariety to nature, reason and revelation; for them to gauge, if that be possible, the real dimensions of this gigantic sin, to collect the statistics of its mighty mischief for two worlds, and paint its atrocities and woes in such colors as shall rouse every Christian community to the work of its speedy, utter, everlasting extinction.

The cause demands a variety of services from men of letters. "Let one," says Chalmers, "take up the question of war in its principle, and make the full weight of his moral severity rest upon it, and upon all its abominations. Let another take up the question of war in its consequences, and bring all his powers of graphical description to the task of presenting an awakened public with an impressive detail of its cruelties and its horrors. Let another neutralize the poetry of war, and dismantle it of all those bewitching splendors which the hand of-misguided genius has thrown over it. Let another teach the world a truer and more magnanimous path to national glory than any country of the world has yet walked in. Let another tell with irresistible argument how the Christian ethics of a nation are at one with the Christian ethics of its humblest individual. Let another pour the light of modern speculation into the mysteries of trade, and prove that not a single war has been

undertaken for any of its objects, where the millions, and the millions more which were lavished on the cause, have not been cheated away from us by the phantom of an imaginary interest."

But services still more important are needed in the cause of peace. The pacific spirit of the gospel is yet to be infused into the literature and religion, the governments and intercourse, the rulers and people of all Christian nations. The history of the world, now a virtual eulogy of war and warriors, must be written anew, and made a faithful mirror to reflect such an image of the guilt and miseries inseparable from this custom, as shall excite deep, universal abhorrence. We need a new literature, the literature of peace, or a thoroughly expurgated edition of all the classics both ancient and modern. The ethics of the gospel must be dug out from the rubbish of centuries, and made to bear upon a custom which embraces in its elements or legitimate effects every species of sin that depravity ever committed. Public opinion on this whole subject must be thoroughly christianized; and the press and the pulpit, every nursery of sentiment and character, must be enlisted in this work of reform. Education, through all its departments, must become a handmaid of peace, and the main influences of Christendom turned into this channel.

Such services can be performed only by cultivated minds; but all this they can do for the cause of peace, if they will. They are the law-givers of public opinion. They are the guardians of education, and preside over all the nurseries of intellect and learning. They write our books; they edit our periodicals; they frame our codes of law; they shape our forms of government; they teach our academies, colleges and professional seminaries. They are the leading educators of society. They cast the mould of the civilized world. Their character puts them, of course, in all the high places of influence. They are physicians, and lawyers, and judges, and ministers of the gospel, and teachers of all the first minds in Christendom. They cannot help leaving a deep impress of themselves on the world; no class in society can exert a tithe of their influence on the mass of mankind; and it is in their power to make wars cease, in this very age, from every civilized nation.

Surely, then, the cause of peace has strong claims, not only on men of letters in general, but especially on students in our seminaries of learning. There is even now slumbering there moral power sufficient to revolutionize the war-sentiments of all Christendom; and this power ought forthwith to be put in requisition for the accomplishment of a reform so devoutly to be wished. Coming from the first families in the land, moving in the higher circles of society, and occasionally going forth to teach in academies and common schools, they might, even during the course of their education, easily perform for the cause of peace services of vital importance; but when they enter upon the stage of public action, and take the place of those who are now guiding the helm of state, giving law to public opinion, and shaping the character and destiny of the world, they will be able to exert in its behalf a

still wider and more powerful influence. As teachers, editors and authors; as expounders of law, or professors of the healing art; as preachers of the gospel, or guardians of society and government, they will hold in their hands the main-springs of the world, and could, if they would, so far saturate the public mind with a love of peace, and abhorrence of war, as to prevent this scourge from ever returning upon civilized nations.

Most earnestly, then, would we commend this cause not only to the cultivated, leading minds already on the stage of public life, but especially to the rising generation of scholars now in our seminaries of learning. Fain would we press its claims on your conscience as well as your self-interest. Its destiny is suspended mainly on you; and your character and circumstances, your future pursuits and interests, your obligations to society and to God, all unite in demanding of you special services for a cause so important in itself, and so indissolubly linked with the welfare of your country and the world. Open your mind then to its claims. Examine the subject for yourselves; you will find it full of unexpected interest. Read and reflect upon it at your leisure. Discuss it in your literary associations. Try your powers upon it both in prose and verse. Make it a topic of frequent conversation, and fully resolve so far to master the whole subject, and so deeply to imbue yourselves with its spirit, that you will feel self-impelled to its earnest, habitual advocacy, and be well prepared in future life to plead with success the claims of an enterprise so vital to the welfare of all mankind for time and eternity.

CHARLES SUMNER.—One of the obstacles to be encountered by the advocate of Peace, is the warlike tone of literature. The world has supped so full with battles, that all its inner modes of thought, and many of its rules of conduct, seem to be incarnadined with blood; as the bones of swine, fed on madder, are said to become red. Fain would I offer my tribute to the Father of Poetry, standing, with harp of immortal melody, on the misty mountain top of distant antiquity; to all those stories of courage and sacrifice which emblazon the annals of Greece and Rome; to the fulminations of Demosthenes, and the splendors of Tully; to the sweet verse of Virgil, and the poetic prose of Livy. Fain would I offer my tribute to the new literature which shot up in modern times as a vigorous forest from the burnt site of ancient woods; to the passionate song of the Troubadour of France, and the Minnesinger of Germany; to the thrilling ballads of Spain, and the delicate music of the Italian Lyre. But from all these has breathed the breath of war, that has swept the heart-strings of innumerable generations of men!

DOUGLASS JERROLD.—Now, look aside, and contemplate God's image with a musket. Behold the crowning glory of his work managed like a machine, to slay the image of God, to stain the

teeming earth with homicidal blood, to fill the air with howling anguish! Is not yonder row of clowns a melancholy sight? Yet are they the sucklings of glory, the baby mighty ones of a future gazette. What a fine looking thing is war! Yet, dress it as we may, dress and feather it, daub it with gold, huzza it, and sing swaggering songs about it, what is it, nine times out of ten, but murder in uniform—Cain taking the sergeant's shilling?

But the craft of man has made a splendid ceremony of homicide. He slaughters with flags flying, drums beating, trumpets braying. He kills according to method, and has worldly honors for his grim handiwork. He does not, like the unchristian savage, carry away with him mortal trophies from the skulls of his enemies. No; the alchemy or magic of authority turns his well-worn scalps into epaulettes, or hangs them in stars and crosses at his button-hole; and then, the battle over, the dead not eaten, but carefully buried, and the maimed and mangled howling and blaspheming in hospitals, the meek Christian warrior marches to church, and, reverently folding his sweet and spotless hands, sings *Te Deum!* And this spirit of destruction is canonized by the craft and ignorance of man, and worshipped as glory! This religion of the sword, this dazzling heathenism which makes a pomp of wickedness, seizes and distracts us even on the threshold of life. Swords and drums are our baby play-things; and, as we grow older, the outward magnificence of the ogre Glory, his trappings and his trumpets, his privileges, and the songs that are shouted in his praise, ensnare the bigger baby to his sacrifice. Hence slaughter becomes an exalted profession; the marked, distinguished employment of what is called a gentleman!!

But, man of war! you are at length shrinking, withering like an aged giant. You are not now the feathered thing you were—the fingers of Opinion have been busy at your plumes; and then that little tube, the goose-quill, has sent its silent shots into your huge anatomy, and the corroding ink, even whilst you look at it, and think it shines so brightly, is eating into your sword with a tooth of rust.

LEIGH HUNT.—I firmly believe that war, or the sending thousands of our fellow creatures to cut one another to bits, often for what they have no concern in, nor understand, will one day be reckoned far more absurd than if people were to settle an argument over the dinner-table with their knives!—a logic, indeed, which was once fashionable in some places during the “good old times.” The world has seen the absurdity of that practice; why should it not come to years of discretion, with respect to violence on a larger scale? Why should not every national dispute be referred to a third party? There is reason to suppose, that the judgment would stand a good chance of being impartial; and it would benefit the character of the judge, and dispose him to receive judgments of the same kind; till at length the custom would prevail, like any other custom; and men be astonished at the customs that

preceded it. In private life, none but school-boys and the vulgar settle disputes by blows; even duelling is losing its dignity.

Two nations, or, most likely, two governments, have a dispute; they reason the point backwards and forwards; they cannot determine it, perhaps do not wish to determine it; so, like two carmen in the street, they fight it out; first, however, dressing themselves up to look fine, and pluming themselves on their absurdity, just as if the two carmen were to go and put on their Sunday clothes, and stick a feather in their hat besides, in order to be as dignified and fantastic as possible. They then go at it, and cover themselves with mud, blood and glory! Can any thing be more ridiculous? Yet the similitude is not one atom too ludicrous; no, nor a thousandth part enough so.

THOMAS CARLYLE.—What is the net purport and upshot of war? To my own knowledge, for example, there dwell and toil, in the British village of Dumdrudge, usually some five hundred souls. From these, by certain 'natural enemies' of the French, there are successively selected, during the French war, say thirty able-bodied men. Dumdrudge, at her own expense, has suckled and nursed them; she has, not without difficulty and sorrow, fed them up to manhood, and even trained them to crafts, so that one can weave, another build, another hammer, and the weakest can stand under thirty stone avoirdupois. Nevertheless, amid much weeping and swearing, they are selected; all dressed in red, and shipped away, at the public charges, some two thousand miles, or say only to the south of Spain, and fed there till wanted. And now, to that same spot in the south of Spain, are thirty similar French artisans, from a French Dumdrudge, in like manner wending; till at length, after infinite effort, the two parties come into actual juxta-position; and thirty stand fronting thirty, each with a gun in his hand. Straightway the word 'fire!' is given; and they blow the souls out of one another; and in place of sixty brisk, useful craftsmen, the world has sixty dead carcasses, which it must bury, and anew shed tears for.

Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart; were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a universe, there was even, unconsciously, by commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! their governors had fallen out; and, instead of shooting one another, had the cunning to make these poor block-heads shoot.—Alas, so is it in Deutschland, and hitherto in all other lands; still, as of old, 'what devilry soever kings do, the Greeks must pay the piper!'

INDEX.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>Abolition of war, 37-48, 234</p> <p>Achæan league, - 242, 248</p> <p>Achilles melted by Priam's
appeal, 570; allusion to, 580</p> <p>Acre, siege of, - - 170</p> <p>Adams, John Quincy, 108, 126</p> <p>Æsop's fable of the sun and
the wind, - - - 340</p> <p>Affghans butchered, - 497</p> <p>Africa, wars in, - - 170</p> <p>Agincourt, battle of, - 170</p> <p>Alaric, - - - - 580</p> <p>Alexander's wars, 172; those
of his successors, - 172</p> <p>Alonzo killed in a duel, - 559</p> <p>Amiens, peace of, - 402</p> <p>Amoy, butchering at, - 497</p> <p>Amphictyonic council, 242, 248</p> <p>Antiquity, the real childhood
of the world, - - 555</p> <p>Antwerp, siege of, and case
of a young man, - 464</p> <p>Appeal to cities, 125; solemn,
to all Christians, (No. xliii.) 373</p> <p>Appleton on war, - - 175</p> <p>Arbela, battle of, (No. iv.) 35</p> <p>Arbitration as a substitute for
war, - - 213-4, 217-28</p> <p>Archelaus' testimony on war, 183</p> <p>Aristotle, - - - 582</p> <p>Armies, standing, of Chris-
tendom, - - - 117</p> <p>Arms, wearing of them, 569</p> <p>Army, our standing; what
use? 566; of England,
Napoleon's, 403; preju-
dices by in favor of war, 557</p> <p>Arsenal at Springfield, cost, 565</p> <p>Arsenals of Europe, - 563</p> <p>Asgill, Capt., selected for re-
taliation, - - - 467</p> <p>Assassin like the soldier, 50-2</p> <p>Attila, - - - - 580</p> | <p>Austerlitz, battle of, - 170</p> <p>Austria, her army and
navy, - - 118, 562-3</p> <p>Athenagoras on war, 185-6, 192</p> <p>Augsburg, loss by war, - 199</p> <p>Bacon's view of war, 253
definition of war, 549, 582</p> <p>Baptists on war, - - 174</p> <p>Bastile, case in, - - 346</p> <p>Battle, war a trial by, 549-52</p> <p>Battles, 133-4, 151-3, 170, 393-6
on sea, 419-20, 438, 471</p> <p>Battle-field, 82-91, 255-6, 314,
393-6; boy on, saved, 340</p> <p>Bautzen, battle of, - - 170</p> <p>Bayard, Chevalier, his duel, 558</p> <p>Belgrade, storming of, - 169</p> <p>Bell, Sir Charles, his account
of wounded at Waterloo, 330</p> <p>Beman, Dr., on war, - 174</p> <p>Bentham, Jeremy, on war, No. iii.</p> <p>Berezina, passage of, - 88</p> <p>Berlin decrees, - - 404</p> <p>Bicetre or madhouse of Paris;
scenes at, - - - 342-5</p> <p>Blockade in war, - - 232</p> <p>Bogue's tract, - - 53-64</p> <p>Bohemia; loss of population
by war, - - - 198</p> <p>Bombshell, explosion in N. Y., 462</p> <p>Bonaparte, Louis, on war, No. iii.</p> <p>Borodino, battle of, No. ii.,
iv., - - - - 82</p> <p>Boy on the battle-field saved, 340</p> <p>Boys punished in the navy, 70</p> <p>Brougham on war, No. iii., 227</p> <p>Brown, Sir Thomas, remark
of, - - - - 553</p> <p>Brunswick, loss of population
by war, - - - 198</p> <p>Bucket, stolen, cause of war, 508</p> <p>Buffon, - - - - 581</p> |
|---|---|

- Buildings, how constructed formerly to guard against attacks, - - - 574
- Bundy's experience with Haynes, - - - 345-6
- Burke's estimate of life lost by war, - - - 172
- Burton on war, No. iii.
- Cabrera, sufferings there, No. ii.
- Cadiz, sufferings at, - - 329
- Campbell's account of a military execution, - - 75-6
- Carlyle, Thomas, view of war, - - - 588
- Cannæ, battle of, - - 170
- Carthagenians, lost in the battle of Hymera, - - 170
- Carthage, siege of, - 311
- Cassian, a martyr to peace, 188
- Cave on the early Christians respecting war, - - 192
- Cecil on war, No. iii.
- Celsus, reply to by Origen, 183
- Cæsar, Julius, men slain by in one battle, No. iii.; his battles, - - - 170, 580
- Cæsars, twelve, their wars, 172
- Chalmers on war, No. iii., 149-56
- Chalons, battle of, No. ii., 170
- Channing, his tracts, No. xix., 157
No. xxxiii., 269; xxxv., 289
No. xxxviii., - - 313
- Charlestown navy yard, amount invested in, - 494
- Chevinge, the maniac, - 344
- Children trained to war, 365-6
how to be educated for peace, - - - 367
- Childs, Mrs. L. M., anecdote by, - - - 352
- China, the fruits of peace there in the growth of its population, 162; an illustration of the safety of peace, 334; wars of the English in, 466; butchering in, - - - 497-8
- Christendom, her army and navy, - - 117-9, 561-5
- Christians, their duty on peace, 62, 277-88, 373-92; early, on war, 181-92, 531-4; their gradual degeneracy, 188-91; summary of their views, 191; in Sweden protesting against war-prayers, - 357
- Christ's sepulchre respected by soldiers, - - - 576
- Church, a support of war, 60-1, 281-2, 555-7
- Cicero's views of war, No. iii, - - - 397, 581-2
- Cimbri, number lost in battle, - - - 170
- Cities, influence of war on, 126-8; their ability, and their obligations to the cause of peace, - - 128
- Citizens not bound to obey government when requiring what is wrong, - 272-5
- Ciudad Rodrigo, case of brutality there, - - 460-1
- Clarkson, 573; account of early Christians on war, 181-92
- Clarendon on war, No. iii.
- Classics, ancient and modern, full of the war-spirit, 585
- Claude's trial of kindness on a hardened criminal, 346-7
- Clemens Alex. on war, 181-3, 190
- Coleridge, quotation from, 574
- Colt, a military punishment, 68
- Combat, judicial, - - 549-52
- Conflict of laws, - - 233
- Congress of nations, 214-5, 225-48, 447
- Congregationalists on war, 175
- Constantine, story of his seeing the cross, 555; introducing pagan usages into the church, - 191
- Conscription in U. S., - 583
- Contraband of war, - 233
- Convicts, effect of kind treatment on, - - - 571-2
- Copenhagen, a child at its bombardment blown to

- pieces, 462; Quaker's house saved, - 338-9
- Cordova, scenes near, - 328
- Cost of war, No. ii., 116-23, 193-6, 285, 441, 469, 493-4, 561-5; of single wars, 121-2; comparative cost to different countries, 563; compared with objects of utility, - 564-6
- Country, our, right or wrong, 560
- Criminals subdued by kindness, - - - 345-7
- Crowninshield, - - - 51-2
- Crusades, - - - 172
- Cyprian on war, - - - 182
- Cyrus' war, - - - 172
- Dalecarlin, Christians in, 357
- David forbidden to build the temple, because he was a warrior, - - - 535
- Davy, Sir H., - - - 582
- Death in war, peculiarly dreadful, 151-2, 157-9, 177
- Debts of war, - 122, 193-6
- Defensive war a misnomer, 549
- Delos, legend of, - 576
- Delusions of war, 473; how kept alive, - 554-76
- Demosthenes, - - - 582
- Denmark, her war-debts, 195; her navy, 563; her demands for spoiliations, No. ii.
- Dick's estimate of life lost by war, 172; his statement concerning Xerxes' army, - - - 171
- Discipline, military, - 65-76
- Dresden, in 1813, - - - 463
- Drills, militia, their cost, 409-11; unnecessary, 411-2
- Duel, refused by a French marshall, - - - 558
- Duelling, how illustrates war, 45; supported by war, 384
- Dumdrudge, Carlyle's fable of, 586
- Durham, battle of, - - - 170
- Dwight on war, - - - 175
- Dymond on war, - - 501-48
- Education of men to war, 60, 365
- Eichsted, loss by war, - 199
- Ellis, Rev., account of Rutu, - - - 387
- Elvira, council of, on heathenish practices in the church, - - - 190
- England, her expenses at different eras, 122; navy, 562; debts, 193; army, 562, 118; expended in French revolution, No. ii.
- Episcopalians on war, - 173
- Erasmus on war, No. iii; labors for peace, No. i.; Tract No. ix., - 77-80
- Eugene, Prince, on war, - 227
- Europe, paupers in, 561, population, 196; debts, 193-6; war-debts, 195-6; growth of its population in war and in peace, - 162
- Eusebius on war, - 184
- Expenses of war, comparative proportion in different countries, 118, 567-8
- Exports, &c., amount of, No. ii.
- Eylau, battle of, No. iv.
- Fairfield war-ship, punishments on board of, - 68
- Famine, its fatal effects in war, - - - 168
- Fanny, the courtesan, in retreat from Russia, - 370
- Fathers, we wiser than, - 555
- Flogging in the navy, 65-72 through the fleet, - - 69
- Fontenoy, battle of, - 170
- Fortifications of Europe, cost, 563; of U. States, 568
- France, her army and navy, 562, 118; her war-debts, 194
- Franklin on war, No. iii., 222, 228, 397; on the slavery of war, - - - 579
- Freedom, war adverse to, 406-8, 579-80
- Fry, Elizabeth, her treatment of prisoners, - 345-6

- Francis I. at Pavia, - 558
 Fulton, how treated as vi-
 sionary, - - - 37
 Galileo, - - - - 573
 Gardiner, Col., influence of
 war on, - - - 377
 Gauls, awed by the Roman
 Senators, - - - 571
 Gauntlet, mode of military
 punishment, - - - 71
 Germans massacred, - 170
 Germany, her war-debts, 195
 her loss in the thirty
 years' war, - - - 198
 Ghuznee, butchery at, - 497
 Gibbon on the early Chris-
 tians respecting war, 184 ;
 view of what continues
 war, - - - - 507
 Glimpse of war, - - - 313
 Gospel, power of, to abolish
 war, 44 ; the only remedy
 for war, 289-92 ; how it
 can abolish war, 54-63 ;
 contrary to war, iv. 49-50,
 140-42, 78-80, 257-68,
 470-2, 517-40 ; how mis-
 conceived at first and still, 55
 Government, its alleged right
 of war, 270-2 ; consistent
 with peace, - - - 425-32
 Grandeur, true, of nations, 553-76
 Grecian wars, - - - 172
 Greece, her navy, 563 ; cul-
 tivated a false patriotism, 559
 Greenbush, N. Y., execu-
 tion there, No. ii., - 73-4
 Grimké, Th's S., his tract, 473-84
 Grotius, - - - - 578
 Gubriant's army, - - - 198
 Gurney, Joseph John, his
 tract, No. xvii., - - 137
 Halidon Hill, battle of, - 170
 Hall, Capt., his testimony to
 the power of peace prin-
 ciples, - - - - 353
 Hall, Robert, on war, No.
 iii., - - - - 52, 177-82
 Hamburg, how treated in
 war, No. iv. ; siege of,
 170 ; capture of, - - 461
 Harrison, Gen. Wm. H., - 580
 Harvard University, its cost
 and expense compared
 with a war-ship, - - 564-5
 Harvey, - - - - 573
 Hayne, Col., case of, and his
 son, - - - - 467-8
 Haynes, the criminal, sub-
 dued by kindness, - 345-6
 Heathen, influence of the
 gospel in disposing to
 peaceful views, 387 ; pre-
 judiced by Christian wars,
 281-3, 495-8
 Heilsberg, battle of, - 395
 Helvetians, their losses, 170
 Helvetic union, - - - 248
 Henry IV., his grand scheme, 249
 Herat, number slain in, No. iv.
 Hesse, loss of population by
 war, - - - - 198
 Holland, her war-debts, 195 ;
 her navy, 563 ; capital
 sent abroad for invest-
 ment in a time of war, - 114
 Holy alliance, view of, - 250
 Homer's description of war, 549
 Honor, point of, - - - 557-9
 Horace, quotation from, - 570
 Hospitals, sufferings of, No.
 ii., - - - - 169, 325-32
 Huddy, Capt., hung, - 467
 Hume, Rev., testimony re-
 specting India, - - - 495
 Hunt, Leigh, view of war, 587
 Hymera, battle of, - - 170
 Idols, their worship by some
 early Christians, - - 189
 Imports, amount of, No. ii.
 Imports and exports, U. S., 116
 Impressment, 234, 457 ; of our
 seamen by England, 400 ;
 in United States, - - 582
 Indians influenced by peace
 principles, - - - 349-51
 Inhabitants destroyed in war, 168

- Insane, treatment of, 342-5, 571
 Intemperance promoted by
 war - - - 379
 Interference of one nation
 with another in a time of
 war, - - - 234
 Ireland, rebellion in, - 351
 Irenæus on war, - - 52
 Isidore on war, - - 185
 Ismail, siege of, - - 169, 311
 Istalif, sacking of, - - 497
 Israelites protected when
 defenceless, 337; wars
 of, - - - 259-60

 Jackson, Gen. Andrew, - 580
 James, John Angell, on war,
 No. iii.
 Jay, William, on substitutes
 for war, 225; on the inef-
 ficacy of war, - 397-408
 Jefferson, Thomas, on war,
 No. iii., 222; views of the
 slavery of war, - - 132
 Jeffries, Rev. Mr., respect-
 ing Peace Societies, - 173
 Jena, battle of, - - 170
 Jenghiz-khan, 580; his de-
 struction of life, No. iv., 171, 582
 Jerrold, Douglass, view of
 war, - - - 586
 Jerusalem, siege of, - 170, 311
 Jewish wars, considered, 137-9,
 142-3, 172, 259-60
 Jews reproaching Christianity
 on account of war, - 282-3
 John the Baptist, his instruc-
 tions to soldiers, - 138, 260
 Johnson, the remark of, - 574
 Jortin on war, - - - 173
 Judiciary, national; cost, 565-6
 Judson on war, - - 174
 Justinian's wars; their sac-
 rifice of life, - - 170
 Justin Martyr on war, 181, 183

 Knight-errantry, - - 40-1
 Knox on war, - - - 520

 Lactantius on war, 185, 190
 Labaume, his account of the
 Russian campaign, 81-92
 how written, - - 81
 Ladd, William; his peace
 story, 348-9; on a Con-
 gress of Nations, 251;
 his tract, - - 373-92
 La Vendee, how many lives
 lost, - - - 493
 Laws, conflict of, - - 233
 League, Achæan, - 242, 248
 Henseatic, - - 248
 Leech, Sam'l, his book on war, 65
 Leipsic; desolations around
 it in war No. iv.
 Lepanto, battle of, - - 170
 Letters, men of, on war, No. iii.
 Lexington war-ship, punish-
 ments on board of, - 68
 Liadoui, scene at, - - 87
 Licentiousness of war, No. iv.
 382-3, 368-72, 459, 465
 Lions touched by kindness, 341-2
 Lieber's definition of war, 549
 Life, its inviolability, alluded
 to, 146; its loss in war,
 161-72, No. ii.; contempt
 of by warriors, - - 132
 Linnæus, - - - 581
 Literary men; claims of peace
 upon, 577-88; what evil
 they have done, and how
 they may repair it, - 582-8
 Literature; its peaceful in-
 fluence, - - - 580
 Liturgy, Musarabic, - 41
 Locke, - - - 581
 Log-wood war, its origin, 508
 London, tower of; punish-
 ment there, - - - 74
 Londonderry, siege of, - 169
 Loo-Choo Islands; their ex-
 ample showing the effect
 of a peace policy, - 353-4
 Louis, St., abolishes judicial
 combats, - - - 551
 Love, law of, violated by
 war, - - - 49, 79
 Lutzen, battle of, - - 170
 Lyman's mother, story of, 454

- Mackintosh, Sir James ; his view of war as adverse to liberty, - - - 408
- Macleod on war, - - - 174
- McNally's book on the navy, and its punishments, - 67
- Madison's view of war as adverse to liberty, - 408
- Magdeburg, siege of, No. ii., 169, 310
- Maid of-Moscow, - - - 369
- Malcom, Rev. Howard, tracts by, xvi. & l., 129-36 ; 433-48
- Malplaquet, siege of, - 169
- Marcellus, a martyr to peace, 187
- Marches ; sufferings, &c., from, No. ii. ; their hardships and effects, 86-91 ; loss of life by, - - 167-8
- Marinus, a martyr to peace, 184-5
- Marlowe, killed, - - - 569
- Marius ; his victories, - 170
- Malo Jaroslavetz, battle of, 85
- Marshall of France, refusing a duel, - - - 558
- Mars, his character, - 556
- Martin's story of the lion, 341-2
- Martyrs to peace, 184, 186-8
- Massachusetts Legislature on a Congress of Nations, 251-2
- Maximilian, martyr to peace, 186
- Mediation as a substitute for war, - - - - 214
- Methodists on war, - - 173
- Mexico, siege of, 311 ; lives lost, No. ii.
- Middle ages, wars of, - 172
- Mifflin, Warner, interview with Washington, No. iii.
- Millennium, first, and peace afterwards, 390, 422 ; Dr. Bogue on, - - - 53-4
- Militia of Europe, 563 ; of U. States, 409-11, 563, 568 ; as a police, - - - 412, 568
- Ministers, Christian, their apologies for war, 60-3, 499, 556 ; deficient on peace, 61 ; their duty, 62-4
- Mirando Cerro, hospital at, 330-2
- Missionaries safe without means of violent defence, 337 ; cases, - - - 338
- Missions obstructed by war, 386-8, 489-500
- Mistakes about peace, - 421-4
- Modena and Bologna go to war about a bucket, - 508
- Montesquieu, his view of honor, - - - - 558
- Moors killed in Spain, - 170
- Morals, influence of war on, 375
- Moravians in the Irish rebellion, - - - - 352
- Mortality of warriors, 116-7, 161-8
- Moscow, its destruction, 83-5 ; retreat from, No. ii. and x., - - - 85-90
- Munson and Lyman, their death, 453 ; victims to war principle, - - - 355
- Musarabic liturgy, - - - 41
- Napoleon's views of war and warriors, 357 ; allowed no priests for his army, 385 ; army in 1812, 406 ; his Russian campaign, 81-92 ; number of his troops, 81 ; waste of life, - - - 92, 172, 582
- Navy of the United States, expensive and useless, 413-8, 567 ; of Christendom, 562-3 ; British, licentious usages, 451 ; punishments in, 65-72 ; navy yard at Charlestown, cost, - - - 565
- Neckar on war, No. iii., 201-8
- Negotiation as a substitute for war, - - - - 213
- Negro in the West Indies ; his kindness to his enemy that sold him into slavery, 341
- Newton, - - - - 581
- Ninus, number in his armies, 582
- Nordheim, loss by war, - 199
- Nuns violated by soldiers, No. iv.

- Numa, his example showing
 a pacific policy to be safe, 335
- Oath, the soldier's, - - 378
- O'Connell's view of war, 408
- Objections to peace, 80; to
 peace principles, - 56-60
- Officers, British, cashiered
 for conscience, - - 378
- Opinion, public, effect in
 abolishing war, 45; pub-
 lic, change of on war; 105-7
- Ordeals, - - - 41
- Origen's answer to Celsus
 on war, - - - 183
- Orpheus, his music, - - 570
- Ostend, siege of, - - 311
- Pagans on war, No. iii.;
 objecting to Christianity
 from Christian wars, 387, 495-6
- Panama, congress of, - 250
- Paris, fortifications, cost, 117, 563
 siege of, 169; archb'p of, 556
- Passage of the Vop, - 86
 of the Berezina, - - 88
- Paterines on war, - 520
- Patriotism, false, a nurse of
 war, - - - 559
- Paulowna, the maid of Mos-
 cow, - - - 369
- Paupers in Europe, - - 561
- Payson on war, - - 176
- Peace, cause of; its origin and
 progress; its sole object;
 its basis of union, mea-
 sures, &c., No. i.; testimo-
 nies to, ib.; distinguished
 from other things, ib.; as-
 sociated efforts needed for,
 63, 155-6; its beauties de-
 scribed by Erasmus, 78;
 some causes of, since Napo-
 leon's fall, 290-2; its claims
 on Christians, 277-88, 373-
 92; its claims on ministers
 of the gospel, 64, 388, 477-
 84; convention in London,
 (1843,) 95; an extensive
 theme, its comparative im-
 portance, 578; history of the
 cause, No. i.; and govern-
 ment, consistent, 425-32;
 measures for, 320-3; mis-
 takes about, 421-4; neces-
 sary to the coming of the
 millennium, 287, 390, 488-
 500; objections to cause of,
 287-8, 421-4; objections to
 its safety, 56-9; objections
 to from Jewish wars, 137-9,
 142-3, 259-60; from N. T.,
 138, 141, 143, 260-4; ob-
 stacles to, 153; practicable,
 209-12; principles, what
 has prevented their growth,
 59-60; their safety, 333-
 56; power over brutes, 341;
 maniacs, 342-5; criminals,
 345-7; principles, their rise
 in modern times, 61; what
 held in common by its
 friends, No. i.; power over
 the young, 348; over In-
 dians, 349-52, 354-5; pro-
 mises of, No. ii. 139, 149;
 how to be fulfilled, 149-50;
 its progress, 105-12, 573;
 how much already accom-
 plished for, 48; influences
 favorable to, 43-4; socie-
 ties, their origin, &c. No.
 i.; success in preventing
 war, 107-8; improperly as-
 cribed to other influences,
 108-12; union in, basis of,
 93-100; men, four differ-
 ent classes of, - - 93
- Penn, William, his exam-
 ple in Pa., 354-5, 575; on
 a congress of nations, 250
- Pennsylvania, example of
 in peace, - - - 56
- People more pacific than
 their rulers, 475; should
 have a pacific education, 477
- Phelan, the wounded tar, 464
- Philanthropist contrasted with
 warrior, by Rob't Hall, No. iii.
- Philosophers on war, No. iii.

- Philippe, Louis ; his views
of war, - - - 574
- Pierre, St. on Henry's grand
scheme, - - - 250
- Piety, influence of war on, 375
- Pillage of cities, - - - 84
- Pillsbury, his treatment of
criminals, - - - 345
- Pinel's treatment of maniacs,
342-5, 571
- Plato's view of honor, - 558
- Pliny, - - - 582
- Pompey, - - - 580
- Ponsonby, sufferings on the
field of battle, - - 394
- Population of Europe, 196 ;
its progress before and
since the wars of Napo-
leon, - - - 162
- Porteus' poetry on war, 52
- Portugal, her war-debts, 195 ;
French butcheries there, 459
- Prayers, war, - - - 357-60
- Prayer, Lord's, repeated by
soldiers, No. iv., - - 50
- Preparations for war, objec-
tions to, 101-4, 568-9 ;
serve to continue the cus-
tom, 561 ; their cost, 562-4
- Presbyterians on war, - 174
- Preuss-Eylau, battle of, - 395
- Priam's appeal to Achilles, 570
- Priests not allowed in Na-
poleon's armies, - - 385
- Prisoner, French, story of,
by the poet, - - - 458
- Prisoners, their treatment,
No. ii., - - - 86
- Privateers, the miseries they
occasion, - - - 465-6
- Procopius' statement of life
sacrificed in African wars, 170
- Profaneness from war, - 383
- Promises of peace, No. ii.
- Property, waste of, in war,
113-24 ; in the U. States,
115, 119 ; private, in war, 233-4
- Prophecies of peace, how to
be fulfilled, - - - 149-50
- Pulsifer, story of, - - - 348-9
- Protection promised by God
to the peaceful, - - - 336
- Prussia, her army and navy,
118, 562
- Punishment of soldiers, No.
ii., 65-76 ; in the navy,
No. ii., 65-72 ; in the ar-
my, 72-6 ; for slight of-
fences, 70-1 ; in London,
74 ; in Algiers, - - - 75
- Quakers in the Irish rebel-
lion and America, 350-1, 354
- Qualla Battoo taken, - 453
- Quatre Bras, battle of, - 170
- Quincy, Hon. Josiah, on
war, - - - 253-6
- Rafaelle, picture by, - 556
- Raleigh, Sir Walter, on
war, No. iii., - - - 505
- Randolph, John, on punish-
ments in the navy, - 68
- Raymond's testimony re-
specting peace principles, 340
- Redress, war as, a delu-
sion, - - - 485-8
- Reflections of a dying king
on war, 207 ; of a pacific
king, - - - 207-8
- Reformation, wars of, - 172
- Reformers, how treated, - 573
- Reforms, how regarded at
first, 37 ; several accom-
plished, - - - 40-3
- Results of one war, - 197
- Retaliation allowed under
the Old Testament, but
forbidden under the New, 481
- Peter, his dagger called his
prayer-book, - - - 556
- Revenge, spirit of, awak-
ened by military punish-
ments, - - - 69-70
- Revivals of religion pre-
vented by war, 385-6 ;
at West Point spurious, 386
- Revolution, our war of, not
originally designed to as-
sert independence, 398-9 ;

- its cost, 399 ; number of men in, 400 ; French, 573
- Rodrigo Ciudad, brutality there, - - - 460-1
- Rogers, Capt., the seducer at Albany, - - - 371
- Roman wars, - - - 172
- Rome cultivated false patriotism, - - - 559
- Rousseau on a congress of nations, - - - 250
- Rouza, scene there, No. ii., 83
- Royal George sunk in 1782, - - - 162, 383
- Russia, her army and navy, 118, 562-3 ; war-debts, 194
- Russian campaign, 81-92 ; loss of life, - - - 92
- Rush, Benj., on war, No. iii.; on reform as supposed to be visionary at first, 37
- Sabbath, influence of war upon, No. iv., 380, 452 ; inspections on, necessary, 381
- Safety of peace principles, 56-9, 148, 333-56, 541-4
- Salem tragedy, illustrating war, - - - 50-2
- San Marino, showing a pacific policy to be safe, 336
- St. Lucar, sufferings at, 329
- Saracens, their wars, 172 ; loss of life in, - - - 582
- Savage, tried for murder, 569-70
- Saxony, loss of population by war, - - - 198
- Scott, Thomas, on war, 173
- Sea fight, - 419-20, 438, 471
- Seamen impressed by G. Britain, - - - 400
- Search, right of, - - - 234
- Self-defence, rights of, 545-8 ; every thing allowable for, 258 ; the N. Testament directed to this, 537
- Seminaries of learning, the expense of, compared with war-ships, - - - 565
- Sesostris' wars, - - - 172
- Semiramis' wars, 172 ; number in her armies, - 582
- Senators of Rome ; the respect shown them by the Gauls after the capture of Rome, - - - 571
- Shaftesbury on war, - 507
- Shakspeare's description of war, 549 ; of honor, 557
- Sharpe, Archb'p, and the footpad, - - - 347
- Ships of war, their cost and current expenses, 414-5 ; in different countries, 562-3
- Sieges, 169, 305-12 ; Saragossa, 135 ; Ciudad Rodrigo, 305-7 ; St. Jean d' Acre, 308 ; Genoa, 308-10 ; Magdeburg, 310-11 ; others, *ib.*, also - - - 169
- Slavery of war, 408, 579-80
- Slaveholder subdued by the Christian spirit of his slave, - - - 453
- Slave-trade, how abolished, 41-2
- Smith, Adam, on the slow growth of population in Europe during war times, 162
- Smolensk, scene at, - - - 81
- Smollet's account of the origin of a war between England and Spain, - 504
- Socrates on honor, - - - 558
- Soldier and hired assassin alike, - - - 50-2
- Soldiers, cost of supporting, 118 ; of raising, - - - 117
- Soldin, battle of, - - - 396
- Souls destroyed by war, 449-56
- Spaniards, their destruction of Indians, - - - 172
- Spain, her war-debts, 195 ; war in, 166 ; Moors killed in, - - - 170
- Springfield, arsenal at, cost of, 494
- Statesmen on war, No. iii.
- Stebbins, Rev. R. P., his tract, - - - 469-72
- Student's danger from war-literature, - - - 583

- Substitutes for war, No. i., 213-6
 Suffering, its mission of mercy perverted in war, 158-60
 Sulpicius Severus, a martyr to peace, - - - 188
 Sumner, tracts, 549-76; extract from, - - - 587
 Suwarrow's catechism, No. iv.
 Sweden, her navy, - - - 563
 Swift, Dean, on the causes of war, - - - 508
 Switzerland, an example of the safety of a pacific policy, - - - 335
 Swords, the two mentioned by Christ, 143-4, 262, 524
 Tamerlane, - - - 580
 Tarachus, a martyr to peace, 183
 Tartars, their wars, 172; loss of life in, - - - 582
 Tatian on war, - 181, 183
 Taxes on account of war, 194
 Taylor, Jeremy, on war, No. iii., - - - 52
 Tertullian on war, No. iii., 52, 181-9
 Testament, Old, prophecies of, 139, 530-2; lives lost in battle, No. ii., iv., - 170
 Testimonies to the cause of peace, No. i.; against war, No. iii.
 Teutones slain, - - - 170
 Themistocles at Salamis, 558
 Theologians on war, No. iii.
 Thiebault, case of, - - - 464
 Thiers on the cost of supporting soldiers, - - - 118
 Thirty years' war, its effects, 197-200
 Tilly, on capturing Magdeburg, - - - 310
 Trafalgar, sufferings after the battle of, - - - 329-30
 Trial by battle like war, 549-52; when abolished in France, 551; when in England, - - - 551
 Tilsit, peace of, - - - 404
 Toulon, terrible case of, 459
 Troy, siege of, 170, 311; loss of life in, 582; origin of war, - - - 508
 Truce, royal, &c., - - - 43
 Turks, their wars, 172; loss of life in their wars, - 582
 Tyrol, story of a scene in, 352
 Union in peace, 93-100; objections to, - - - 98-100
 United States, expenses for war, No. ii., 119-20; an example of pacific policy as safe, - - - 334-5
 Usipetes, their loss, - 170
 Vatel, the cook, his honor lost, - - - 558
 Vattel on arbitration, 220, 225; definition of war, 549
 Vienna, siege of, - - - 170
 Voltaire on the origin of war, 507; reproaches of Christianity on account of war, - - - 282
 Vop, passage of, - - - 86
 Wales, South, convicts in, 575
 War, arguments for, 257-63, 294-6, 223-4, 526-30, 335-6; four aspects, 49; its abolition, 37-48, 209-12, 302-4, 320, 434; how to be abolished, No. ii., 46-8, 155-6; its former atrocities, 42; its causes, 56, 501-8, 129, 243, 318-20; slight, 507-8; duty of Christians respecting, No. iii.; its cost, No. ii., 117-24, 561-5, 415, 440-2, 469-70, 493; its cost to the U. S., No. ii., 119-20, 563-4; comparative in different countries, 563; debts, 122, 193-6; incidental waste of property, 113-7; what might be done with the money it wastes, 123-4, 470;

and the decalogue, No. iv.; and the gospel, *ib.*; declaration of, an awful act, 271; its delusions and suicidal results, 473; as defined by Lieber, Vattel, &c., 549; as described by Homer, 549; by Shakspeare, *ib.*; influence on domestic happiness, 457-68; its effect in driving Christianity out of the East, 491; the nurse of duelling, 384; adverse to freedom, 406-8; with England in 1812, a failure, 400; feudal, how abolished, 43; does not forgive, 49; glimpse of, by Dr. Channing, 313-24; its general evils and horrors, No. ii., iv., 65-76, 77-80, 81-92, 113-24, 151-4, 157-60, 161-72, 177-80, 197-200, 313-17, 325-32, 305-12, 393-6, 439-44, 449-68, 469-72, 473-5, 488-98, 509-16; and the hearth, 457-68; its moral chief evils, 157-60, 509-16; on whom its evils fall, No. ii.; insensibility to its evils explained, 269-76; inconsistent with nature, 77; with Christianity, No. iii., iv., 49, 77-80, 129-36, 137-48, 257-62, 278-80, 434-9, 470-72, 517-40; its inefficacy, 397-408, 550-2; the infidel's view of it as inconsistent with Christianity, 358; destructive to minds, 582; influences which still countenance it, 554-76; its influence on literature, science, education, 580-3; influence on morals, 375; on piety, 576; on the Sabbath, 380; its hardening influence, 86-90; its laws, what, 231, 485; loss of life in, No. iv., 161-72; total loss of life

by, according to Dick, 172, according to Burke, *ib.*; its licentiousness, No. iv., 161, 382-3, 369-72; case at Albany, 371; at N. Y., 372; in Eng., 451; its meliorations, 42; its effects on mind, 578; missions, obstructive to, 386-8, 489-500; its moral character, 173-6, 179-80; not necessary, 39; its supposed necessity, 554; neutralizes means of grace, 454; case, 455; occasions of, 243, 318-20, 501-8; offensive and defensive not distinguished in the N. Testament, 536-7; prayers, 357, 556; punishments in, 65-76, No. ii.; as a judicial redress, 485-8; only remedy for, 289-92; revivals, an obstacle to, 385; violates the Sabbath, No. iv., 380; a school of profaneness, 383; sketch of, No. ii.; slavery, 132, 378, 576; solemn review of, 293-304; sources or springs of, 318-20; substitutes for, No. i., 213-28; souls destroyed by, 449-56; spirit in contrast with the Christian spirit, 453; its spirit, 586; sufferings of soldiers in, No. ii., and temperance, 379; a trial by battle, 549-52; unchristian, 257-68; of the Jews, 172; of the reformation, *ib.*; of the Grecians, *ib.*; of the middle ages, *ib.*; of the twelve Cæsars, *ib.*; of the Romans, *ib.*; of the Sarcens, *ib.*; of the Turks, *ib.*; of the Tartars, *ib.*
 Warriors, their testimonies against war, No. iii.; how enlisted, 457; how treated, 65-76; engross political power, 580; wounded, their fate, - - 85, 394

- Warrior and the philanthropist in contrast, No. iii.
- Ward on war, - - - 174
- War-ships, their expenses, 414-5, 564; of different countries, 562-3; one described by Sumner, 556; brothels, No. iv., 162, 372, 383
- Washington on War, No. iii.; his administration, its war expenses, 573; his use of the peace principle with Payne, - - 348
- Waterloo, battle of, 170; wounded there, No. ii.
- Watson, bishop, on war, No. iii., - - - 173
- Wellington on war, No. iii., conduct after the battle of Waterloo, 568; views of war, 357, as unsuitable for a conscientious Christian, 579
- Webster, Rev. J. C., statements on flogging in navy, 66
- West Point academy, its moral influence, 381; cost, 494
- Wesley, John, on war, - 173
- White, murdered in Salem, 51
- Wilna, dead bodies there, No. ii.
- Witnesses for peace, No. xxi., - - - - 173
- Wirtemberg's loss of population, - - - 198-9
- Wolfe, account of objections to Christianity from wars of Christians, - 390, 496
- Women, claims of peace on, 361-72; influence of war-dresses on, 363; warriors in France, 364; encourage war, 364-6; degraded by war, 388; abused in sieges and assaults, 460-1; their duty to peace, - - - 63-4
- Woolwich arsenal, - - 563
- Wycliffe on war, - 173
- Xerxes' army, 171, 582; men lost by, No. iv., - - 171
- Yarmouth, battle of, - 170
- Ziska, John, allusion to, - 573