

THE
BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1838.

ART. I. — THE CHARACTER OF JESUS AND THE CHRISTIAN
MOVEMENT ORIGINAL AND PECULIAR.

FROM the fact, that in a previous Essay* I undertook to set forth that the Christ was in the world before Abraham, and had been the only savior of men from the beginning, I would by no means leave it to be inferred that I see nothing peculiar in the character of Jesus, or original in the movement he commenced, — in the moral, religious, and social order to which he has given his name. The character of Jesus was, in truth, strikingly original and peculiar; and the movement he commenced, and to which his death gave such a mighty impulse, — like his character, from which it proceeded, — was alone of its kind, original and peculiar, with no prototype in the previous history of the world.

But in what consisted the originality and peculiarity of his character? And wherein does the Christian movement differ from other important movements of Humanity? These are the questions which I propose to answer.

* See Boston Quarterly Review, No. I., Art. II.

I. In what consisted the originality and peculiarity of the character ascribed by the New Testament writers to Jesus? I answer,

1. Not in his nature. If we may regard at all the reasoning of my previous Essay, on this subject, or place any reliance on what seem to be the plain declarations of the writers of the New Testament, Jesus was in no respect distinguished, by his nature, from mankind in general. He did not belong to a separate order of being, but to common Humanity. The Christ was not manifested in a superior nature, in a super-angelic, nor in an angelic, nature, but in a human being, in a man, made like unto other men, subject to all the infirmities of other men, sin alone excepted. It behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, otherwise he could not have properly sympathized with them, and been an example unto them of what they might and should be, in order to be followers of God as dear children.

2. The originality and peculiarity of Jesus do not consist in the fact that he taught any new and peculiar truths, that he disclosed to the world any intellectual truth before unknown, nor in the fact that he pointed out any new method, or created any new means, by which men may be justified in the sight of God. This I have proved, by showing, as I think I have done, that the Christ, the only savior of men, the only redeemer of lost sinners, was before Abraham, was, in fact, the lamb slain from the foundation of the world, and that by virtue of which the wise and the good of all ages and nations had been justified. The way of salvation, the means of redemption and sanctification, were, after the coming of Jesus, precisely what they had been before his coming. Men were before Jesus just and holy in the sight of God only on the condition that they possessed the Christ, and they can be just and holy under the Christian dispensation only on the same condition. The conditions of salvation never change. Men must be holy, before they can be accounted holy, by Him

who is not deceived by appearances; and holiness is possessed only by dwelling in love, and by love dwelling in us,—dwelling in God, and God dwelling in us.

3. Nor was Jesus original and peculiar, because the Christ was in him and manifested through him. The Christ, I have proved, at least, think I have proved, is nothing but pure, disinterested Love. Now Jesus was not the first that loved, nor was he alone in the fact of manifesting pure, disinterested love. Thousands before him had loved, and with as much purity and intensity as he did. His love was strong, was intense, and able to endure neglect, ridicule, persecution, and death; but in this he was by no means singular. Others had been able to endure all he endured, and to submit to as great, if not even greater, sacrifices than he did. His personal sacrifices were great; but, according to the record, they were by no means remarkable, nor are they difficult to be matched in any age or nation of the world. His death on the cross strikes me in no wise as remarkable; and it loses much of its merit too, if we suppose that he foresaw that it was to be only a temporary suspension of existence, and that he should be alive again and well after the third day. Who of us would not joyfully consent to be crucified, if we could foresee that our crucifixion would result in the regeneration of the world, and that in three days we should be alive and well, walking about, meeting our friends, eating and drinking, and knowing that we were henceforth to die no more, but to rise at once into inconceivable glory and blessedness?

4. Nor was Jesus separated from all who went before him by the fact that he died a martyr to principle, or to convictions of Duty. Socrates long before him had set an illustrious example of a noble martyrdom to principle, and Abraham had been ready to offer up his son Isaac at the command, or supposed command, of Duty, which, I must believe, cost him altogether more than it would have cost him to lay

down his own life. And shall we suppose that truth, principle, duty, love, had no martyrs in the countless generations which had passed on and off the earth before the coming of Jesus? Shall we so wrong our common nature, do such injustice to the patriarchs, sages, and prophets, and saints, who the writer to the Hebrews says, "had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, of bonds and imprisonment, who wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, in deserts, in mountains, in dens and caves of the earth, destitute, afflicted, tormented, stoned, sawn asunder, or slain with the sword?" Never since the human race began its endless career of progress, has truth, science, love, faith, principle, duty, wanted martyrs, and martyrs too whose corporal and mental agonies suffer not in comparison with those of Jesus. It was noble in Jesus to die rather than be false to his mission; but this fact does not separate him from his race. Humanity is rich in martyrs, and the fact that Jesus was one, does but admit him into a numerous and a glorious company. Every page of human history is written in the precious and life-giving blood of martyrs; and the blood of martyrs is too honorable to Humanity to be called the distinguishing glory of one alone. A goodly company, an august assembly was that, composed of the martyrs of all ages, which the apocalyptic John saw in the visions of his spirit, almost in the very days of Jesus, gathering round the throne of the Ancient of Days, and striking their harps to the triumphal song of Moses and the Lamb. Let no man wish to snatch the crown from one of their heads, or the palm from one of their hands, for the sake of elevating any one of their number above his equals.

But if Jesus was distinguished neither by his nature, nor the truths he taught or revealed, nor the means of man's justification which he pointed out or created, nor the strength and intensity of his love, nor by his personal sacrifices and his martyr death on the cross, in what then did the originality, the

peculiarity of his character consist? It consisted in the fact that in him the Christ attained to Universality, and that his love was no longer the love of family, caste, tribe, clan, or country, but a love of Humanity; it was no longer mere piety, nor patriotism, nor friendship, but it was PHILANTHROPY.

I will try to explain and verify this statement. Love had existed, and been as pure, as intense, as all-unconquerable, in thousands who had preceded Jesus, as it was in him; but in none of them had it taken the form of philanthropy, or love of mankind. Take the case of Abraham, the father of the Jewish people. The Christ was in Abraham; the principle, or sentiment, which I have called love, was strong and abiding in him; but it was partial, it wanted freedom and universality; and it manifested itself in no remarkable degree, save in its religious aspect. The effort to give up his son Isaac, must, I have said, have cost him more than it would to have sacrificed himself, and could have been made only through the force of the strongest religious principle. But you see nothing of the human side of Abraham's love. The Christ in him was not the God-Man, the union of the love of God and the love of Man. Faithful to God, he was often wanting in his duty to Man. In his human relations, he was false, tyrannical, and in no way distinguished from ordinary chieftains of a nomade tribe. He lived by pasturage, and perhaps by carrying on a predatory warfare, as do the Bedouin Arabs to-day. So far as history gives us any account of him, it does not appear that he ever dreamed of loving or serving mankind. He was, so far as he is known to us, the true type of the Jewish people. That people was of an earnest race, full of noble qualities, capable of the firmest principles, the most exalted sentiments, and the loftiest deeds; but it was an Oriental race. Its brow was expanded but not elevated. It equals, if it do not surpass, all others on the religious side of our nature; but it comprehends nothing, feels nothing of the sentiment

of Humanity. The fulness of its heart overflows towards God, but never towards man. From the depths of its being, rise perennial springs of piety, but not of philanthropy. In the same breath it pours forth the most kindling strains of devotion, and utters the most horrid imprecations upon its enemies.

Moses and David, the two most eminent names, after Abraham, of the race, partake of the same noble qualities, and are marked by the same defects. Moses was a great man. Antiquity boasts few greater names than his. The Christ was in him; but unable to attain to a symmetrical development. His love was strong, intense, all-enduring, but it was love only in its religious and patriotic, or more properly, clannish phases. Piety was his breath. He saw God at all times, and in all things; and he bowed down with profound awe before the Divine Presence. He recognised God as the only rightful sovereign of the universe, and he would have no king in Israel, but Jehovah. His love for his tribe, or, if you please, for his people, was strong, generous, and strikingly verified. Though brought up as the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter, and by his education, talents, genius, and position, capable of becoming virtually the first man in the kingdom, he chose to adhere to his people, a proscribed race in Egypt, to suffer reproach and affliction with them, and, if need were, to die for them. This was to him far more desirable than all the wealth, honors, pleasures, and power that Egypt had to give. But his love did not extend beyond his people. They were the whole earth to him. They were the only mankind he knew. He was willing to rob the Egyptians to enrich them, and he could command them to extirpate with fire and sword the Canaanites, even to helpless women and innocent babes. So strong is his hatred even of other nations, that he surrounds his people with laws and institutions designed to keep them forever a separate, distinct, and peculiar people. I will not say that all this, considering the age in which Moses lived, and

the designs of Providence, was wrong. Nothing can come but in its time; and the time for the universal brotherhood of Humanity was not yet. Moses doubtless was as perfect as his age and people admitted or demanded. All I would say is, that he was not a *whole* man, that he manifested the Christ only in its religious and patriot phases. This was much, but was not all. It was enough for his time, but not for all time.

The same, in some respects at least, may be said of David. David was a second Moses, really inferior by many degrees to the first, in himself, but in some measure compensating that disadvantage by living some centuries later. He was a poet and a warrior, a prophet and a man of blood. He was remarkable for his piety, and the strength and freshness of his devotional feelings. Even to this day, religious people can find no better medium for expressing their devotional sentiments, than his really inspired Psalms. I can conceive no language so adequate to the utterance of our religious feelings, as those astonishing Hebrew Odes of his. I read them always with fresh wonder and awe. But no sooner does David sink, as it were, the priest and the prophet in himself, and withdraw his eyes from the dazzling glories of Jehovah's chariot, than he breaks forth in the most intolerant rage against all who are not of his Israel. Some of his Psalms are nothing but imprecations upon his enemies. Spite, contempt, disdain, wrath, hatred, revenge, ring forth in a sort of hellish harmony, and would seem to partake enough of the infernal to make hell's monarch himself applaud. He loved his tribe, and through the aid or intrigues of the priesthood he made it the ruling tribe. He loved his family and left it the throne, of which it retained possession for many generations. But no recognition of human brotherhood ever escaped him; no gleam of philanthropy ever broke in upon the obscure night, as to the relations of man to man as man, in which he lived, and in which he died. All the nations of the earth,

save the Jews, were his and Jehovah's enemies, and could be favored only by bowing their necks to his yoke. So was it with all his successors, whether among the bards and minstrels, or prophets and kings, unless an exception be made in favor of Solomon, who seems, in the latter part of his life, to have relaxed somewhat from the rigid national bigotry of his countrymen, and to have felt that other nations besides his own were worthy of regard and even of imitation. Perhaps a slight exception ought also to be made in the case of Isaiah, for though he was a Jew, a stern, unrelenting Jew, and doubtless held all other nations in suitable abhorrence, he does seem to have had some dream or dim presentiment, that the time would come at least, when the Gentiles would enjoy a share of Jehovah's regard, though probably, in his mind, only by being converted to Judaism.

If from the Jews, we pass to the Greeks and Romans, albeit we find a difference, we shall still find the Christ only partially formed. The religious aspect of the Christ is less striking; the love of country suffers no diminution, and that of Science, and in the case of the Greeks, that of the Beautiful, are superadded. But we do not find the sentiment of Humanity. No precept betrays it, no life reveals it. There is certainly a greater approximation towards universal brotherhood, than with the Jews. You meet a more human and cosmopolitan spirit. Still the Greek looks with a sort of contempt upon all races but his own. The Roman deems liberty, freedom, the especial property, or deserving to be the especial property, of the Roman citizen alone. In either country, there is no want of men who can die for family and friends, and especially for country; but there are none to die for Humanity. Instances of the most striking devotion to one's country meet us at every step. Rome up to the epoch of the Empire was always full of men ready to immolate themselves for the safety or glory of the City; but I have found no instance, recorded in her history, of a man who immolated himself for mankind.

She furnished heroes and patriots, but not philanthropists.

Socrates, as Plato has given him to us, is in my judgment the greatest of the predecessors of Jesus, and the only one of them that may with any propriety be brought into comparison with him. History presents me in none of her favorites, before Jesus, a single individual who comes up so near to my conception of a complete man, as Socrates; and yet he has nothing of the completeness we perceive in Jesus. He has a strong devotional spirit. The religious phase of the Christ was, perhaps, as striking in him as in Jesus. He had equal sincerity, modesty, firmness, and moral courage, though less warmth and earnestness. But he was an Athenian; the greatest of the Athenians, the noblest race of antiquity, but he was not great enough for Humanity. Great as he was, it is questionable whether his love stretched beyond his native Athens, at most beyond the Hellenic race. His life and his death was a noble homage to virtue and truth and philosophy, but not a homage to philanthropy. He did not submit to death because he loved the human race, but because he loved wisdom; not because he was a philanthropist, but because he was a philosopher.

Now all these whom I have mentioned, and to whom my remarks naturally refer though I have not given their names, did much, and did nobly. They prepared the way for Jesus; but he is distinguished from them all by a broad line. His originality and his peculiarity consist in the fact that he was not the man of a clique or coterie, of a tribe, or a people, that he was not a patriot nor a philosopher; but a philanthropist. In him, if we may credit history, the Christ for the first time leaped the narrow enclosures of the Temple, the priesthood, the school, the sect, the family, the clan, the country, and bounded forth, with a free step and a joyous heart, over the immense plains of Humanity. Then, for the first time, there was a MAN on the earth; one who might, in the significant idiom of

the Hebrews, call himself the Son of Man; and who was a type of the universal man, the man of all ages, and countries, the man formed not by conventions, but by the free, full, and harmonious development of human nature itself.

I cannot say how much the prejudices of a theory, or of education, may have blinded my eyes and biased my judgment, but I think every intelligent reader of the Gospels, must admit that Jesus was singularly free from every thing merely local and temporary. He has no feature of the conventional or artificial man. Though born and brought up a Jew, there is nothing Jewish in the genius and complexion of his mind. There is nothing in his character by which you can determine the age, or people, to which he belonged, nor the circumstances amid which he had grown up. Indeed it is difficult for us to conceive of his character as ever having been formed. We are almost compelled to look upon it as a spontaneous production, as coming into the world all ready formed, perfected and finished by the Creator's hand at one stroke. It is this completeness, and this fidelity to universal human nature, that enable him to commend himself to all men of all times, nations, sects, and creeds. Eighteen hundred years have rolled away since he was on the earth. Mighty revolutions have changed more than once the face of the moral and intellectual world; his countrymen have been scattered to the four winds of heaven; the empires which in his day were in the pride of their strength and the zenith of their glory, have passed beneath the sway of the conqueror, fallen to pieces and mouldered to dust; new tribes and new peoples have issued forth from the depths of the forest, passed on and off the stage, and been succeeded by others still; new sciences, new arts, new laws, new thoughts, new feelings, new languages, new forms of government, new religions, and new modes of life, have sprung up; and yet his character is as young, as fresh, as modern, if I may so speak, as though he had been the playmate

of our childhood, and the companion of our youthful studies, — is as faithful a type of human nature as it is developed to-day in this Western world and in this free republic, as it was of human nature as it was developed in the multitudes that thronged to hear him, as he went preaching through the cities of Judea and Galilee. Through the lapse of ages, and all the changes that time works in the things of this world, it has not been outgrown, has acquired nothing of the antique, the superannuated, the obsolete. Here is a proof of the universality of his nature. He was no Sadducee, no Pharisee, no Jew, no Gentile; HE WAS A MAN, true to universal human nature. The elements of his mind and heart, were the elements of all minds and hearts. Herein was his peculiarity. He was peculiar in that he was not peculiar, in his entire freedom from all idiosyncrasy, in being marked by nothing which does not belong to the universal mind and heart of Humanity.

With this character we may readily predict that his love will not be confined to his family and friends, to the individuals of a particular caste, class, sect, party, or country; but that it will be free, impartial, and universal. His sympathy will be awakened by man and by man only. All the factitious distinctions of Society will disappear before him; kings, priests, nobles, patricians, plebeians, thrones, sceptres, diadems, and mitres, all will vanish away, and there will stand before him only men, human beings in their moral strength or moral weakness, in their beauty, or their deformity. Man and men, not tribes and nations, man and men, not classes, orders, or estates, he will see, love, and die to redeem. This is his glory. This gives him the title, more honorable than any nobility ever bore, of the SON OF MAN. This makes him the savior of mankind. This endears him to simple Humanity throughout all time and space, establishes his empire over the universal mind and heart, builds the temples which bear his name, and tunes the millions of voices which on each successive sabbath day, throughout all

the earth, shout forth his praise in glad and loud hosannas.

In this, I see the originality and the peculiarity of Jesus. He was the first of our race in whom the sentiment of the universal brotherhood of the human race was developed; the first who had died a martyr to his love of mankind. His life was the earliest revelation of philanthropy, and he was the first who, sinking all considerations of father, mother, sister, brother, friend, country, creed, school, sect, party, tribe, people, order, class, estate, could let the fountains of his love overflow for simple Humanity, who could die for man as man. He was the first whose love begat Humanity; and through him the human race is installed; and the good man directed henceforth to find his household and friends and countrymen in Humanity; and a neighbor in whomsoever needs his kind offices. With him philanthropy, love, to man as man, was born; and well did Heaven's hosts shout at his birth, "Peace on earth and good will to man," as well as "Glory to God in the highest."

II. Having ascertained wherein consisted the originality, the peculiarity of the character of Jesus, there can be no difficulty in seizing the peculiar traits of the Christian Movement. The Christian Movement sprung from the life of Jesus; and as that life was the life of philanthropy, the Christian Movement must needs be a movement in the direction of love to mankind. It was not a movement in behalf of piety, of patriotism, nor of art and science, but of Humanity. Its end was to reconcile men to one another and to God, to bring together in Christ, all the members of the human family, however widely estranged, and to integrate them all in the unity of the spirit of Love. In this consists what it may claim of the original and peculiar.

The Jewish Movement, commenced by Abraham, continued by Isaac and Jacob, of which Moses was the lawgiver, Joshua the hero, David the poet, and

Solomon the philosopher, was essentially a religious movement, using the word religion, as I now do, in its most restricted sense. Its main-spring was piety, the worship of God, not the weal of man; and its mission was to bring out the religious element of human nature, and to institute the worship of a spiritual Divinity. This was the end of that movement, and to this end was limited the mission of the Jewish people. To this mission, God, in his providence, had called the Jewish people; and this is wherefore they were denominated the chosen people of God. They were God's chosen people, in an especial sense, because it was their especial work to bring out the idea of God, of piety. This work, as far as, when taken exclusively, it can be accomplished, they did accomplish. When the time had come for religion to be transferred from the Jews to Humanity, to be brought out of the temple at Jerusalem and placed in the temple of the universal human heart, the Jewish nation died, as die all nations, and all individuals too, when their work is done, their mission fulfilled.

Had Jesus been sent merely to effect a religious movement, he would have been only the continuator of Abraham and Moses. In this case he would have had nothing original and peculiar in his character, nor in his mission. Christians would have been called merely to engage in the work which had been assigned to the Jews, which work was finished when the veil of the Temple was rent in twain, and the Holy of Holies laid open to the gaze of the profane. The Christian Movement would have had no aim peculiar to itself; it could only have tended to achieve a work already achieved.

So far as it concerns the religious element of human nature, taken as an exclusive element, I must needs believe the Jews had done all for its development that can be done. In respect to piety, Christians can make no advance on the Jews; nor do they essentially differ from the Jews. They and the Jews worship one and the same spiritual Divinity. The

most religious of to-day find the Hebrew Odes, as I have said, the best interpreters of their religious feelings. Whoever would sing the praises of God, extol his providences, or speak forth his glory and majesty, might and dominion, strikes the harp of David and pours out his soul in a Hebrew song. On the religious side of our nature, Jews and Christians are the same. In a strictly religious sense, then, Christianity adds nothing to Judaism. The Christian Movement is not original and peculiar, under its religious aspect.

But however perfect Judaism may have been, as a development of the religious element of our nature, as it concerns a sense of man's duty to God, it is extremely deficient in relation to other essential elements of Humanity, and especially in relation to a sense of man's duty to man. The Jew was defective on what may be called the human side of his character. He had no love for man, as man, for the simple fact of his being a man. He held all nations but his own in abhorrence, and if he loved a single human being, it was because that human being superadded to his claims as a man, those of countryman or kindred, of a benefactor, or a dependent, a friend, a companion, or an acquaintance. He never conceived of the love of simple, naked Humanity. This was his great defect. This defect Christianity supplies. To the Jew's piety it adds philanthropy, the love of man, as man, for his human nature, without reference to anything else. It does not take from the Jew, it simply adds to what he had. Jesus did not come to destroy Judaism, but to fulfil, perfect, complete it, to supply its deficiencies. The tendency of the movement he commenced was not to make us love God less, but man more. This was its grand characteristic. By its philanthropic tendency it was distinguished by a broad line from Judaism, and became and should be considered something more than a continuation of Judaism.

The Christian Movement may also be as clearly

distinguished from the Greek Movement. Greece was the land of art and science, the home of the beautiful and the true. The Jews had no art, no science, and, properly speaking, no philosophy. But Greece had them all, and in a high degree of perfection. God called the Greeks to the work of developing art, science, philosophy, in like manner as he had called the Jews to that of developing religion. If Christianity were a movement in the direction of the arts and sciences, if its object were to realize the true and the beautiful, it would be merely a continuation of the Greek Movement, it would be identified with that movement, and would therefore have nothing original and peculiar to itself.

In point of fact, that element of human nature which creates Art, whether under the form of literature, poetry, eloquence, or under the form of music, painting, sculpture, and architecture, has received no extraordinary developments from the Christian Movement. We study most of the fine arts at Athens to-day, as we did before the coming of Jesus. The Greek historians, poets, tragedians, orators, sculptors, architects, are still our masters in their respective spheres, as the Jewish prophets are in what relates to the worship of God. Christianity has done something. It has embodied in its painting and in its Gothic architecture, the beauty of Sentiment, a species of beauty unknown to the ancient world, and which could be developed only by a religion of Love. The Greeks embodied in their works of art only the beauty of form and of idea. In science we have advanced on Greece, but always in the direction of Greece. We have continued and improved Greece. In philosophy we have agitated no questions which were not agitated at Athens, and we probably must continue to agitate the same problems for ages to come, without obtaining solutions which may be regarded as definitive. However much we may have surpassed the Greeks, either in art or science, in the cultivation of the true and the beautiful, we can claim little originality. We cannot

say that the world is at all indebted to Christianity, or to the Christian Movement, for art, science, and philosophy, though it may be indebted to it in some degree for the progress they have made.

The Christian Movement is distinguished also from the Roman Movement. The Roman world is nothing but the complement of the Grecian world. It stands out for its contributions to patriotism and jurisprudence. Its mission was to found the State, and to teach the world to live under law. Law is truly a Roman element. Christianity has extended it, and contributed much to the improvement of legislation, both in its spirit and in its forms, but it is not the originator of law.

But there is one aspect under which the Christian world, by the side of Greece and Rome, must strike us as original and peculiar. Neither Greece nor Rome, in any of their movements, in any of their creations, ever realized the love of man, as man. They give us no example of philanthropy. The word is indeed Greek, but the thing is purely of Christian origin and growth. Penetrate the Grecian and Roman city, you shall find there no institution that recognises, no law that reveals, a love for man, as man. The duty of the citizen is in no case the duty of the philanthropist. You find men with philanthropic souls, with humane feelings, men who are chaste, continent, generous, brave, heroic, but the end prescribed them, by the order of civilization to which they belong, is never the welfare of Humanity, but always the glory of the City. To improve, enrich, and embellish the City, to extend its conquests and dominion, to preserve or confirm its empire, is the great end prescribed to the individual. For this he toils, studies, sings, creates, faces danger, meets the enemy and death in battle. He does not live for himself alone. Far from it. Selfishness is not the *primum mobile*. Sacrifice is enjoined. The individual must be ready to give up ease, wealth, reputation, life, and that too without a murmur — but for what? For the city, the state, not for Humanity.

Greek and Roman civilization advanced far beyond selfishness, and beyond the mere love of family and friends; but it attained only to love of country. It could obtain the sacrifice of all the tender affections of the heart, all the endearments of home, all the pleasures of life, and life itself, at the call of Duty, but merely at the call of duty to the city or state, not at the call of duty to man. The citizen rushed forth to battle, and left his bones at Thermopylæ, at Marathon, Platea, Sardis, Arbela, Memphis, Carthage, in Spain, Gallia, Germany, or the Isles of the Britons, but not at the voice of Humanity; it was always at the voice of Sparta, Athens, or Rome.

I say not that Humanity has gained nothing by Greek and Roman wars. The interests of the human race were in them all, and were debated at Thermopylæ, at Marathon, at Platea, at Salamis, on the Granicus and the Nile, at Arbela and Philippi, in Pontus, Parthia, Spain, Gallia, and the British Isles; but the motive which moved the Grecian phalanx, or the Roman legion, was not a sense of duty to man, as man, but to the Grecian or the Roman state. Man, as man, claimed as yet no regard, and never did in the Grecian and Roman civilization. To promote the interests and glory of the city, was the highest moral end ever imposed by that civilization. He who was conscious of fidelity to the state, was acquitted of all sin in the eyes of his conscience, and felt that he had done all that Gods or men could demand of him.

This civilization, therefore, did not repel slavery. It had no conception of human brotherhood, of man's equality to man. It recognised distinctions of class, and had its nobles, patricians, plebeians, its populace, its *prolétaires*, its helots and its slaves. Sparta kept a whole nation in servitude, and if they became too numerous, hunted them down as we do wild beasts. Athens had slaves in abundance, and Rome to several times the amount of her free population. This fact of itself proves that there was no recognition of the rights of man, no love of simple Humanity. For he

who sees in others the same Humanity he loves and reverences in himself, who loves his fellow men simply as men, because they are men, will not, cannot degrade them to a lower round of the social hierarchy than he is willing to occupy himself, will certainly never consent to reduce them to slavery.

Hence, again, this civilization did not repudiate war. In fact, it was almost purely a military civilization. Its main business and its chief glory, were war and conquest. But had it been penetrated with a love of Humanity, had it seen a brother in the foreigner, a fellow man to be loved, it could not but have condemned war in principle, even if it had tolerated it in practice. But no. The same word served it to designate an enemy and a foreigner. All out of the pale of the city, were out of the pale of its love.

You see, then, wherein consisted the defectiveness of the Greek and Roman civilization. It probably was far behind the Jewish in its religious phase, but it far surpassed it in art, literature, science, philosophy; yet like the Jewish, it was wanting in the love of man, as man. This love of man, as man, wanting in both the Jewish and the Greek and Roman civilizations, in the Oriental world and in the Occidental world, is precisely that which Jesus came to supply, and which constitutes the originality and peculiarity of the Christian Movement.

The Christian Movement does not tend to develop piety, as did the Jewish; it does not tend, so exclusively, to perfect the state, to bring out art, science, philosophy, jurisprudence, the sense of law and love of country, as did the Greek and Roman; but it tends to the development of genuine philanthropy. In this tendency it proves itself original and peculiar. It does not destroy piety, art, science, philosophy, nor even patriotism; but it aims to shed over them a purer light, to diffuse through them a freer and a richer sentiment, and to make them all harmonize with, and contribute to, the freest and fullest development of human nature, man's highest possible perfection.

The love of man, as man, is Christianity's point of departure, and its point of arrival too. From this it starts, and to this it comes round. By making this its starting-point, it teaches us that our duty to God, to our country, to relatives, family, and friends, is discharged in the true love of Humanity, that all our duties, of whatever nature, are integrated in the love of man, in the service of mankind.

Under Judaism every thing was subordinated to religion, or the worship of God. The city or the state existed only for the purpose of maintaining the priesthood and the temple-service. All human interests were sacrificed. Art could not flourish, literature could have no existence, science and philosophy no toleration. Religion must reign without a rival, and by so doing it became exclusive, despotic, tyrannical. It lost its primal character, lost sight of its legitimate end, and from a reverence for the true and spiritual, a love of the beautiful and good, it degenerated into a long, fatiguing ritual, a mass of unmeaning rites and ceremonies, as unacceptable to God as burdensome and debasing to man. Religion, when separated from our other duties, when erected into a separate, a distinct duty of itself, or even when regarded as capable of being so erected, becomes a deep and withering curse upon Humanity, and inevitably awakens abhorrence, and the most unrelenting hostility in the bosom of every genuine Son of Man. Religion should be to us as the light, a medium through which we see all that we do see, but which itself remains forever unseen.

Man ought to learn, and if he studies the Christian Movement he will learn, that it is folly to think of doing anything for God. God stands in no need of help from man. He dwelleth not in temples made with hands, nor is he served with men's hands as though he needed anything. He is the universal Being, self-subsisting, and self-sufficing. He is above and beyond, albeit near and within us. He asks no vain oblations, no offerings of sweet incense and

myrrh, gold and precious stones. His worship is no separate act, standing out by itself, distinct from all human interests and in opposition to them. This is the great lesson Christianity teaches the Jew.

The Greek and Roman citizen is taught, by this same Christian Movement, that the City is not ultimate, that instead of living and dying for his country, he should live and die for man. The city or state to which one belongs, can have no legitimate interest, not identical with the interests of universal Humanity. What is the true interest of one city, is the interest of all cities; of one nation, of all nations; and of one man, of all men. The true way then of doing what the Jew sought to do, that is, to serve God, and of doing what the Greek and Roman sought to do, that is, to serve the city or state, is to do that which best serves man, as man. He who loves man, as man, that is, as he loves himself, will always seek to do him all the good in his power, and by so doing will fulfil his whole duty both to God and the state. In love, then, all interests and duties unite; in love our duties to God and to man unite; in love, then, God and man meet, lose their antithesis, and become one.* Love is the Christ, as I have before proved, and of course then love is the mediator between God and man, the universal Atoner or Reconciler. Hence the idea of the God-Man, the union of the Divine and human natures in the same person, an idea held by the Church from its birth up to the present, though in all likelihood without being comprehended in its full significance. In the love of man, as man, all antitheses in matters of interest and duties will be found to meet and become identical.

The Christian Movement, from what I have said, it will be seen, is not a destructive movement. It destroys no element of human nature. It accepts the

* See *New Views of Christianity, Society, and the Church.* Boston : James Munroe & Company. 1936. This little book, which some call a dark book, is written expressly to unfold the idea touched upon in this sentence.

piety of the Jew and the patriotism of the Greek and Roman, and absorbs them in a higher and broader sentiment than either. It takes nothing from the world, which is enduring, but it adds that which gives life and energy, and a right direction to the whole.

Having ascertained the true character of the Christian Movement, and wherein it is original and peculiar, I proceed to remark on its progress, and to determine who are affected by it, and what we must be and do in order to be Christians.

The progress of the Christian Movement is the great matter of human history. The history of it has not yet been written; its grandeur and immense bearings on the destiny of man in this life, have as yet been hardly conceived. The histories of the Church, and especially of Christianity, at least those accessible to the English reader, are small things, and give one about as just a conception of Christianity, as a single brick would of the city of Babylon. We find in them little except a mass of miserable cant and nauseous details of controversies about words and unmeaning dogmas, ever renewed and never ending; contests between rival sects; contests between the civil society and the ecclesiastical society; persecutions, crusades, holy wars on a large or a small scale; facts at one time horrible, revolting to all human feelings, at other times trivial, foolish, disgusting. And this miserable detail is called the history of Christianity. The true history of Christianity is the history of the progress of philanthropy for the last two thousand years; its struggles with the old world, with old habits, old manners, old institutions, old doctrines; its struggles with the barbarian hordes issuing out of the bosom of the North, and overrunning the civilization of the South; its efforts to humanize religion, government, law, art, science, literature, the whole order of civilization, and its failures and successes. This history, so far as my knowledge extends, remains to be written, and till it is written, there will be no history of the Christian Movement.

I have neither the space nor the ability, to sketch even the faintest outline of the mighty progress of this Movement. I stand in awe before it, and bow down in gratitude to God for it. It has been sweeping on for two thousand years, and I can hardly credit the changes it has already wrought. It has swept away Judaism and Greek and Roman civilization, as exclusive states of society; it has tamed and humanized the ruthless Barbarian, softened national hostilities, subdued national prejudices, demolished the military nobility, put an end to the hereditary nobility in the spiritual society, and struck it with death in the temporal society. It is substituting the order of merit for the order of birth, and supplanting the artificial aristocracy by that of nature, by the aristocracy of talent and virtue. It has destroyed all distinctions of caste, and of master and slave, in principle at least, and will soon do it in practice. It proclaims the kindling doctrines of liberty and equality; it is preparing a system of universal education; it is carrying on an exterminating warfare against privilege, in whatever name or shape it may appear; it is raising up the poor and neglected, the low and oppressed; it is everywhere infusing into the human heart a deep reverence for human nature, a regard for everything human, and it issues its decree, Let not man, ever again, be counted vile or vulgar in the eyes of man.

They who manifest a true love for man, as man, who labor to meliorate the condition of man, who seek to obtain a greater amount of good for man, even for him who is at the foot of the social ladder, as well as for him who is at its summit, are affected by the Christian Movement. They who sympathize with man, and labor for his elevation, whether it be by reforming theology or philosophy, church or state, schools or jurisprudence, by improving art or science, by infusing morality into the transactions of the business world, unmasking the pretensions of a self-styled aristocracy, or imparting dignity to the me-

chanic arts, and to honest though ill requited labor, whether called heretics, perfectionists, loco focos, transcendentalists, colonizationists, abolitionists, temperance reformers, or moral reformers, are affected by the Christian Movement, and do show forth more or less of the Christ dwelling within them.

In order to be Christians, we must take a deep interest in whatever concerns man, as man, and each in his own sphere, according to his light and strength, must do his best to elevate the human soul and enlarge its sum of good. What can be done, and what ought to be done, each must determine for himself. It may be the mission of one, the mother, to attend solely to household affairs, to develop in the soul of her son the principles of the Gospel, to quicken his mind, and form his heart to virtue, to fit him for the love and achievement of grand and lofty deeds. It may be the duty of another, merely to prepare her own mind and heart for the duties which may await her as a wife and a mother. This one may be called merely to provide for the little ones committed to his care; that one will confine himself to the proper education of the young immortals confided to his wisdom and guardianship; this one may call out in a loud and thrilling voice to the masses, and seek to awaken the many to self-respect, to their rights, and to efforts for their melioration; that one may be commanded to thunder rebuke in the ears of a corrupt and indolent priesthood, to demand a reformed theology, a higher philosophy, a broader and more thorough education, a more equal, and therefore a more just, state of society; and another may have it in charge, to bring out the beautiful, to improve the fine arts, and adorn the world. There is a diversity of gifts, and of occupations, but the same spirit. Let each be true to the mission God has given; and dare neither live nor die without contributing something to make the world the wiser, the better, or the happier. We should all so live and so act that, when the moment comes in which we must leave these scenes which now know

us and which shall know us no more, we can say in truth, man is the better for our having lived. Then shall we follow or be carried along by the Christian Movement, and be able to die with the comfortable assurance that we are true Christians, and that we do but leave the society of our fellow men on earth to mingle with the spirits of the just made perfect in heaven.

ART. II. — *An Oration delivered before the Inhabitants of the Town of Newburyport, at their request, on the Sixty-first Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1837.* By JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

AN old statesman is likely to be a moral hack. There is something in the strifes of party, through which he has passed, so destructive to the moral sensibilities; something in the habits of office so uncongenial to the more generous developments of character; something in the exercise of power in government, so opposite to that quality of mind, which seeks for the justification of authority, in principle, and not in established law, that he is a moral wonder, who has come out of politics at the age of seventy, unchanged from the confiding spirit with which youth enters the arena of political life. He has been accustomed to use his fellow men for his purposes, and to direct them in masses. They have become to him instruments to work with, and to be worked upon. He has forgotten to reverence the image of God in every human being, and to comfort himself in the brotherhood of Humanity. He looks upon the past and the present, but rarely to the future. The *Now* is his all important period in the line of time, and the "*all hail hereafter*," little else than nothing. He regards man as a political animal. He defines him to

be "an animal created to be governed." To speculate upon his destiny as a moral, a religious, a progressive, an immortal being; to delight himself in the prospect of his ultimate attainment to a more perfect condition, does not belong to his matter-of-fact province. He is apt to scout all this as theoretical and utopian, to set his face, as flint, against it, and rejoice in calling himself a *practical* man. He is one who says, "all this may do well enough for the contemplations of the student, and the dreams of the philanthropist; but I must take men as they are. This world is not Paradise. Men are not angels." You would not look for reformers among statesmen.

But you find no such practical hack in the veteran statesman, whose name stands at the head of this article. A fresher enthusiasm, a more cordial trust in man, a more glowing and intense sympathy in his prospective attainments, are not to be found in the compositions of a young optimist, just bursting from the visions of the closet upon the theatre of active life, than you read in the last dozen pages of Mr. Adams's Oration at Newburyport. They are resplendent with hope and promise. They are full both of unction and eloquence, and burn with all the fiery inspiration of a prophet; and you drop the book, at its close, to sit for hours, rejoicing in the future, into which the venerable orator has borne you from the present, delighted away.

He anticipates the time, he believes in the time, as yet to come, when wars are to cease, and be known no longer throughout all the civilized world. He does not, with the poets, go back to the past for the golden age; but with the prophets and the wise men, he seeks it in the future. There religion places it. There philosophy teaches it must be, if anywhere. The race is progressive. There never was a time, since the creation, when the fabled poetical perfection of the human state could have existed upon the earth. It never has been. It is historically false to believe it has been. It is intrinsically impossible that

it ever could have been. History shows man ever advancing. Originally, he is a savage; and by arts and letters and the heaven-born influences of religion, from age to age, he rises from the savage, step by step, to the civilized state; and thence, onward through every stage of improvement, to the last attainable bourne of his nature, where he emerges from the Human, (as the past has defined that word,) and passes into the earthly resemblance of the Divine. The golden age is not past,—it is to come,—it is in the future. We run back to the origin of the race; we trace man's constant advancement, from the beginning, upwards; we deduce thence the *law of progress*, and wait patiently, undoubtingly, the result of that law upon every evil institution. Men are mortal, but this law is immortal. Generations may die in the midst of evil; but the law survives, for the redemption of the race. It shall never die. While the world stands, it shall govern the course of God's intelligent creatures; and when this earth shall be stricken from its sphere, and time shall be no longer, this law of progress shall still regulate our spiritual being. In the triumphal march of this law, wars shall end, and the world yet be blessed with universal peace.

A master trait in the philosophy of our age, is its thorough confidence in the advancement of our race. There is nothing in its view of human nature, low, or narrow, or grovelling; but everything in it is expansive and soaring. In the true Christian spirit, it hopes too much to doubt; it loves too much to fear. It does not, by a false standard of admeasurement, limit the capacity of mankind for progression to what they have already done, but wisely refrains from computing the infinite, by the rules of a narrow experience. It sits at the feet of the Past, to gather lessons of wisdom, and then turns its back upon its instructor, to apply his lessons to the direction of the present, in full view of the future. It does not blindly worship antiquity, but reverences its own destiny.

In the records of that destiny the total extinction of war in Christendom is written, not more legibly to the eye of faith than to that of reason. Who is there, understanding the spirit of the Christian system, who does not believe that it shall fulfil the proclamation of its advent,—"peace on earth, and good will to men"? And who is there, versed in the history of the world, who can stand on the vantage ground of the nineteenth century, and looking back over the line of two thousand years, and say that the prevalence of universal peace within the next five centuries, is not more probable to the judgment, than the advancement of the nations, which has actually taken place since the commencement of our era?

It has always given us the deepest regret to find that the great name of Professor Cousin could be quoted as authority against the possibility of so glorious a prospect. In his "Introduction to the History of Philosophy," he contends for the necessity of war. This doctrine is there stated and illustrated by him with his usual eloquent expansion. The point of the argument, by which he sustains his views, is as follows: "The root of war is inherent in the very nature of the ideas on which the existence of different nations is founded,—for these ideas, being necessarily partial, bounded, and exclusive, are necessarily hostile, aggressive, and tyrannical." Hence war is necessary; that is, it must always exist. This argument we propose to examine, to see if there be in it a strength proportioned to the boldness of its statement.

War is not necessary for the reason assigned. The argument proves too much. If it be necessary among nations, then it is so among communities, towns, villages, individuals; for the ideas on which the existence of *these* is founded, are necessarily partial, bounded, and exclusive, and there is an end of all civil government, and social order. Every nation must be made up by the harmonious union of these

separate parts, which are all in their nature, tyrannical and discordant. Supposing the argument to be a good one, we have not at this moment, and never have had, and to the end of time, never can have, a single organized state in the world. The kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is no longer one kingdom, but is England, and Scotland, and Ireland, — nay, it is the different local divisions of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and we are carried back beyond the days of the Saxon Heptarchy. And so of every other country made up of what were once separate sovereignties, as is the case with all Europe and America, — and the people, though existing united in nations, *in fact*, have no national existence in *Professor Cousin's philosophy*. But happily,

“There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamed of in your philosophy.”

The kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland *is* the kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, — and France *is* France, and not Burgundy, and Normandy, and Brittany, and the other provinces, — and the United States *are* the United States, in spite of logic and philosophy. If the argument were good, the whole world would now be in a condition of original barbarism, in which each family of savages (no, not each family of savages, but each savage, there could be no such thing as a family) lived, and hunted, and fought by itself. The idea of every individual man is quite as selfish, aggressive, hostile, and tyrannical, as that of every nation, — the root of selfishness is inherent in individuality, and grows and flourishes in it as in its natural soil. But in the advance of human nature, the social state springs out of the savage; society breaks down and subdues the selfishness, the hostility, the tyranny of the single barbarian, and submits them to the authority of law. And out of this system, in process of time, springs up a nation. Who shall prescribe limits to the process of association? Who shall say that nations shall not come to

obey the same laws of justice among themselves, which the individuals composing them acknowledge ?

Cousin not only argues that war is necessary, but following out his principle that every nation is the representative of certain opinions and institutions, which he calls "the idea of a nation," he undertakes a justification of war, and an exhibition of its benefits, on the ground that the victory brings about "the predominance of the idea of the conquering nation." But war in general has no such object. Take all the wars, as many as you can recount, from the time when man first raised his hand against his brother, and they had no other object but ambition, revenge, or the gratification of some selfish passion, (with a very few exceptions,) and had nothing to do with the predominance of an idea. They had to do with the predominance of *men, not ideas*. And what palliation shall we undertake to invent for an institution, which has commonly had its origin in the worst motives in princes, and leaders, and which fosters the worst passions in the people ; which works by murder and every mortal suffering ; which does not contemplate good as an object ; which, in the main, does not produce good, but terrible evil ; and which, where good is its aim, might, and ought to be superseded by better means ?

And supposing the purpose of war to be what Cousin represents it, namely, "the predominance of the idea of a nation ;" (which it certainly is not in most cases ;) and supposing it to be beneficial, and worthy the countenance of a good man ; (which it is not ;) still war is not the best means of answering this purpose. There are now other and far better means. Whatever it might once have been, it is not now necessary to answer this object. Commerce, mutual, familiar intercourse, such as exists at this day among the civilized nations, the interchange of literature, and public opinion, and the thousand reciprocal national relations of this most favored era, can accomplish this end much more safely and surely, much

more for "the glory of God, and the relief of man's estate." Did Great Britain, after she had abolished the slave trade for herself, go to war with France and Spain and Portugal to compel them to abolish it? And yet that blessed cause is carried, — the predominance of this *idea of the British nation* over its neighbors is accomplished without a battle, by the peaceful process of negotiation, now most triumphantly successful in similar cases. Apply this fanciful theory of war to the relations which existed two years ago between this country and the French people. Suppose France and the United States had then gone to war upon the causes of quarrel which then existed between them, and France had been victorious, would she have made faithlessness to treaties predominant? or had the United States prevailed in the contest, would they have made forbearance under injuries and insults predominant? No. War is now recognised among the civilized nations as an institution to be justified and called into use, only as an arbiter of disputes; in a word, as a trial for ascertaining an issue, resulting in no predominance, — and any people, who should now adopt it for the latter purpose, would be put down by all the rest, leagued together in a common cause.

Well may the Mahometan claim the art of war as his agent of predominance, but not a Christian philosopher. Would Cousin recommend to us to exterminate Brahmanism by the sword, and so to establish the predominance of the idea of the Christian nations? Or to take up arms against Mahometanism, or idol worship, or inhuman and brutalizing rites of religion of any kind? Would he counsel us to make war against every evil national influence, out of the borders of Christendom, in order to make our civilized creed and arts and institutions predominant? Our instruments in this work are noiseless, bloodless, yet most mighty reformers, — national intercourse, example, generous competition, and the benevolent ministrations of a gospel of peace. There is no

philosophy, no religion, no humanity, no heart, in such a justification of war. It springs from a misapprehension of the spirit of our time, and belongs to the policy of barbarians, and the history of other ages. Our heroism, the heroism of this our period, is in a scientific, an intellectual, a moral, a religious, a manly, a godly warfare. We fight the powers of evil. Our expeditions are fitted out in the love of God, and of his creature, our fellow-man, and led against the armies of Belial, among benighted nations. We send forth our missionary forces, Christian warriors, having on the helmet of salvation, grasping the sword of the spirit, and their feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace. We send our Howards to invade the dungeons and prisons where misery and guilt dwell together, to relieve and bless them. Our Parks, Ledyards, Denhams, and Clappertons, our Parrys, Rosses, and Backs, go out to explore new regions of the globe, and new channels for the all-pervading course of human enterprise. And our Franklins, our Davys, our Watts, and our Fultons vanquish the forces of nature, and wrest the elements from their ancient seats. Such is the warfare with which we bring about the predominance of our ideas. These are our heroes. This our chivalry. This our glory. Let other ages boast of their exploits on the field of battle, their victories, their conquests, and send us down embalmed in history, and oratory, and poetry the names of their "man-killers," as Dryden calls heroes. We live in a different age, and for other destinies.

Cousin seems charmed with war, because, as he says, "an absence of it is a state of absolute immobility." Then such is the present state of the Christian world. Profound peace reigns between all the nations. But is immobility the condition of the times? On the contrary, *was* it not such, during the almost continual wars of Europe, from the reign of the emperor Charles V. to the fall of Napoleon? And is it anything but peace which has changed this

immobility to motion, rapid motion, and motion *forward*? Is there no virtue in the thousand impulses of an intensely active and excited public spirit, in philanthropy, in the communication of opinion and literature, in gaining and getting, and a generous but pacific rivalry among states, to keep the wheels of human affairs from standing stock still, in a state of "absolute immobility"? Will nothing keep them in motion, but a perennial, rushing stream of human blood?*

When the application of the magnetic properties of iron to the purposes of navigation was discovered, then its power as an instrument of destruction was on its way to a sure decline and fall. The compass came into use, and the sword ceased to be the efficient agent of national predominance; and commerce assumed its office. This has thrown the affairs of the civilized world into a new orbit, to which war is an antagonist and disturbing force. Attraction is now the law of the nations, where, formerly, it was repulsion; intercourse is now their object, where before it was separation.

Yes. The world is changed. Heaven has vouchsafed to man a new order of events, and a higher aim for his aspirations of social advancement.

Magnus, ab integro, sæclorum nascitur ordo.
Jam redit et virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna.

War has ceased to be the employment, it has ceased to be the glory, it has ceased to be the enricher of

* The universal consent of men, learned and unlearned, has spurned the theory of Hobbes, that war is the natural state of man. And he is looked upon, for his views in this matter, as a sort of evil genius; and his name, as a philosopher is in reproach. But if the doctrine we have attempted to examine be correct; if war be necessary; if men cannot be kept from fighting with each other, and it is justifiable that they should fight, and beneficial too, then Hobbes's theory is true. *War is the natural state of man.* It is in vain to disguise this. If we denounce Hobbes, why do we embrace his doctrine? If we abjure his sentiments, why are they found nestling in our own bosoms?

nations. A new spirit is at work in political transactions. The views of governments are now directed to the making of treaties for trade and for the removal of abuses, and not treaties for defence or offence. The era of commerce in national affairs has succeeded to that of war. The glowing language of Burke is literally true, and in a far higher sense than that in which he used it. "The age of chivalry is gone. That of economists and calculators *has* succeeded; but the glory of Europe is not," as he deemed it, "extinguished forever." No. The glory of Europe and of the world never blazed forth as now, in living splendors.

"Farewell ! the plumed troop, and the big wars,
That make ambition virtue ; O, farewell !
Farewell the neighing steed, and the shrill trump,
The spirit-stirring drum, the ear-piercing fife,
The royal banner ; and all quality,
Pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war !

• • • • •
Farewell ! Othello's occupation's gone."

Though the commercial world may be unconscious agents in this process of redemption; though they may not know, nor rightly value their high calling, and follow it rather for gain than godliness; though they may contemplate no such effect as the result of their operations; though that effect should even be contrary to their purposes and intentions; to this, at last, in the course of modern civilization, it must assuredly come.

ART. III. — *The Americans in their Moral, Social, and Political Relations*. By FRANCIS J. GRUND. Boston: Marsh, Capen, & Lyon. 1837. Two volumes in one. 12mo. pp. 423.

NOTHING annoys a portion of our countrymen more than certain books, concerning us, which English

travellers from time to time put forth. These books, it is said, abuse, misrepresent, caricature, and make us sweet food for laughter. All this is unquestionably very provoking; but it is nothing more than they who complain deserve. It is meet that English travellers should make us their sport, so long as we continue to worship the English. When we cease to be apes and dare be men, when we leave off our blind devotion to everything English, and set up for a national character of our own, thinking our own thoughts, speaking our own words, and living after our own manner, English travellers, and all other travellers, will try us by the proper standard, treat us with proper respect, and tell the truth about us. Till then, God grant that the Halls, the Trollopes, and the Hamiltons may continue to write and publish concerning us.

The book before us, by an intelligent German, who has resided several years among us, is in a very different vein from the productions with which English travellers have so liberally favored us. It is a work of respectable ability and information. It has evidently been conceived and executed in a good spirit, and with a friendly intent. The impression concerning our morals, manners, institutions, and social relations, the perusal of it must leave on the mind of a foreigner, we should think, would be in the main correct. Perhaps it is too little disposed to find fault, and that it sometimes praises us, when it would do well to censure us. However this may be, we welcome the book, and recommend it as deserving the attention of our countrymen. They may find in it some useful suggestions, and derive much pleasure from its perusal, perhaps profit from its study.

This book has one fault, at least what will be deemed a fault by many. It is not written in the interests of the aristocracy. Mr. Grund's literary reputation, as well as his standing in American "Good Society," will be seriously affected by the respect he has shown for democratic principles. Will it be believed in the

Saloons, in State Street, in Wall Street, and especially in Old Harvard, that a man capable of writing a book of unquestionable ability, has spoken of General Jackson in terms of respect, and even gone so far as to approve his administration? The fact is even so, incredible as it may appear. This is probably because Mr. Grund was neither born nor educated in America. Had he been born and educated in this country, it is not likely that he would have been guilty of such high handed *lèse-aristocratie*. The presidents and professors of our colleges take proper care that no democracy infect their halls, which are duly fumigated, and ever and anon, ventilated with fresh currents of good English atmosphere.

A foreigner might naturally think that the literature of a democratic country should be democratic; but we can teach him better. This country is too democratic to tolerate a democratic literature. What would become of our aristocracy, if our literature, by any strange mischance, should become democratic? Where would it be, if the "Rabbis of the Universities," together with the learned Dean who presides over the North American, should, by any singular confusion of ideas, embrace democratic notions, and undertake to train up the young men entrusted to their care, to love the free and democratic institutions of their country? Gone were it, and gone forever. Aristocracy dies in this country the day that it loses the aid of our literature. The people of this country will do very much as they have a mind to do; and if they take it into their heads to give the aristocracy the go-by, they will do it, and no power on earth can hinder them. Need is there then that the aristocracy keep in their own hands the control of all the influences which go to form the mind of the people. This is their only means of salvation. Of these influences the most important is literature. The men who come forth from colleges are looked upon as the masters of literature, as its creators rather, and hence the necessity of keeping democracy out of colleges.

The necessity there is of keeping up an aristocratic tone in our literature, accounts in part for our fondness for English literature and our aversion to French and German. The French and Germans, in literary matters, are rank democrats. They pay no deference to Cant, they speak out boldly what they think, and they think for themselves too. The English are not guilty of these sins. They dress the altars of thrice holy Cant, take good care to exhibit no trace of free thought or of bold and manly utterance. Their literature is not disfigured by any wildness of speculation, by any consciousness of mental independence, or any living sentiment of Humanity. It is therefore just the literature for us, young Americans. It is safe, and will tend to keep us in order. Should we once begin to study, to some extent, the literature of France and Germany, there is no telling what strange consequences might ensue. There would soon be no respect paid to a thing merely because it is old, nor to a man because he is rich. It is even possible that we should become so perverse as to reverence only worth, and to reverence that though clad in rags!

Our remarks are not quite just to English literature. England has had, and has, some writers whose works are not altogether tame and servile; but these writers are not commended, and are generally represented as dangerous and not to be read. Scott it is safe to read and to praise, for he was too much engaged with the past, too busy in furbishing up old escutcheons, and tracing out old heraldic bearings, to ever dream of elevating the masses, or of giving countenance to doctrines of political equality. But the "Lay of the Last Minstrel" has been sung. The Minstrel sleeps with his fathers. Peace to his ashes. We did him due honor for his genius in his day, and suffered ourselves to be beguiled, by his enchanting volumes, of many a weary hour. Bulwer it is not safe to praise or to read. He is evidently democratic. His moral character is said to be very bad, and the saints es-

chew his books; though these same saints will support a man for president of the United States, whose character is said to be no better than they represent Mr. Bulwer's. But then this candidate for the presidency is not loaded with the sin of democracy. Poor Byron is under the ban of the Reviews, is declared to have been no poet, to have been given to the flesh, and to have sometimes sipped gin and water. There is great peril in reading him. He should be eschewed by all who have a regard for their morals. Not indeed because he was given to the flesh, for that may sometimes be the case with men accounted godly, nor because he drank gin and water, for it is lawful to praise Charles Lamb, though he would now and then get tipsy; but because he did not reverence Cant, and because he was not, as he was in duty bound to be, a staunch aristocrat. Wordsworth may be praised, for few have the patience to read him, and moreover he is a Tory; but poor Shelley must not be mentioned, for he dreamed of social equality. Coleridge and Southey are permitted to be read, notwithstanding the "pantisocratic" dreams of their youth, for when they became men they "put away childish things."

Of our own writers it is lawful to praise Washington Irving, for he has never, we believe, written anything not acceptable to the North American and the London Quarterly. Cooper was a favorite, so long as he wrote only to amuse, and took good care to show no sympathy with the democracy; but since he has felt himself an American, and sought to infuse into his works some portion of American thought and feeling, he has fallen from grace, and must now be looked upon as under the ban of all the Quarterlies in the world,—except our own. It would hardly do for Bryant to hazard another volume of poems. Channing, it is said, is a *loco foco*, and has an eye to Congress, for he has shown no little sympathy with common Humanity. Bancroft must be endured, because nobody but a thorough going democrat can write the History of the United States, and it is very desir-

able that the History of the United States be written. The Whigs, or their fathers, have tried to write it; but they have been as unable to do it, as a Mussulman would be to write the History of Christianity. Nobody but a democrat can seize the spirit of this nation, comprehend its Idea or embody it in his narrative. Mr. Bancroft must then be endured as an historian; but as a man, he finds no mercy. He has committed the sin of democracy, in a democratic country too, and absolution he must not hope for, in this world nor in that which is to come.

Now the fact is, these democratic or liberal writers are not such depraved beings as this condemnation of them would seem to indicate. They suffer not in point of morals, talents, genius, information, by comparison with any who may be arrayed against them. A short time since, Alexander H. Everett was a great man, an accomplished scholar, an able and elegant writer; but now he is not allowed to be one or the other. Yet nobody can believe that Mr. Everett the Democrat is not every way as great a man, as accomplished a scholar, as able and as elegant a writer, as Mr. Everett the Whig. The truth of the matter is, the democratic writers are the great writers of the age and nation. This indeed is one of their principal sins. If they were weak, timid, if they neither had nor were able to impart life, they would be patronized, to a certain extent, by the aristocracy out of complacence to the common people. But being as they are, master minds, minds that will leave their impress on their age, they are not to be endured. If justice be done them by the wealthy, the fashionable, the supporters of the aristocracy, their influence will be too great to be withstood. They will breed sedition in the populace, and carry away the whole people in a democratic direction.

We beg pardon of our readers for having bestowed so much attention upon the American aristocracy, for after all, the American aristocracy is an insignificant affair. We hope no one will infer that we are

hostile to it. We do not think it strong enough, or likely in this country to do mischief enough, to excite a reasonable man's hostility. The best way to treat it is, to let it alone. It will die soon, and the east wind will sweep it away, as it did Jonah's gourd. This country is appointed, or doomed, to be a democratic country. This may or may not be an evil, but it is the fact. Men may write against it, electioneer against it, do all they can to array wealth, fashion, learning, refinement, against it, but all in vain. Democracy at last is to have a country she can call her own. Here she is to reign, and the sooner we give in our adhesion, the better for her, and the better for ourselves. The policy we should recommend would be for every friend of his country, to do his best to enlist literature, philosophy, religion, and refinement on the side of democracy. This has ever been our policy, and we trust ever will be.

The following remarks on the aristocracy in this country strike us as just.

“No aristocracy can exist or maintain itself without property. The nobility of France had virtually ceased to exist long before the hereditary peerage was abolished; while the patronage of the English would alone be sufficient to establish a power which would make itself felt, even if the House of Lords were reformed. There are even those who believe that in the latter case its power, instead of being confined to its usual channel, would extend itself over every department of state, and absorb, for a time at least, the main interests of the country. The American aristocracy, on the contrary, possess neither hereditary wealth nor privileges, nor the power of directing the lower classes. The prosperity of the country is too general to reduce any portion of the people to the abject condition of ministers to the passions and appetites of the rich. It is even gold which destroys the worship of the golden calf. •

“But how can it be possible for the American aristocracy to lay claims to superior distinctions, when the people are constantly reminded, by words and actions, that *they* are the legislators, that the *fee-simple* is in *them*, and that *they* possess the invaluable privilege of calling to office men of their own choice and principles? Are not the American people called

upon to pass sentence on every individual whose ambition may prompt him to seek distinction and honor at their hands? And what is not done to conciliate the good will and favor of the people? Are they not constantly flattered, courted, and caressed by that very aristocracy which, if it truly existed, would spurn equality with the people? Is the judgment of the people, expressed by the ballot-box, not appealed to as the ultimate decision of every argument and contest? Aristocracy, if it shall deserve that name, must not only be based on the vain pretensions of certain classes, but on its public acknowledgment by law, and the common consent of others. This, however, is not the work of a generation, and requires an *historical* connexion with the origin and progress of a country.

“Why, then, should the Americans recognise a superior class of society, if that class be neither acknowledged by law nor possessed of power? How shall they be brought to worship those from whom they are accustomed to receive homage? — who are either men of their own election, and consequently of their own making, or the defeated and unhappy victims of their displeasure? The aristocracy of America may claim genius, and talent, and superiority, and they may be ambitious; but it is an ‘ambition of so airy and light a quality that it is but a shadow’s shadow,’ — a sort of *fata morgana* reflected from beyond the waters, whose baseless fabric can neither excite apprehension, nor arrest the progress of democracy. Coteries there always were, and always will be, in large cities; but they need not necessarily be connected with power. In America, moreover, they exist principally among the ladies; there being, as yet, but few gentlemen to be called ‘of leisure,’ or exclusively devoted to society. The country is yet too young, and offers too large a field for the spirit of enterprise and business, to leave to the fashionable drawing-rooms other devotees than young misses and *elegants* of from fourteen to twenty years of age. That such companies may, nevertheless, have their *attractions*, no one can reasonably doubt; but they are not composed of elements capable of changing the manners and customs of the country; and, as long as their composition does not materially alter, must remain deprived of that influence which the higher circles in Europe are wont to exercise over all classes of society.

“The manners of republicans must necessarily be more nearly on a level with each other than those of a people living under a monarchical government. There are no nobles to

vie with the splendor of the throne; no commoners to outdo the nobility. The dignified simplicity of the American President and all high functionaries of state is little calculated to furnish patterns of expensive fashions; and were all Americans, in this respect, exact imitators of the amiable plainness of General Jackson, their manners would soon cease to be an object of satire to English tourists. They would then present dignity without ornament, candor without loquacity, loftiness of mind unmingled with contempt for others. Europeans would then visit the United States, not to ridicule American manners, but for the purpose of studying them; and, perhaps, carry home the useful conviction, that though republics are not fit schools for courtiers, they may, nevertheless, abound in good sense, agreeable address, and genuine cordiality of manners." — pp. 22 - 24.

Mr. Grund's remarks on the intelligence of the Americans, on the respect paid to men of letters, on the character and education of American ladies, we wish he had said *women*, — will be found in the main just. He appears to comprehend our society, its tone, spirit, and fundamental principles, and what he says of it is liberal and candid. He bears honorable testimony to the morals of our community, and probably says more for the sanctity of marriages than our Moral Reformers, as they call themselves, will be disposed to admit. If so, he and they must settle the difference; we believe him rather than them. Men and women, who set out to cure a single vice, are prone to see it everywhere, and they almost inevitably exaggerate, in order to demonstrate the importance of their work. We never place much reliance on the statements of those reformers, who see only one evil in the world, and have but one idea to work with.

Mr. Grund complains of our aversion to public amusements, but as we think without any just reason. Many of our friends have made the same complaint, and we think we have seen it recommended that public provision should be made for diverting the people. We have no sympathy with the complaint, nor with the recommendation. A despot may furnish amuse-

ments to the populace; it is a good way to keep them quiet, and from thinking of their rights, or trying to repossess them. For ourselves we are not frightened at sight of a serious people. A people with a destiny to achieve, a great work to accomplish for the world, has no time to be gay, to dress itself out in masquerade. It must be grave and earnest; it must think and act in relation to the future and not to the passing moment. They who are recommending amusements seem not to be aware that they are recommending America to give over the work to which God has called her.

We make the following extract because it expresses a thought and a regret which we frequently meet with among some of our countrymen, who have fallen into a habit of sentimentalizing o religion.

“But, proud as the Americans may be of their halls of congress, they have not, as yet, a single place of worship at all to be compared to the finer churches of Europe, where they might render thanks to the Omnipotent Being for the unexampled happiness and prosperity with which he has blessed their country. Some not altogether unsuccessful attempts have been made in Boston and Baltimore, at what might be called a cathedral; but neither the size nor the order, nor even the materials, are resembling those of the nobler specimens of Gothic architecture in Europe.

“Our feelings and emotions are always tinged with the reflections from the objects around us; and I cannot, therefore, divest myself of the opinion that a superior style of architecture in an edifice of public worship may materially assist the imagination, and enable the mind to turn from mere worldly objects to the contemplation of heaven and the adoration of God. I have known persons who could never pray so fervently as when encompassed by the sombre vaults of a gothic cathedral, and I have, myself, experienced the same feelings on similar occasions.

“But, in addition to the deficiency in style and ornament there exists in America, an almost universal practice of building churches, or at least the steeples, of wood, to which are frequently given the most grotesque figures, partaking of all orders of architecture, from the time of Noah to the present day. There is scarce an excuse for this corruption of taste,

except the cheapness of the material, which may recommend the custom in practice. A church ought to be the symbol of immutability and eternity, the attributes of the Infinite Being; but nothing can be more averse to either, than its construction of so frail a material as wood. An *imitation* of stone-work is still more objectionable, as it appears like an attempt at deceit,—a sort of architectural counterfeiting, least pardonable in a house of prayer. Such an edifice seems to be unworthy of its noble purpose,—a sordid mockery of grandeur, which, without elevating the mind, represents to it only the melancholy picture of human frailties.”— pp. 43, 44.

Now it may be a fact that the architectural beauty of our churches is very defective, that our churches are also made of materials that are not durable; but what then? Would you have a new people, the greater part of whom must depend on their own exertions for a livelihood, lavish millions in erecting stately piles for the sake of producing a languid emotion in a few sentimental dreamers, who can see nothing in the majesty of God, in the sublime idea of communion with the universal Spirit, to move their souls? We say no. These dreamers are hardly worth saving at so great an expense. God is worshipped in spirit and in truth, by a consciousness of his presence being ever with us, by studying his law, by serving his children, doing good to mankind, our brethren. The emotion waked up by the stately piles or lofty cathedrals which some would have us erect, is not a religious emotion, and has no kindred with that stirring of the soul we are conscious of when we find ourselves in the presence of God. They who have any religion within them, can be moved without there being anything in the building in which they assemble, to strike their senses or over-awe their imaginations. They can worship God anywhere, in the fields, the forests, the shop, or by the domestic fireside. They want a church only as a meeting house. They prefer to have it chaste, simple, severe, and as little likely, by its profuse ornaments or imposing grandeur, to draw off their minds from the indwelling God as possible.

We insert the following because it gives us an opportunity to bear our testimony against those who are raising a cry about the Irish. The sin of the Irish is that they are poor, and that they are not always good and true Whigs. When a rich man chooses to immigrate into our country, our arms and our hearts are opened to receive him. Some of our readers may remember certain newspaper paragraphs concerning one Count Leon, who came to this country a few years since, reputed to be worth seven millions of dollars. Who is there to-day that does not own that the poorest Irishman that ever came among us, was worth more to us than this famous Count Leon? The honest laborer is a better inhabitant of a republic than a rich nabob. A country may be corrupted and destroyed by riches; by poverty, never. The Irish, indeed, are, to a certain extent, burdensome to us, though much less so than is pretended; but they are our brothers; they have in their own country fallen among robbers, been stript, wounded, and left half dead, and we should not deem it a hardship, that we are permitted to perform towards them the part of the good Samaritan. After the second or third generation they have become amalgamated with our native population, and are among our most useful and often our most enterprising citizens. Instead of sending them back when they come, or declaiming against them when here, we should do well to seek to elevate them, and to make their adopted country the means of raising them to the true dignity of manhood. Some of the expense our sentimentalizing religionists would have us lavish on churches would perhaps do as much for the service of God in this way as in that.

“The Irish are, by the great majority of Americans, considered as an oppressed and injured people, which is sufficient to entitle them to the sympathies of freemen. It is true, the greater number of Irish who arrive in the United States are poor, and some of them tainted by the vices of poverty, which, in some of the states, have created a prejudice against them. But, considered collectively, they constitute a highly

useful part of the American community, and contribute, by their honest industry, to increase the wealth of the country. They perform the hardest labors at the lowest wages given in the United States, and are satisfied and happy to provide for themselves and their children the bare necessaries of life. But it is even their being contented with little, and their less heeding the future, which render their actions and motives less acceptable to the Americans. The Americans (as I shall prove hereafter) are living altogether for their children. They are ready to make any sacrifice for the advancement of future generations, and love their country not *as it is*; but *as it will be made* by their enterprise and industry. The Irish, on the contrary, are, by habit, inclination, and the vivacity of their temperaments, inclined to enjoy the present. Their previous lives contain but the sordid catalogues of privations and distresses, and, on their emerging from the most cruel misery which ever extorted groans from a nation, they are apt, — as all human creatures would be, — to draw the first free breath with joy and exultation. Like Lazarus, they were accustomed to feed upon the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table; and now that they are invited to sit down, and partake themselves of the banquet, those rigid censors stand by and scoff at their greedy appetites. A man, whose morning meal consisted of capon, can certainly await dinner with better grace, than he who went hungry to bed and awoke to breakfast on sorrow. Cheer to him is manna distilled from heaven, to support him on his way through the desert; and he is eager to snatch at a gift of which he knows not when it will again be within his grasp. Excess is the companion of poverty, and its consequences perpetuate its direful existence. Misery they drown in stupefying potions; for oblivion alone is the happiness of the damned.

“These are the vices of some of those wretches who are annually thrown upon the hospitality of the Americans. And shall America, the land of political and religious freedom, cast them from her, and let them perish, while a bounteous Providence has put in her possession the most fertile regions on earth, capable of supporting thousands and millions of human beings? And shall the supplications and prayers of these emigrants ascend up to heaven without invoking a blessing on the children of liberty? Are their habits and their vices not to be corrected by improving their wretched condition? All human experience speaks loudly in the affirmative. Set before them the prospect of steady employment, the hope of not only earning a subsistence, but something more; give

their children an opportunity of education; and you will breathe into them a new vivifying principle. Occupation will prevent the commission of crimes; the influence of religion and good example will abolish the vice of intemperance, and the facilities of instruction will make respectable citizens of their children. This is not declamation. I speak of facts which I know, and to which I shall have occasion to allude hereafter.

“The Irish in Boston are a remarkably orderly people. They are *not* usually given to intemperance; but on the contrary, willing to aid in its suppression. If the annals of prisons and houses of correction furnish a larger number of Irish than American names, it must be remembered that, in all countries, the greatest number of culprits is furnished by the poorer and the least educated classes, and that as strangers, unacquainted with the peculiar police regulations of the towns, they are more apt to trespass against the laws, and make themselves liable to punishment, than those who have been brought up under its influence, and with whom obedience to it has become a habit.

“Abstract numbers are no criterion of public morals. Hundreds of crimes against God and against man are not amenable to the law, while others, arising sometimes from innocent motives, are visited by its severest penalties. During the space of nearly ten years I have lived in Boston, but very few capital crimes were committed, and certainly not more than three or four considerable robberies and forgeries; but no one of them, so far as my remembrance goes, has been perpetrated or abetted by an Irishman. Their offences consisted, principally, in disorderly conduct, and in infringing on the police regulations of the city. Theft they were rarely charged with; and I am fully persuaded that were it not for the still too pernicious influence of ardent spirits, not one half of these acts would have been committed, and no stain left on the honest reputation of even the lowest of the Irish laborers. But, when we reflect upon the number of crimes committed by the poor, we ought not to forget their exposed situation; and when we praise the moral rectitude of the rich, we ought to consider the high premium which is paid to their virtue. It does not belong to man to condemn a whole nation as vicious, or to pray, —

“‘Lord, we thank thee that we are not as these men are;’ for they too will pray, and ‘the prayer of the poor shall be heard,’ as it is more likely to come from the heart.

“ Who never ate his bread with tears,
 Who ne'er, through nights of bitter sorrow,
 Sat weeping on his wretched bed,
 He knows ye not, ye heavenly powers.”

“ But it is not so much the vices of the Irish, as their political principles, which prove sometimes offensive to Americans. Some disturbances which of late arose in New York, at the election of the Governor, and in which the Irish unfortunately participated, furnished a certain party with a convenient pretext to ascribe their want of success to the destructive influence of the Irish. In consequence of this, a series of resolutions were adopted to prevent their occurrence in future. The subsequent election, however, proved the insufficiency of the ground they had taken; for, not only did it pass without the public peace being, for one moment, disturbed, but the majority *for* the government was nearly doubled. But I shall not expatiate on this subject now, and will only remark, that the Irish are naturally supposed to be in favor of democracy, having been, for centuries, the victims of the opposite doctrine.” — pp. 61–64.

Mr. Grund is no Unitarian, as the following uncalled for and unwarranted strictures on Unitarianism may testify.

“ The Unitarians, who are forming large congregations in the Northern and Eastern States, taking for their motto the words of St. Paul, ‘ Prove all things; hold fast that which is good,’ are, perhaps without knowing it, as nearly as possible, on the verge of pure Deism; but as long as they conform to the usual form of prayers, to the regular sabbath service and evening lectures, and partake of the sacrament, they will be considered as good Christians, and enjoy the same consideration as any other sect in existence. But their creed is far from being universally popular, especially in the Southern States, where it is almost wholly confined to the trading classes, composed of emigrants from New England.

“ The inhabitants of the South are principally Episcopalians, and as much attached to authority in religion as they dislike it in politics. They consider Unitarianism as a religious democracy; because it relies less on the authority of the Scriptures, than on the manner in which the understanding of the clergy expounds them, and retains too little mysticism in its form of worship, to strike the multitude with awe. I have listened to many excellent sermons preached by Unitarian clergymen, containing the most sublime morals which I ever

knew to flow from the pulpit ; but I hardly ever perceived a close connexion between the text and the sermon ; and whenever they entered upon theological doctrines, I have always found them at variance with themselves and each other. I write this with the fullest conviction that I do not, myself, belong to any orthodox persuasion ; but, as far as logical reasoning and consequence of argument go, I think the Unitarians more deficient than any other denomination of Christians. I do not see how they can hold the ground which they have assumed : they must, in my opinion, go either further on the road to Deism, or retrace their steps, and become once more dogmatical Christians. The greatest objection I would make to Unitarianism is the absence of *love* in many of its doctrines ; and the substitution of ratiocination in most cases, where the heart alone would speak louder than all the demands of a sedate, reasonable, modest morality. When I hear an argumentative sermon, I always remember the words of our Savior :

“ ‘Happy are the poor in spirit ; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.’ ”

“ And when I hear stoic virtues preached, I remember poor Magdalen,

“ ‘To whom much was given ; because she loved much.’ ”

“ Two reasons there are for the spreading of Unitarian doctrines in the United States. First, because its ministers are amongst the most highly gifted, and the more eloquent as they belong to a sect which is yet in the minority ; and, secondly, because there is a class of people in America, who, aware of the moral and political necessity of religion, in order to restrain the vices of human nature, would do all in their power to preserve the text and practical applications of Christianity ; while, at the same time, they would willingly dispense with certain ceremonies and popular beliefs, which, in their opinion, are not essential to religious worship. They call themselves ‘Unitarians,’ because they dare not call themselves more, or rather less ; and are better known by their opposition to orthodoxy, or what they think the extravagances of the Christian faith, than by any positive tenets of their own. They agree, as far as I am acquainted, on but one point, which is the denial of the Trinity, by denying the divinity of Christ ; but as to the *authority* for their belief, it is too nearly related to a certain branch of the applied mathematics, to require a particular comment.

“ Many Unitarian preachers have published excellent sermons, which have become popular, even in England ; and as

long as they refrain from attacking other sects, and retain their purity of style, I can see no reason why they should not be read by all denominations of Christians, as containing a concise, intelligible, and even eloquent code of morals.

"I ought to observe, moreover, that the Unitarians in New England form a highly respectable and intellectual class of society, whose private lives and virtues offer but little room either for moral or religious criticism. This is probably the reason why Unitarianism is supposed to become popular in the United States; though it is, by the great majority of the people, still looked upon as a doctrine incompatible with pure Christianity. But then we ought to distinguish between cause and effect, and not ascribe exclusively to the doctrine, what may perhaps be more easily explained by the peculiar position of its followers.

"The Unitarians in the United States are not numerous; they are, for the most part, in tolerable circumstances; and at the head of their persuasion is the oldest and best university of the country. No other religious denomination in America enjoys the same advantages; and we might, therefore, naturally expect some moral distinction in favor of its adherents. But if Unitarianism should ever become the creed of the great mass of the people, it is more than probable those advantages would cease, or, at least, be confined to a small number.

"Religion gains more from the heart than from the abstract understanding; and is more accessible through the medium of the feelings, than through the most logical course of demonstrative reasoning. Man is naturally a sophist, and ever ready to adapt his creed to his actions, or at least to allow his conscience a certain latitude, incompatible with moral and religious justice.

"The Christian religion addresses itself particularly to the heart, and is, on that account, accessible to all capacities, and adapted to every condition of life. Love and charity are its basis; and Christ himself has set the divine example in dying for the sins of this world. To strip religion of its awful mysteries, to explain the creation and redemption of man like a phenomenon in natural philosophy, and to make human intellect the ultimate judge of its truth and applications, — is to deprive it of its sanctity, and thereby of its influence on the majority of mankind.

"I do not believe that the spreading of Unitarianism will serve to increase the respect for the Christian religion, or that its moral consequences will benefit society in general. Neither do I think it capable of becoming the universal religion of the

people, whose affections and hopes require a stronger prop than the cold dictates of human morality.

“ Venture then to hope ; and fondly dream ;
Yonder world shall every pledge redeem,
Of your true and faithful sentiment.

“ Thus far, it does not appear that Unitarianism has made very rapid progress in the United States. The number of its congregations is still small when compared to those of other denominations of Christians, and, as far as I am acquainted, is not on the increase. This, however, is not owing to the want of zeal in their clergymen, but principally to the doctrine itself ; which does not seem to captivate the feelings and sympathies of the great mass of Americans, however it may please and accord with the argumentative disposition of its followers.” — pp. 158 – 161.

It is not our especial province to defend Unitarians or any other denomination of Christians as such ; but we cannot pass over this statement in silence. Whatever may be thought of Unitarianism as a definitive form of the Christian religion, the Unitarians have rendered an invaluable service to Christianity by the introduction of Rationalism into theological speculations. They have done something towards making Theology a Science, and towards adapting it to the improved state of the human mind. They have too rendered a much greater service to democracy than some of its conservative fathers are aware of. A religion, based on a positive instead of a rational authority, cannot long coexist with perfect political freedom. The habit of yielding to authority in matters of religion, and of believing without conviction, disposes the mind to servitude, and paves the way for absolutism in the state. If it prevail, political liberty must be given up. On the other hand, the habit of inquiring freely into all matters of science, of civil and political liberty, and of judging for oneself in all these matters, is incompatible with a blind adherence to authority in religious matters. Unitarians have, to a certain extent, tolerated free inquiry in matters of religion, and have asserted for the mind, in relation to religion, the same rights that the democrats

have asserted for it in relation to politics. In doing this they have done much. This has made them the Liberal party, and it is as Liberalists, not merely as Unitarians, that they have gained the footing they now hold; and it is only by being Liberalists that they can retain it.

The charge that Unitarians approach Deism is too stale to be dwelt upon. They are Deists in that they believe in one God and no more; but when the term Deist is taken to mean one who rejects Divine Revelation, they are no more Deists than are Calvinists, Episcopalians, or Roman Catholics. Every Unitarian believes in Divine Revelation, in the Inspiration of the Bible, and many of them believe in the Inspiration of God made to the soul of every man. If on this head there be any charge to be brought against Unitarians, it is that they place too much reliance on the mere letter that killeth, and not enough on the spirit that giveth life.

The sentimentalism about mysteries is all very well. Whatever is unknown is mysterious, and do our best to know all that we can know, to explain all that we can explain, there will always be a universe of Mystery round, about, and within us, before which we may stand in awe, or bow down with adoration. We shall always have enough to wonder at, to surprise us, to seek to find out, to unravel, however earnestly and successfully we may ply our reason. The fear Mr. Grund seems to have that Unitarians will explain all mysteries, and make all things so easy to be understood, that religion will cease to excite in us any profound emotions of wonder and awe, we look upon as perfectly idle. If it were not so, we should still say to the Unitarian, go on and make all things plain. The wonder and awe, which come only because we have remained in voluntary ignorance, we do not regard as worth much. Man may serve God by reasoning as well as by feeling, and a clear and sublime thought is an offering not less acceptable to him than a profound emotion of wonder or awe. Sentimen-

talism will do for boarding-school misses and for boys who begin to dream of love, but for grown up men and women, let us have something more robust and healthy. The greatest objection we have to our German friends is that they are dreamy, sentimental youths, lying all day watching the bubbling fountain, rather than strong and active men prepared to go forth into the world and to labor with a vigorous arm and a stout heart. We do not underrate the emotions. We may have felt in our day, and perhaps can feel even now; but we are past the age to place religion or the worship of God in emotion merely. Let us have clear thought and masculine energy of soul; with these we will do more for God than with all the fine feelings in the world.

Mr. Grund thinks the Unitarians are deficient in love. We think this is no more the case with them than with some other Christian denominations, nor even so much. It is customary to call them cold, even freezing. We know they are not quite so hot as some sectarians are, and do not say so much about hot places; but we have yet to learn that this is much to their discredit. The fault we find with Unitarians, and not with them alone, is that they do not seem to us to feel that deep, abiding interest in the weal of Humanity, which as Christians they ought to feel. They feel as much as any sect; for the earnestness other sects manifest is for their creed or their sect, not for Humanity; but they feel not enough. They are not enough in earnest. They do not feel that they should live for man, and for man only. They do not feel the deep and abiding interest in whatever concerns mankind that Jesus did. They do not seem to us to be conscious of the great work, and of the high glory, to which God has called them. They have done something, and they seem to think that they have done all. Nevertheless they are getting the better of this fault. They are enlarging their views, and kindling their hearts, and nerving their souls, for the revelation and the maintenance of a

new and a higher life. Our faith in the Unitarian body is strong, and we expect great things from them. A glorious future is before them. A noble destiny awaits them. Let them open their eyes, look, behold, and march.

Mr. Grund, in the following extract, makes out quite a good plea for Judge Lynch, much better than he deserves.

“There exists but one practice in the United States, which seems to be at variance with what I have thus far advanced; and yet, upon further consideration, I am almost inclined to consider it as a part of the common law of the country. I would refer to the ‘Lynch law,’ of which the most brilliant accounts are furnished in the British papers. The Lynch law of America, it must be remembered, is not a child of democracy; it is of a much more ancient and illustrious origin, and occurs already in the early history of the colonies. It was begot in those happy times, in which religious customs took the place of the law; and in which the ingenuity of the settlers recurred to the simplest means of obtaining the most summary justice. It is, in fact, of a patriarchal nature, having for its motto the wisdom of Solomon, — ‘Do not spare the rod.’ The pilgrim fathers, who settled the New England States, were a highly religious people, — with whom the authority of the elders of the Church was of more avail, than any positive law of Great Britain, which, from its distance, and the manner in which it had been abused into an instrument of oppression, had considerably lost of its force. Their little community was more governed by mutual agreement and consent, than by any written code, except that to which their ministers pointed, as leading the way to salvation. The Bible furnished them with precedents of the cheap, easy, and salutary correction of flogging; and there was no reason why their legislators should have attempted to improve upon the wisdom of Moses.

“The custom being once introduced and found expedient, was gradually increased in severity as the rigid morals of the puritans began to relax; until, towards the American Revolution, when abuses had reached their climax, the original method of ‘tarring and feathering’ was substituted for the more lenient punishment of the rod. The commencement being made with the excisemen in Boston, was soon imitated in the other provinces; and being at first employed in a patriotic cause, created a universal prejudice in its favor. It became a

national custom which, as far as I remember, was only used in cases more or less directly affecting the people. Thus, whenever an individual gave a national insult, or did or practised anything which threatened the peace and happiness of the people, they resorted to it as a domestic remedy; but I am quite certain not with the intention of opposing the regular law. They only resorted to it *ad interim*, till the regular physician could be called in; and in most cases effected a *radical cure*, without paying for the attendance of the doctor. In this manner the Lynch law was executed on gamblers, disorderly persons, and latterly also on a certain species of itinerant ministers, who, a little too anxious for the emancipation of the Negroes in the Southern States, had betaken themselves to preaching the doctrine of *revenge*, instead of that of the *atonement*, and thereby forced the good people to apply the doctrine to those, who evinced the most zeal for its propagation. But as I have said before, the Lynch law is not, properly speaking, an opposition to the established laws of the country, or is, at least, not contemplated as such by its adherents; but rather as a supplement to them,—a species of *common law*, which is as old as the country, and which, whatever may be the notion of ‘the *learned* in the law,’ has nevertheless been productive of some of the happiest results. I am aware there are different versions of the origin of ‘Lynch;’ but the above will be found to contain the essence and philosophy of all.”—pp. 178 – 180.

Mr. Grund is right in saying that Lynch law has long existed in this country. More than one of our towns has borne witness to some lewd or disorderly person ridden on a *rail* out of its precincts. In general this fact may be taken as a proof of our morals rather than of our disregard for law and order.

So long as Judge Lynch confined his operations to those whom everybody counted guilty, nobody saw anything in his court likely to trench on the authority or jurisdiction of the other courts of the land. He is now impeached, because he has ventured to sentence some concerning whose guilt there is a difference of opinion. The lawless tenor of his court is now seen, and efforts are now made to remove him from the bench. Perhaps it is well that he has extended the jurisdiction of his court, and pronounced concerning some doubtful cases. He will be the

sooner removed. It is well that he has struck some who are able to enlist a portion of popular sympathy in their favor. The poor wretch, with whom nobody sympathizes, and for whom nobody has a single kind word, may not now be exposed, as he was, to be Lynched. He, whom the laws do not condemn, may not now be sentenced and executed without law. A good may therefore come out of the late prevalence of Lynching.

For ourselves, we do not share the fears of some of our friends in regard to Lynch law. It is wrong, totally wrong, and never to be tolerated for a moment; but it does not make us despair of the Republic. We have confidence in the people. They love law and order. Nothing is so hateful to them as anarchy, and they will submit for ages to the grossest of tyrannies rather than to run the peril of it. If the constituted authorities of this country were all overthrown to-morrow, the great body of the people would continue the even tenor of their way, as quietly and as orderly as ever. The people, in fact, do not stand in half so much need of being taken care of, as do the enlightened and kind-hearted few, who are always volunteering their services to take care of them. They, who are always trembling for order, and dreading anarchy, neither know the people nor the history of their race. The people can spare all governments altogether better than governments can spare the people. We have therefore no fears that Judge Lynch will overthrow our free institutions and bring freedom into disrepute. His days are numbered.

We would simply add, that they who declaim against Judge Lynch mistake the effect for the cause. Lynching comes, at least in these times, from the want of proper respect for the rights of the mind and freedom of utterance. We have not yet learned to respect every man's opinion to the extent, we would have every man respect ours. We have not yet learned that no opinion is or can be dangerous, if reason be left free to combat it, and he who avows it be

not obliged to suffer some social, bodily, or mental inconvenience for avowing it. When we learn this and practise accordingly, Judge Lynch will trouble us no more.

We must tell Mr. Grund that we are not pleased with the manner in which he speaks of the political importance of the German settlers, in the following extract.

“The quiet temper of the Germans does not allow them to take a very active part in politics, though their number would be sufficient to form a most powerful party. In Pennsylvania they have, nevertheless, acquired great influence, and the governors of that state have, for many years past, been selected from amongst their countrymen. This is a matter so much settled by mutual consent, that, even at the last election, when there were two democratic and one whig candidate for office, all three were taken from the ranks of the Germans, and none other would have had the least chance of success. In the state of Ohio, though it was originally settled by emigrants from New England, there are, at present, not less than from thirty-five to forty thousand German voters. The state of New York, though originally settled by the Dutch, contains, nevertheless, a large German population in several counties, especially in that of Columbia, which gave birth to Mr. Van Buren, the present vice-president, and, in all probability, the next president of the United States. The state of Maryland contains a large proportion of German voters; the population of Illinois is nearly one third German; and the valley of the Mississippi is being settled by thousands of new emigrants from Europe. I do not think it an exaggeration to state, that not less than one hundred thousand votes are annually cast by Germans, and that, in less than twenty years, their number will have increased to half a million. In the city of New York the Germans have already a great influence on the election of mayor and the other city officers; the number of those who are entitled to vote amounting now to three thousand five hundred.

“Under these circumstances, ‘*the German vote*,’ as it is termed, becomes a matter of great solicitude with politicians of all ranks and persuasions; and, accordingly, newspapers in their own language are established in all parts of the United States where they have settled. In Pennsylvania alone there are now more than thirty German (mostly weekly) papers; and in Ohio and Illinois, as many more are published and cir-

culated. A considerable number of them is also published in Maryland; and the 'New York Staatszeitung' was entirely established by the democratic Germans of that city. If these papers were ably directed by a standard publication in any of the large cities, whose editor should understand the peculiarities of the German mind, the local circumstances of their settlements, and their relation to the general government, they could be made a most powerful political engine, which would give strength and perpetuity to any party in whose favor it should once declare itself.

"But the Germans in the United States have, to this day, no powerful political organ to express their opinions and sentiments; and their policy, therefore, is but a reflection from the ruling doctrines of the other states: they are unconscious of their power, and more bent on increasing their numbers, than on concentrating their efforts, and directing them to a certain point. The Germans in America are not so easily excited as their brethren to the south or north, and are consequently often indifferent on a variety of minor questions, the connexion of which with the more important principles of government seems to escape their immediate notice. In this manner they are often defeated in their own ranks, and contrary to their intentions and purposes, made the tool of insidious politicians. But no sooner is an important question of state agitated, than they unite again; and, despite of all efforts to disseminate discord by appealing to their prejudices and local interests, — an appeal which is hardly ever made in vain to the inhabitants of any other section of the country, — persevere in supporting the men and principles of their adoption.

"They are not apt to speculate on politics, but rather act in accordance with general maxims, which are as liberal as possible, and of which they never question the utility, provided they agree with their ideas of moral and political justice. They seldom enter on details, but never desert a principle; and are, therefore, least actuated by motives of interest and selfishness. Their practical sense is republican; and as I have previously observed, they are democratic almost by instinct. But the time may come when they will be conscious of their power; and they will then form a party, the strength and importance of which will, in all probability, be beyond the computation of mere abstract politicians." — pp. 215 – 217.

'We have none but kindly feelings towards the German immigrants to this country; but when they have once taken up their residence with us and become

nationalized, we do not choose to look upon them as Germans. We would regard them as Americans and fellow citizens. But in order to be so regarded by us, they must so regard themselves. Nothing can be more detrimental to them, or tend more to create prejudices against them, than a disposition on their part to form a distinct population by themselves, and especially to band together as a German party in politics. Let them act in political and social life as Americans, not as Germans; let them consider themselves an integral part of our common population, not as foreigners, if they would have this country become to them a second home, and its citizens their brothers. We always welcome foreigners who come to amalgamate with us and to account themselves of us; but emigrants from any foreign nation will find this an uncomfortable residence, if they undertake to get up parties in their own favor, and by combination among themselves to control the politics of the country. Such an undertaking would be fraught with danger both to the emigrants and to the nation. Mr. Grund should have known this, and advised his German brethren more judiciously.

Few travellers in this or any other country have deigned to take much notice of the common people. Travellers see very little of the people among whom they travel. They stop at public houses, and usually visit with the wealthy, the fashionable, or the educated. They see what are usually termed the more favored classes, and from these form their opinion of the nation. An opinion of this country, formed in this way, would be worth little or nothing. The upper classes here, if we may be pardoned the bull, are the lowest, altogether the most unfavorable representatives of the American people. We blame nobody in the world for ridiculing what may be termed American fashionable society, nor for expressing their disgust at the manners of the would-be American aristocracy. Our "good society," the society of which travellers see the most, is the very

worst society, the most vulgar, and the most immoral, of any society in the country. It is the masses that are great with us. Whoever would judge correctly of the American people, must go into the houses of our small, independent proprietors, of our industrious mechanics, and study that portion of our population not met at public hotels, in steamboats, stages, nor saloons. These are our real aristocracy, who for true nobility of mind, and native dignity and courtesy of manners, we will put against the world. English travellers may say what they will about our would-be aristocracy, but we have a people the world cannot match. Of this Mr. Grund is well aware, and we thank him for his notice of the fact.

“ Where a man has to labor all day in order to obtain for himself and family a bare subsistence, there it is impossible for his mind to act with a proper degree of freedom. The physical wants are too urgent to allow him sufficient respite for thought and reflection, and the only thing coveted, after the cravings of his stomach are appeased, is the necessary rest to restore his physical abilities. In America, not only the master mechanic, but also his journeymen, have the means of earning more than is required for a mere living; they are able to procure for themselves comforts which would hardly enter the imagination of similar orders in Europe. They are enabled to command a portion of their time; and their minds being free from the anxieties of a precarious life, and less vitiated by a desire of frivolous pleasures, are better qualified for study or improvement,—the only sure means by which they can hope to better their conditions. Their domestic habits, and the custom of spending the Sabbath at home, are highly favorable to the development of their mental faculties, and in this respect, of immense advantage to the general morals of the people. The majority of the lower order of European workmen hardly think of becoming independent, or doing business on their own account; and, being less sustained by hope, in the exercise of their physical powers, need more relaxation and amusement than the Americans, who consider the hardest of labor but an introduction to something better which is to follow. The American operatives are sustained by the very efforts they make, and need not have recourse to the sordid pleasures of debauchery, or the bottle, in order to plunge themselves into a momentary and brutal oblivion of their present necessities.

"I wonder the superior condition of the laboring classes in America has not been taken notice of by any English tourist, (if we except Mr. Hamilton's philosophical dialogue with the Scotch baker,) while they were so tediously minute in describing the fashionable coteries! No drawing-room, in any part of the world, is without its second and third-rate performers, and their number in America may even be greater than in Europe. Nor will I deny that an American exquisite is, *per se*, an inferior being. A man, in Europe, may be a coxcomb, or a buffoon, in a manner peculiar to his own country, in which case he is still a *national* character; but to be a slavish imitator of the follies of others, in a country where they are only known to be despised, presupposes a degree of presumptuous imbecility, for which no excuse can be found in the customs and manners of the people. If Englishmen censure Americans for imitating the fashions of Europe, they ridicule them justly for not being wiser than themselves, or for succeeding less in an unprofitable enterprise. But let them turn their attention to the thousands with whom they hardly come in contact on their tours; let them observe and watch the elevated character of the merchants, the skilful industry of the mechanic, the sober regularity of the workmen, and they will find ample room for a more charitable exercise of their judgment; they will then find the true strength and superiority of the American *people* over all other nations on the globe. They will find no humiliating imitation in the trade and commerce of the United States. They will see the arts exercised on a most liberal and extensive scale; the character of workmen raised by emulation to that of respectable citizens; and, instead of machines or mechanical operatives, they will discover everywhere intelligent beings, capable of accounting for every process, and improving it constantly by their own ingenuity. In no other country could they behold a similar spectacle; in none other witness the same emancipation of the mind. In England and Scotland a most generous beginning has been made to arrive at similar results; but the improvements have not yet penetrated to all classes, and for many a generation, America yet will be unrivalled in the moral elevation of her citizens.

"A great deal has been said, by American and foreign writers, on the subject of trades' unions and other societies of operatives known under the name of 'workies,' and especially about their cries for 'equal and universal education.' I confess I never knew that the workmen wished to *arrest* the progress of education, in order to reduce the moral superiority of

the higher classes to a sordid level with themselves, but, on the contrary, understood them to covet the same opportunities of mental improvement, which are enjoyed by the wealthier portion of the community. I am quite certain there is no class of Americans so utterly degraded in their moral sentiments, as to wish for universal ignorance, or a comparative mediocrity of talents, in order to protect and excuse their own imbecility. The workmen of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia have struck for the 'ten-hour system,' on the ground that if a man work more than ten hours a day, '*he is unfit to read and improve his mind in the evening, or to superintend the education of his children;*' a plea which expresses certainly a very different desire from that of destroying the opportunities of acquiring superior knowledge. The wages of American workmen are high; but then it is seldom known that they make an improper use of their money; and they abstain entirely from the European custom of spending in one or two days, the whole earnings of the week. They understand not only how to make money, but also the art of saving it; and the amount of capital deposited in the various savings banks of the country furnishes the strongest evidence of the prudence and frugality of their habits. As long as these last, I cannot possibly persuade myself that the institutions of the country are in danger, whatever be the aberrations of individuals, or whole classes, in their respective political orbits." — pp. 290 - 292.

Those of our readers who recollect what an uproar was made a few years since about the "Ten-hour men," will probably read with some surprise the remarks of Mr. Grund in the last paragraph of the above extract. The mechanics in some of our larger cities took it into their heads, a few years since, that ten hours a day was as much as an honest man ought to labor, and therefore resolved that ten hours' labor was as much as they would sell for a day's work. A very harmless resolution one would think. It was neither more nor less than a number of free-men saying to the men who wished to employ them, "We will work for you indeed, but only ten hours in each day." What mischief there was concealed under the mealy form of these words, we were never able to divine. Yet all our great men, learned men,

wealthy men, business men, all those men who think they alone, of all the men of the nation, are qualified to exercise the right of suffrage, and to govern the people for the people's good, were struck with consternation, and for a long time were evidently *distraught*, — a proof of their superiority and fitness to be rulers! We never supported the ten-hour system; but if the mechanics had struck for six hours, instead of ten, we would have supported them to the best of our ability. Six hours is enough for any man to labor in one day, enough for his health, and enough, in a state of society at all approaching a just one, for his worldly prosperity. Man has mind as well as body, and should have time to think as well as to exercise his limbs. If the mechanics have become aware of this fact, and therefore choose to shorten their hours of labor, we should rather applaud, encourage, aid them, than censure them, or be frightened at their movements. Has not the journeyman mechanic a perfect right to say how many hours he will work in a day? Has anybody a right to compel him to work more hours than he chooses? And who that is a man would see his brother man made a beast of burden, doomed to toil from sunrise to sundown, with no time to read, no opportunity to improve his mind, and become a man?

But we are told that these "working men would not spend the few hours' leisure obtained, in acquiring useful information. They would run to the grog-shops, and spend their leisure in dissipation." Now we do not believe this; and if we did, we should not recognise the employer's right of guardianship over men who are every way his equals, except it be in the amount of borrowed money in his pocket. The men who struck for ten hours were not the men who go to grog-shops, who spend their time in dissipation. They were our industrious, honest, and intelligent working men, who, having obtained a little knowledge, wished for leisure to acquire more. The idle and dissipated who hang round places where

they can get drunk, were not of the Ten-hour Men. These loafers, who are maintained occasionally at the public expense, are genuine aristocrats, and have as honorable an aversion to honest labor as any gentleman in the land.

Mr. Grund goes very fully into the question of slavery, and proves clearly that he is no Abolitionist. From many of his views on this subject we wholly dissent. We did intend to remark on this part of his book at some length, but we have not the space to do it. The slave question has become quite an absorbing one. Its discussion cannot be and ought not to be prevented. Slavery in any form is an evil, and should be removed as soon as it can be. The right of citizens of the North to form associations for the removal of slavery in the South, is a distinct question from that of the good or evil of slavery, and should never be confounded with it. We doubt both the right and the expediency of these associations, and therefore are not Abolitionists; but we are decidedly opposed to slavery, in any and every possible shape. All that we of the North have a right to do with Southern slavery is, to throw what light we can on the wrong it does to man, the danger with which it menaces the country, and the means by which it may be safely and expeditiously removed with benefit to the slave. We have no right to use any but moral and rational means, arguments addressed to the reason and consciences of our Southern brethren. The argument of numbers, which is the only argument gained by associations, is an argument which every man, who is conscious of the dignity of manhood, will scorn to listen to. So far as the Abolitionists are merely addressing arguments to the reason and consciences of the community against slavery, we are with them; so far as they are merely organizing associations to concentrate public opinion, and bring it to bear on the Southern planter, we are not with them. We dislike to urge a man to do this or that because public opinion demands it. We con-

sult the voice of God within, not the voice of the multitude without, to learn our duty and to find our motive for acting.

ART. IV.—*Thoughts on Unity, Progress, and Government.*

ALL truth, whether in science, philosophy, religion, or politics, is one. The one truth is God's idea, the Right, the Expedient, the Indispensable.

The soul is also a unity. It has no dualism, either in its powers or its requisites. Humanity has but one law, as the Deity has but one mind.

All errors in theology, politics, life, have originated in dualism, complexity, ignorance of, or disloyalty to, unity. Mankind have sought good, not in the resolution of all things into one, but in division. Hence idolatry, despotism, anarchy. The mission of the present, our hope, our safety, is the centering of the fractions in the great One, the return of all men into the One Man, the atonement of the Creature with the Creator.

All nature is republican. Minerals, vegetables, animals, men, angels, the Deity, sway themselves. Each blade of grass, each constellation, is an independency. The harmony of the whole universe is but the union of distinct sovereignties. As by polarization, spirits in all worlds act and react upon each other. The thoughts of a child move the cherubim, as a drop influences the ocean. So one soul heaves the whole tide of spiritual life that flows from eternity to eternity.

Truth thus communicates itself, as by electricity, from prophet to prophet, as one by one the several minds, through which it passes, conduct, and straightway become surcharged again.

This union of all in one, being offended and lost sight of through selfishness, was the origin of sin, war, slavery. The oracle therefore ceased; want and fear became the insurgent foes of peace, and hatred in all its forms usurped the throne of universal love.

The elements of a Millennial kingdom have spread through the Past as in chaotic parcels; the Present is fast centring all these fragments; the Future will give them sphericity and an orbit. Heaven will be the space of their revolution, God their everlasting sun, centre, and system, and eternity their cycle.

The present age is prophetic. The seers are on the watch towers, gazing with serene eye upon the moral firmament, reading the aspect of the lights and shadows which alternate in the moral heavens, solving the problems, interpreting the prophecies, and opening the parables which are written in the history of man, which are uttered by the experience of society.

The inspiration of nature is the music in all our hearts. Brotherhood, the warm tide that, flowing through the arteries of the universal frame, connects the unit to the whole, and the whole to the parts by a life-current of quick loves. Individual minds are the best interpreters of the Divinity. The original thinkers, the single-eyed, the holy-hearted, are the purest conductors of infinite truth, the Christs of God. The word is incarnate in every God-child. The oracles of the Father-mind issue warm from the bosoms of his Well-beloved, in all generations. Revelation is confined to no age. No man can invent truth; all men may discover it. God reveals himself to all orders of spirits equally, as the sun illumines all alike, even the blind. It is our opaqueness that hinders the Deity from shining through us. Were we only transparent and true, we should shine also.

Fear has frozen up the well-springs of truth in the past. The voice in us, which is in unison with the same voice in every man, must utter itself, or the prophet in us dies. The teacher is taught by his own lesson; as he scatters light, his own orbs are brimmed

with light; and thus the blind see, and the dumb find tongues, and through sympathy with truth, a heavenly speech is breathed through the lips of death. The rustic is thus touched with an Isaiah's coal from the inward altar, and Chrysostoms are multiplied in the back-woods, on the hill sides, and in the market place. Thus has the world ever been taught; Moses from his sheepfold, the carpenter's son from his manger.

Thus truth is constantly surprising us by its spontaneous outbreakings; and while men say, "Lo here, and lo there," the kingdom of God is within us. The mysteries in which truth has been shrouded by the initiated, theology by the priest, nature by the professor, have frightened young and credulous minds from researching the more profound religion of Humanity, the more glorious science of the Soul. Corporations have monopolized literature and the arts, colleges patented for themselves the sole right to inculcate truth, and the pale of the church has shut out man and shut in Christianity, so that all aliens, from these self-constituted commonwealths, are either idiots, or infidels; and notwithstanding all this, are there mines still unwrought, systems unmeasured. The Omniscient, the Infinite, is still to be approached, to be known. The Allholy may yet be seen, worshipped, loved, and imitated.

One of the most striking characteristics of the present age, the spirit of association, is fast giving place to the more powerful engine of progress, individuality. The moral power, hitherto divided, subdivided, and weakened through multiplied associations, is beginning to be centred and sublimated in the strong focus of single minds. The great idea, that the whole is best served by the perfection of the parts, is becoming more and more the ruling sentiment of our times. Men are daily made to feel and to revere the "might that slumbers in a peasant's arm," the value, the responsibility, the God-like capabilities of individuals. This is a progress of public opinion, far in advance of all the past. It is a great central truth

which shall one day become as universal as it is omnipotent. It is a truth which speaks to the souls of all who perceive and appreciate it in the voice of Divine inspiration, commanding a self-respect far removed from all egotism, prompting a steady and sincere obedience to the inward original law,—the elder Scripture, which in its result will unite the Human with the Divine, the whole spiritual universe with the Father. Men have been classed heretofore in masses; they have been weighed collectively. The standard of any age or nation has been that of the general average. The view now taken of mankind is a personal one. We look at man in the abstract. The standard of the age is one man, the purest specimen, the most perfect character. As a prism separates the rays of light, so does the highest idea of this age count, and single out, and give independency to individual minds. This characteristic is the bright harbinger of new power to the approaching era; rightly seen, and duly appreciated, it is the chief element of that revolution on whose eve we are standing.

To this feature of the age, too, we are in no small degree indebted for those numerous biographies, lately presented us by the press, of the great and good, who have been signalized in the world's annals; and to this we owe some of the best poetry and philosophy of our times, the best and most original papers of our periodical literature. Heretofore there has been too much mental and moral plagiarism manifested in all departments of science, literature, life. Few men have dared to utter the sincere, profound, and lone reflections and convictions of their own spirits. Every religious, philosophical, or political idea, which courted the public eye, or popular ear, has been clad in popular guise, moulded into fashionable shape, and tricked out in the cant of party, sect, or school. The press, the lyceum, the pulpit have been all held in servile bondage to the taste of the past. Every post in the government, every legislative assembly, has been crowded with the delegates of a departed day,

with men whose constituents are either dead, or have passed on in the progress of society, to a point far in their advance.

The idea of the present has not been echoed in the Capitol; the spirit of the age is nowhere truly embodied; conservative forms, a paper constitution, the reverence of the people for the past, and, above all, the balancing power of hope in the future realization of the great idea of our government, is all which has given any centre or union to our republic. We rejoice, however, that the reign of yesterday is over, that neither its watchwords nor its livery will suit the men of to-morrow. We are grateful that there are spirits sufficient for to-day's exigencies, and the progressive duties which, like "coming events, cast their shadows before." We hail the promise everywhere given, by the restless, panting, prospective, and resolving genius of the present age, simultaneously breaking forth with electric movement and prophetic power throughout our land, of a firm union, a manly struggle, a majestic achievement in the cause of American truth, religion, government, life. Amid the gloom of political strife, commercial embarrassments, and monetary revolutions, we are comforted with the rise and progress of a movement party, as yet perhaps ungathered, certainly unmarshalled as a distinct body, yet none the less but rather the more powerful on that account, from the very fact of the diffusion of its members, and the peace and silence, but strong moral force which secretly unites them. This party we may denominate the brotherhood of universal Man. Its field is the world; its bond love; its aim the perfection and happiness of entire Humanity. It embraces all those spirits in every clime and of every name, who have been regenerated by the new birth of righteousness, duty, progress. It comprises all ages, both sexes, and all nations, who acknowledge the legitimate supremacy of the soul; who feel strongly the inward workings of the Divinity enshrined within them; who have seized the true idea of Christianity, and separated all

that is powerful, practical, and holy, in the religion of Jesus, from all that was local, temporary, and incidental; who have passed beyond all symbols to the spirit and truth breathing and embodied in the living Christ; who regard the salvation of the gospel as character; and whose highest ideal of Divine worship is to become like the Father.

Christianity, rightly understood, has a mission to fulfil for Humanity, as yet but faintly conceived, certainly never systematically developed. It has great political objects to achieve, a heavenly kingdom to establish on earth, such a kingdom as philosophers, philanthropists, and statesmen have delighted to contemplate as a beautiful vision of Utopian fancy, but too beautiful ever to be realized. Essentially progressive in itself, it is the sure engine of progress to society. Deeply rooted in the constitution of man, its indisputable office is his entire perfection, an office which it proceeds calmly indeed, but surely and successfully, to accomplish. An important and indestructible element of spiritual being, it is the spontaneous system by which all spirits in the universe *are*, love, and grow; the omnipotent law which the Deity himself fulfils. If we will receive it, there is no other law of mind than Christianity, no higher constitution of government, bill of rights, magna charta of Humanity. For what is Christianity, in its last analysis, but God? What is the gospel revelation, but a transcript of the Divine mind? and what was Christ but the visible image of the character of the Infinite, God manifest in the flesh, God-Man with us?

From the earliest Fetichism to the most perfect Monotheism, by all religious forms, by every theological symbol, from prostration before an image to the worship of a Christian Father by imitation of his holiness, this great idea has been embodied. Religion and government rightly understood are one; the craving for a power to adore is the yearning after a mind to obey; the hungering and thirsting after a righteousness to rule, the desire of a perfect system of legisla-

tion—life. The inward struggle to attain God is the profound longing after a model, guide, and governor for our salvation. Therefore it is that throughout all systems of religion we find, clearly marked, a uniformity of character between the people worshipping, and the Being worshipped. The dominant idea of the Divinity in any age, is always the ruling feature of the religion, character, and legislation of that age. Men, whose objects of adoration are heroes, are warlike; men, who worship the divinities which their vices and passions enshrine, are vicious; men whose ideas of the Deity, like those of the Jews, are merely ritual, are formal. True Christians are spiritual. Describe to me the Deity a man worships, and I will portray the man. Show me the nation's God, and I will define its laws and character. It is precisely as natural for a good man to worship God, as for the savage to deify demons. Divinities mark epochs in the world's history, as well in individual virtue as in jurisprudence. The early sacrifices of men and beasts mark a cruel age; the worship of Venus and Bacchus marks a sensual one. And thus we might settle every period in the progress of man, morally or politically considered, by the data furnished by his religious symbols.

The same is true with regard to Christianity. In proportion as it has been rightly understood, in proportion as it has clearly and truly instructed mankind in the knowledge of God, in that same proportion individuals and nations have advanced in their characters and government; and in proportion as it becomes better understood, and as it more fully instructs them, shall they continue to advance. Every advancement made in the science of the Divine mind is a step taken in perfect Humanity. Every advance gained in the true wisdom of Man is, in its turn, an advance gained in the interpretation of the Deity.

The tendency of all enlightened Christian education then must be the establishment of a perfect theocracy; not a theocracy like that of the Jews, but the theocracy of Jesus; not a theocracy wherein priests have

power, but that in which God shall reign in the spirit of his children, that of the great human brotherhood.* The tendency of all growth in religion will be a centring of all spirits in their great First Cause. There will be union in opinion, for the one truth alone will be worshipped; union in thought, and heart, and hope, for the soul [the universal reason] will be revered, as the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. There will be union in government, for there will be only one law, of the one Lawgiver, even God. Forms may grow old, altars decay, and prophets die, creeds change, and dynasties crumble in the dust, but man shall always be priest and king, so long as he shall be true to the Urim and Thummim stamped on his heart; so long as he shall obey the oracle of his own spirit, and fulfil the inwritten commandment of his Godlike nature. As we learn to reason justly, and record our experience wisely, we shall change our religious views, so as to permit the reception of more perfect, because personal, revelations. Whatever may become of systems, principalities, and powers, Truth changes not, but remains the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. We should remember that we have the nature and capacities of God-sons to account for. We should toil, even to the baptism of blood, for the establishment of our Father's kingdom, and for its establishment on the earth, ever remembering the apostolic promise, that "speaking the truth in love, we may grow up into him in all things, who is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

* This would be rather an *anthropocracy*, if we may coin a word, or a democracy, than a theocracy. Yet it makes no difference; for that which is highest in man is one with God; and it is only that which is highest in man that has a right to rule. True democracy and theocracy, as above defined, are one and the same thing. We do not object therefore to the idea of the writer, though we own that we dislike the term theocracy. — *Ed.*

ART. V.—*The Boston Association of the Friends of the Rights of Man.*

VERY few of our readers, we presume, have ever heard of this new Association, and most of them, on reading its name, will probably be somewhat puzzled to make out who may be its members, or what can be its object. Are its members abolitionists, infidels, fanatics? or are they philosophers? What propose they to do? Why do they associate in defence of the rights of man, especially in this free country, where the rights of man are acknowledged and secured? Perhaps the following, which they have put forth as their confession of faith, may throw some light on these questions.

“*Principles.*—1st. The *rights of man* are not grants or privileges; they are derived from no compacts; but are founded on the simple fact that man is man. They cannot be alienated by the individual, given nor taken away by civil authority.

“2d. Every man, by virtue of the fact that he is a man, has the right to develop freely, and to perfect all his faculties, his whole nature, as a moral, intellectual, and physical being.

“3d. Every man has a right to freedom of industry, freedom of thought, and freedom of conscience.

“4th. The rights of society can never be in opposition to the rights of the individual. If they could be, right would be able to change its nature, and become wrong, and there would be the foundation of a perpetual war between the individual and society, in which both parties would be, at the same time and in relation to the same proposition, in the right and in the wrong.

“5th. That social state, therefore, which does not respect all and every one of the rights of its members, is by virtue of that fact wrong, and needs to be revolutionized, reformed, or ameliorated.

“6th. Government is the creature of society, and is restricted in its functions to the mission of maintaining, from all encroachments, the rights of the individual and of society.

“*Objects.*—Our Objects are to ascertain in detail and to determine with precision what are the rights of man and of society; to ascertain and fix the boundaries of the legitimate

province of government; to keep government within its province; and lastly, to labor for such reforms in governments, in the individual, and in society, as will secure to every member of the community the opportunity and the means to be and to do, what he is fitted to be and to do, by the nature and faculties with which he is endowed.

Means.— Our Means are simple, but mighty, and such as can work no injustice to governments or to individuals. The causes of all existing abuses are ignorance and selfishness; abuses, therefore, can be removed only by knowledge and love; these are our means. We wish to direct our own attention, and that of the whole community, more directly than it has heretofore been, to the whole subject of the rights of Man, and the means of promoting the progress of Man, and of Society.

“ We therefore propose to inquire into the whole subject, and to inform ourselves as to what the Rights of Man and Society really are; also to ascertain how far those rights are acknowledged, secured, or enjoyed in our present social state, and how far custom, prejudice, false notions, governments, or legislation, disregard, abridge, or attempt to disannul them.

“ If we can do something by private discussions, by public debates, by lectures, and the publication of well written essays, and select libraries, to diffuse just knowledge among the people on these great subjects, and to kindle up in our own hearts and in the hearts of others a love of virtue, and the genuine sentiments of Humanity, we shall at least do something to preserve our rights as far as already obtained, and to obtain them where they are yet denied.

“ Let the people once perceive and understand their rights— perceive and understand what is wrong in our present systems of legislation, and defective in our social arrangements, and let them be inspired by a true sense of the worth of Man, as man, and they will easily and peaceably effect all the governmental and social reforms needed to place every man in the free and full enjoyment of all his faculties.”

This, to our way of thinking, is not a bad confession of faith; and it indicates very good intentions on the part of those who make it. It proves that the members of this new association are not wholly ignorant of the subject with which they concern themselves; that they have lofty aims; that they take broad and comprehensive views; and that they con-

template a most thorough, radical reform, one which will root out nearly all existing evils, and base governments and society itself on the laws of universal, eternal, and unalterable justice. For such a reform, every heart must cry out, and every hand exert itself. The members of this association may never live to realize it; they will in all likelihood die without having been able to witness any perceptible change in the world for the better; but we cannot but deem them deserving high praise for contemplating such a reform, and for undertaking to effect it. Men who have bright and glorious dreams are never to be spoken lightly of. They have rich stuff in their souls, and may always be relied on as true friends to the cause of Humanity.

We may also add that this association is composed mainly, if not exclusively, of mechanics and other working-men; and it is this fact, more than any other, that has induced us to place its name at the head of this article. This is the age of associations. Men now-a-days associate for every purpose, great or small, good, bad, or indifferent. The simple fact of the organization of a new association deserves of itself no attention. But we confess we cannot view an association like this with indifference. We feel something of patriotic pride swelling our hearts, when we find even our working-men associating for the study and defence of the rights of man, and putting forth such declarations as the one we have laid before our readers. It is a proof that our free institutions work well, and that their quickening and elevating influences reach even to the lowest ranks of society. Nowhere but in this democratic country of ours, could we think of finding an association like the one we are considering. The working-men must have advanced far, and attained to a good share of well-being, before they could think of their rights, before they could have the leisure, the intelligence, and the means of investigating such great subjects as those set forth in this confession of faith. The fact then of the organi-

zation of this association is a proof of the comparatively good condition of the working-men in this country, that their condition has been improved, and that though it may not yet be as good as it should be, or as it one day will be, yet that it has become tolerable. This fact should endear our free institutions to the friends of mankind, and forbid us ever to despair of popular liberty.

We have been struck, coming as it does from the working-men, with the catholic spirit that pervades this confession of faith. It breathes peace and good will; it censures nobody, makes war upon no class of society, and manifests hostility to no existing institution. It makes war, if war it makes, upon ignorance and selfishness only; and the weapons of its warfare are those of knowledge and love; powerful weapons indeed, but harmless save against evil and evil-doers. These working-men seem to forget themselves, to sink themselves in common Humanity, and to dream of no good for themselves, which is not at the same time a good for universal Man. Changes they no doubt contemplate, reforms they may demand, thorough, radical reformers they may wish to be, but not with a view to their own interests alone—not with a view to the interests of a class, sect, or party; but with a view to the interests of mankind. We commend this fact to those of our friends who are apprehending a “war of the poor against the rich,” who have feared that the movements of the working-men would render property insecure, throw the whole community into a universal hubbub, and send us all back to the savage state to go naked, to feed on nuts and the scanty and precarious supplies of fishing and hunting. The working-men will respect the rights of property, for they have a natural love of justice, and because they have no design in what they are attempting, but that of making justice universally triumphant.

More might be said against the visionary or impracticable character of what these working-men propose, than against its dangerous tendency. It might be

said, with some plausibility, perhaps, that hopes of a reform so vast, so thorough, so radical, of results so desirable and so felicitous as they contemplate, are perfectly idle, and that no sane man, at all acquainted with the world, can indulge them for a moment; that the world is as good, society, here especially, as perfect, as we have any right to expect; and that instead of wasting ourselves in fruitless efforts to make the world better, we ought to do our best to keep it from growing worse. This all may be so. We have a great respect for the practical men, the men of routine, who say so; that is, when they keep in their own sphere; but when they undertake to prophesy, we have no disposition to lend them our ears. We cannot but distrust their capacity to look through the whole future, and tell us exactly what can and what cannot be done. They would themselves do well to bear in mind that he, who undertakes to tell what cannot be done, may be as much out in his reckoning, as he who undertakes to tell what can be done. For ourselves, we rarely tell a man that he is a visionary, that his schemes are impracticable. We do not know everything. We have not been able, as yet, to find out the exact boundary between the possible and the impossible, the practicable and the impracticable, between the man who is verily a visionary, and the one who entertains projects which are rational and may one day be realized. We do not know what may or may not yet be done. For aught we know, man may yet rise above the loftiest and loveliest ideal, which the most rapt dreamer in his most ecstatic moments has ever bodied forth to his dreaming fancy. "The prophet that hath a dream let him tell a dream," for who knows but the dream may turn out to have been from God, and to contain a truth in the diffusion of which all coming ages are interested?

More than all this, we would not discourage these dreamers, as the world calls them. The man whose mind never strays beyond the actual, never soars into the ideal, and loses itself in that which is not

and perhaps will not be realized, is never able to perform any great and glorious deed. The mind moves before the hand; and he who contemplates nothing great or good in his soul, will accomplish nothing great or good in his deeds. It is by communing with the sweet, and holy, and sublime visions which ever and anon flit across the soul, by seizing, seeking to embody, and prevent them from escaping us, that we ever become able to do anything for which the world should bless our memories. He who has a glorious ideal will achieve glorious deeds. He who hopes much will accomplish much. Never should we damp the ardor of hope, or seek to chain to the earth the soul that would rise to heaven. Never should we seek to subdue man's faith in himself or in his race. Faith is the true miracle-worker. To him that believeth all things are possible. We know not how much injury we have done by clipping the wings of the young eagles, that were ambitious of taking their lofty flight through the heavens; how much we have dwarfed the intellect and kept back the progress of our race by our sneers at enthusiasm, and our cold-water counsels of experience poured on the ardent hopes, and burning zeal of the young prophets of Humanity. Men of the world, who never had any dreams, and old men, who no longer remember the dreams of their youth, should never be suffered to open their lips, or in any way to hint a counsel. They are the Deevs of Ahriman's kingdom, the kingdom of darkness, and should ever be avoided by the children of Ormuzd, the children of the light.

But we are not sure that these working-men deserve to be accounted visionaries. We confess that we see nothing in the result they would bring about, in the end they are in pursuit of, that even *practical* men, men of routine, men wise for yesterday and not for tomorrow, men with pleasant country seats, who think only of enjoying snug quarters for the rest of life's campaign, need regard as visionary or chimerical. They, who oppose the result, who think they can arrest

the working-men's movements, and prevent this result; they are the visionaries, the real dreamers. This result, this end the working-men are pursuing, of which they have a lively sentiment, if not a clear perception, is that towards which the whole force of modern civilization is bearing us. These working-men's movements, which have alarmed some, and which short-sighted politicians have thought to arrest by a sneer or a nick-name, by crying out "workie," "loco-foco," "agrarian," and other like terms of presumed reproach, are but so many proofs that the great law of modern civilization is still in force, and that its influence is at work in the heart of the millions. The working-men in these alarming or visionary movements are only, consciously or unconsciously, exerting themselves to fulfil the mission of that order of civilization, to which Christianity has given birth. The whole tendency of this civilization is in the direction these working-men are looking, to the realization of such "reforms as will place every man in the free and full enjoyment of all his faculties."

They, who have no faith in the progress of man and society, are always very fond of appealing to history, as though history was in their favor; and they are always ready with a pile of individual facts, with which to drive back the reformer or beat out his brains; but happily for Humanity, the reformer can read history to-day as well as they, and it shall go hard but his reading shall turn out to be as correct as theirs. According to his reading, history shows us everywhere progress, and is ever with her ten thousand angel voices calling us to a loftier and lovelier future. They, who find history against the reformer, may perhaps be convicted of having never read history. Descriptions of some famous battles they may have read, some court anecdotes they may have picked up, and the dates of certain events they may have ascertained, but the concealed causes in operation, the invisible forces, the spiritual facts, the laws of the

great events which have occurred, and to which the facts usually narrated in history owe their birth, and which are the only things in history it concerns us to know; these it is altogether likely they have not discovered, have not stumbled upon in any of their historic researches. To know history is to know these; and these, with modesty be it said, bear witness to the kindling truth that the human race is progressive, and that society is ever struggling to realize a more and more perfect ideal.

How many different orders of civilization have, each in its turn, ruled the world, we know not. Some think they catch here and there a glimpse of an earlier civilization, which they call the Cyclopean, the "golden age" of the poets; but the earliest civilization, of which we can affirm anything with certainty, is the sacerdotal civilization, as we find it in ancient India, Egypt, and Syria; in its greatest perfection, perhaps, in Judea. The idea of God is the dominant idea of this order of civilization. God reigns, in principle, supreme, though, in fact, his symbol, or representative, the priesthood, possesses all the power. The state and the individual, as we have shown in another place, succumb to the priesthood. Everything, all ideas and all actions, are held to be subordinate and subservient to the worship of God.

To the sacerdotal civilization succeeds the Greek and Roman, or political civilization. The dominant idea of this order of civilization is the state. The state is everything. The priesthood is a function of the state, and religion is regulated by a decree of the senate, or an edict of the emperor. The individual man is not yet born. There is no people. There is the Roman city, but no Roman people, as we understand the term people now.

The mission of this order of civilization was the realization of the majesty of the state. This mission it accomplished. We stand in awe, even to-day, of the majesty of the Roman state. Wherever Rome set her foot she left the imprint of her majesty. The

modern traveller, over what was once her dominion, is struck with a sense of her greatness in every fragment of her antiquity he meets. The language she has left us, reveals in every phrase, in its very construction, in its single words even, her majesty. We can hardly, by imagination the most creative, conceive of the greatness and power of that City of the Tiber, which could make her presence felt, her faintest whisper heard, and obeyed as law, at the same moment, throughout the extremities of Europe, Asia, and Africa. But the majesty, before which we stand awe-struck, is always the majesty of the state, never of the people as individuals. The individual is merely a member of the corporation, and aside from his corporate capacity has no recognised existence, no rights, no worth. If he is cared for, it is solely because he is an appendage to the state, a part of the body politic.

This fact becomes apparent, if we merely glance at the conquest of the Roman empire by the Barbarians. In the long agony of that struggle, the Barbarian encounters no forces but those of the Roman legions. In scarcely an instance does he find a people to resist him. The moment the Roman state is overthrown, nothing is to be found standing. From the general silence of history, we might almost infer that just in proportion as the Roman legions were withdrawn from the provinces, especially from the provinces of Gaul, they became deserts, and that of all the numerous populations which covered them none were left. In most instances of a conquered country, the conquerors do not gain at once a peaceful and undisputed possession. The conquered revolt, rebel, rise against their conquerors, and attempt to throw off their yoke. But nothing of this meets us in the history of the conquest of the Roman empire by the Barbarians. When once the regular forces of the empire have been overcome, the conquest is complete. We take our stand in the heart of the Western Empire at the close of the fifth century; the Franks are seated in Gaul,

the Visigoths in Spain, the Vandals in Africa, and the Ostrogoths in Italy, and of that vast empire we see nothing, unless it be a few of its municipal institutions in the city of Rome itself, and some of the larger towns. Wherever the eye extends, nothing is to be seen but barbarians, the church, and slaves. The reason of this must needs be in the fact that, under the Roman civilization, all authority, all energy was absorbed in the state, and none was left to the people. That civilization created a majestic city, but not a majestic people. The populations which lived under it had no inherent vigor, no self-reliance, no resources in themselves. Consequently, when the protection of the city was withdrawn, they had no power to beat back the invader; and when fallen under the Barbarian rule, no energy to revolt and to struggle to regain their independence.

Rome called herself a Republic, and boasted of her liberty; but the people had less freedom under her dominion than they now have under the most despotic of Christian princes. Beneath the overshadowing majesty of the government, the dazzling prosperity of the state, there was the most abject servitude, the most inconceivable wretchedness. The masses were degraded below the condition of our Southern slaves. Human rights, human well-being, a regard for man simply as man, efforts to raise every man to the true dignity of manhood, were unknown, undreamed of. Now was this to be the definitive state of human society? Could this civilization be the term of human progress? It could not. Something better for man was needed, and must come. The good of Humanity required a new and a different order of civilization; one which should substitute the majesty of man for the majesty of the state. This new order of civilization is the natural fruit of the Christian idea of the worth of man, as man. Christianity gives to man precisely the place given by the political civilization to the state. But by its great doctrine of the universal brotherhood of Humanity, the enfranchise-

ment it demands for one man, it demands for every man.

Modern civilization is the offspring of Christianity. It is the attempt to realize the great idea of the equal worth of every individual man, as man. Its mission is the perfect realization of this idea in the new society to which it gives birth. Now the perfect realization of this idea is precisely what these workingmen, of whom we have spoken, are striving after. Will this idea be realized? That is, will modern civilization fulfil its mission? Will it fail, die before its time comes? Did Judaism fail before it had fulfilled its mission? Did Greece and Rome expire before their work was done? Has a nation ever been known to die before realizing the idea on which it was founded? Are there any indications of disease, weakness, decline, decrepitude, in modern civilization? Has it ceased to extend itself, to make conquests? Is there a new order of civilization springing up and threatening to invade its territory? Is it not still vigorous, young, and full of the future? What reason have we, then, to think that it will fail to do its work?

When modern civilization began its career, the individual, we have said, was nothing, the state was everything. The first thing to be done, was to break down the state and raise up the individual. But this could be done only by destroying the old order of civilization, and of course not without overthrowing the Roman empire which it had created and which was its last word. This could be done only by raising up a new and vigorous society in its bosom, which should contain the germs of the new civilization, and by the influx of a new people, in whom the individual should still live in all his integrity. The first was found in the Church which undermined the Roman state from within, and the second was supplied by the Barbarians who invaded and conquered it from without.

In the savage state, individuality predominates. There is in that state no society. The elements of society are there, but they are isolated, and for the most part inoperative. Each man is his own centre, and forms a whole by himself. The city is not yet organized, and counts for nothing. The tribe counts for something, but it can never absorb the individual. The attachment to the tribe, or to its chieftain, is personal, not political. The Barbarians who supplanted the Roman empire cannot be said to have been pure savages, nevertheless they had not advanced so far as to lose sight of the individual. Personal freedom was still the dominant sentiment. Individual Barbarians indeed grouped, at unequal distances, around a chief; but he was their leader, not their master; and their attachment to him was by no means a political attachment. He was not in their eyes the representative of the majesty of the state, but a man like the rest of them, only perhaps a little taller, or the descendant of a more respected branch of the common family. The Barbarians' idea of freedom was always that of personal freedom, freedom of the individual, not the freedom of the state, or body politic. In seating themselves in the Roman territory, they necessarily introduced into that territory this element of individual freedom. This is one of the benefits which has resulted from the overthrow of the Roman empire, and may induce us to regard the destruction of the Roman civilization as a blessing, not as a curse, to Humanity. As we come to know more of the designs of Providence, and to see more clearly their wisdom, we shall be less and less disposed to complain of what has been.

If we take our stand again in the Western Empire immediately after the Conquest, immediately after the irruptions of the Barbarians have ceased, we shall discover, already at work, all the elements of modern civilization. These elements are, first, The Church, depository of the earlier or sacerdotal civilization, invigorated by the infusion of the Christian idea of the

majesty of man ; second, Royalty, or recollections of imperial Rome, mingled with the Barbarian notions of chieftainship ; third, Republicanism, or recollections of republican Rome which survived in the city of Rome, in some of the Italian cities, and a few towns in southern Gaul ; and fourth, Feudalism, in germ, which embodied the new element, that of personal freedom.*

Each of these elements is good and essential to a perfect state of society. The fundamental idea of the church is that of the supremacy of moral power. Its aim is to substitute, in the government of the world, moral power for brute force. The order of civilization it represents, the sacerdotal, is that which breaks down the savage state, and rescues man from the dominion of brute force. It must necessarily precede the political civilization. Theocracy is older than monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy, as the priesthood is older than the state. The church becomes mischievous only when it becomes exclusive, and governs in the interests of the priesthood, and not according to the law of God ; when it resorts to material force to make what it calls moral right prevail. It then becomes a theocracy, and practises a tyranny over man, of all tyrannies the worst ; for it strikes not only the body, but the soul also, perverts conscience, and makes man a slave within as well as without.

Royalty, as it exists in modern Europe, is a branch of republicanism. All governments, whatever their form, which represent the majesty of the state and are held to be instituted for the public, are republican. Asiatic monarchies are instituted not for the public, but for the monarch ; they therefore are not republics. But the governments of France and England, for instance, are held to be instituted not for the benefit of the monarch, but to take charge of the public affairs, for the public good. The real idea which lies at the bottom of republicanism, whether

* See Guizot's *Histoire générale de la Civilisation Moderne en Europe*. Paris, 1828.

bearing a royal or popular form, is that of the state. The idea of the state is that of the social nature of man. Its mission is to realize the social instincts of mankind, to give order, regularity, harmony, stability, to all social actions and social intercourse. When it becomes exclusive, separated, on the one hand, from morality, and, on the other, from personal freedom, it degenerates into despotism either of the one, the few, or the many, and becomes unjust, cruel, and oppressive.

The fundamental element of feudalism is, as we have said, the element of individuality or personal freedom. It is the recognition of the fact that there are rights of man, as well as rights of the priesthood, and of the state. But when this element is predominant, not limited by the moral and the social elements of our nature, it breaks all social bonds, destroys everything like social order, and precipitates us into the savage state. When it is not generalized, or when it is coupled with the notion that might creates right, and that he only deserves to be a freeman who is able to assert and maintain his freedom, it establishes an order of things like that, which prevailed in Europe from the sixth century to nearly the close of the fourteenth. It gives us then only here and there a man, (a baron, for baron means man, a man, or the man, probably from the Latin, *vir*,) while the many are his vassals, serfs, bondmen, or slaves. An exemplification of this may be seen on any southern slave plantation, and a reminiscence of it in a cotton factory in our own New England.

The exclusive predominance of any one of these elements would have defeated the design of modern civilization. Has any one of these been able to obtain exclusive dominion over modern society?

Each of these elements of modern civilization has made its effort to reign without a rival. The church made the attempt, and appeared to succeed, but it did not. The progress of civilization is not backward. The past never returns. The success of the

church would have been the reproduction of the sacerdotal civilization of Egypt, India, Judea, which had yielded to the political civilization of Greece and Rome. It therefore failed. It reached its culminating point under Hildebrand, Gregory VII., and from that time, notwithstanding appearances and pretensions, it steadily declined till Luther appeared to prepare the way for its reconstruction under a more liberal form. Royalty attempted to gain exclusive dominion, and under the Frank emperor, Charlemagne, seemed to have reproduced imperial Rome; but feudalism was too strong for it, and Charlemagne was hardly laid in his tomb, before his empire was dissolved. Republicanism, especially in the Italian cities and the large towns in the south of France, made an effort, threatened for a time to reproduce republican Rome on a small scale, and to cover Europe with a multitude of city-republics; but it could not succeed against royalty, feudalism, and the church. Feudalism made its effort also, and nearly plunged the European world into primeval barbarism. It resisted all the tendencies to centralization which manifested themselves under Charlemagne, and Gregory VII. It held the burghers in subjection, and yet it enfranchised the slave. Under Louis XI., it was shorn of its power, and it lost itself in the Public under Louis XIV. Not one of these elements has been able to succeed in obtaining exclusive dominion, and yet all the ideas they represent have ever been gaining power.

The conquest of England by the Normans hastened in that country the march of civilization, and tended to establish and develop those free institutions, which have for so long a time been the boast of Englishmen. The first effect of the conquest was a large accession of power to the central government, that is, to the monarch. This was necessary in order to keep the Saxons, or native English, in subjection, and to secure to the Norman adventurers the quiet possession of their estates. But this accession of power to the central government led to tyranny, on the part of the

monarch, and for a time threatened the triumph of absolutism. Feudalism took the alarm, and calling to its aid a portion of the burghers, principally of the Saxon race, wrested Magna Charta from king John at Runnymede, a sort of compromise between feudalism and royalty. For a time the preponderance might have been on the side of feudalism; but the barons found themselves arrested in their progress by the burghers. They had used the burghers against king John, against royalty, and these uniting with royalty under Henry VII., restrained and all but annihilated them, weakened as they had become by the wars of the Roses. Royalty threatened again to become absolute under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, but it was resisted under James I. and decapitated under his successor. The Republic appeared with the Long Parliament; but inasmuch as sufficient account was not made of personal freedom, it gave way to the Restoration, which in its turn yielded to the Revolution of 1688, a compromise between all the elements of modern civilization, the church, royalty, feudalism, and republicanism.

Thus we see that not one of these elements has succeeded, though all have made the attempt. Each in turn has been defeated. Yet in being defeated it has not been destroyed. Defeat has brought along with it a modification, but an increase rather than a diminution of real power. Royalty, meaning by it either the central government or the representative of the majesty of the state, has been always on the advance. Order has been ever on the increase, and social relations have ever been becoming more determinate and fixed, social action and intercourse freer and more regular. The church, though shorn of some of its material splendors, has lost nothing of its spiritual power. Moral power has been continually gaining on brute force. France was more truly religious in the eighteenth century than it was in the eleventh. Feudalism had lost much of its exclusive dominion, but personal freedom and security, the ideas it repre-

sented, were much greater under Louis XIV., or James II., than under saint Louis, or Henry III. Republicanism had not succeeded in establishing the Communal régime; yet in the sixteenth century, we find a PUBLIC, and the burghers sitting in Parliament as one of the three estates of the realm, and exerting an influence on public affairs, almost infinitely greater than they did in the most palmy days of the Communes.

Though all the elements of modern civilization existed and were at work, as soon as the Barbarian conquest had been effected, yet they existed separately and were at work, each on its own account. Before modern civilization could achieve its destiny, all these elements were to be brought together and moulded into an harmonious whole. They must needs go through a process of fusion. The governing forces, the church, royalty, and republicanism needed to be fused into one uniform power; and the feudal or conquering population, and the conquered or indigenious population, into a uniform population, in which every member should be free and equal to every other member. This was the work to be done. How far has it been accomplished?

One great imperfection in modern society has been the separation of church and state. The separation of church and state is the separation of morality and politics. The church, faithfully or unfaithfully, represents the ideas which belong to the moral order; the state represents those which belong to the social order. The church separated from the state gives us a moral, spiritual code indeed, but one which embraces no social idea, which in no wise regulates the intercourse of man with man, as a social being, or directs him to labor for the melioration or progress of society. The state separated from the church establishes a social order indeed, but a social order that embraces no moral idea, and which is supported by no appeals to conscience, or to a sense of justice inherent in man. It is founded on physical might, and is sustained by

the sword, the *posse comitatus*, the dungeon, the scaffold, and the gibbet. The two, not united, but, blended into one, forming a unity rather than a union, give us a government resting for its support on moral power, and a social order founded on justice. The unity of church and state is the great desideratum. Now to this unity, we think, both church and state have been tending. This is what the Puritans had a presentiment of, precisely what Vane, the Fifth Monarchy men, and the Quakers sought to realize in the English Revolution of 1648.

There should be in no country two societies, one spiritual and the other political. During the past, this division has been doubtless the less of two evils; but it always marks an imperfect social state. Civil government should be instituted for the purpose of maintaining social order, and that social order too, which is founded on absolute justice; the means it makes use of to establish and maintain social order, should always be strictly moral, spiritual, holy. Its symbol should not be the sword, but the crosier. If this were the case, civil government would be as holy as the church has ever claimed to be. The church, as a governing or controlling body, would then be superseded, or rather, the state having become the church as well as the state, no separate church would be needed or admissible. Religion we should still have, preachers we should have, meeting-houses we should have, but no ecclesiastical corporation. The duty of the preacher would cease to be that of gathering people into an outward, visible church, and become that of infusing into all hearts a love of goodness, and that of directing all minds to the decrees of strict justice, as the laws to be obeyed in all social and individual action. Clergymen might make public prayers, administer the sacraments, and wear a surplice or a black gown; but they would not constitute a separate class of men, organized into a distinct body, whose members must be accounted, *par excellence*, men of God. They would be teachers of right-

eousness, men laboring to promote knowledge, justice, piety. Now this is precisely the condition to which, with us, both church and state are tending. The separation of church and state hardly exists in this country, especially in this Commonwealth, which stands as it should and as it becomes it, in the front rank of the advanced guard of the great army of progress. All the ecclesiastical establishments of this country are breaking up. The Episcopalians gain few converts to the doctrine of the Divine right of bishops; the Methodist church has reached its culminating point, and its members, democrats as most of them are, will soon see that their church establishment is an engine which may be directed with but too much success against freedom. As soon as they discover this, they will abandon it, which they may do without abandoning their doctrines or their piety. The Presbyterian church is torn by intestine divisions, and is penetrated in all directions by Congregational notions, and it must ultimately adopt the Congregational form of church government, the only form of church government that can long coexist in harmony with democracy in the state. To the same result England and France are tending. To no other end can tend the writings of the Abbé de la Mennais and his party.

Not only do we perceive an approximation to the unity of church and state, but a sort of blending of royalty and republicanism. The notion that kings own their subjects, are their absolute lords and proprietors, is growing obsolete. Kings are beginning to be regarded as public officers, and royalty is considered, as we have said, the representative of the majesty of the state. The king is not considered now as governing for his own good, but for the public good. He is not above, but under law. The Republic, which may be said to represent the majesty of the people, is also under law. The people may do what they will, but not unless they will that which is lawful, right. All governments are now, at least in the principal states of Christendom, held to be public, to

be instituted for the public, and to have it for their mission to make justice prevail. The question between monarchy and its rivals is merely a question of expediency, a question as to what form of government is most likely to secure the prevalence of justice. There is then a sort of fusion of the church, the empire, and the commune, taking place, and they must soon lose their opposition, and become one under the dominion of law—justice.

On the other hand, a similar fusion has been taking place in relation to the different populations of Christendom. At the beginning of the sixth century, all that part of Europe, which had been under the Roman dominion, was covered over by two distinct populations, one noble, and the other ignoble. The Barbarians, with a very few exceptions, constituted alone the noble population. The native population, saving that portion of it which belonged to the ecclesiastical society, was ignoble, deemed an inferior and degraded race. It was the conquered population, and to that fact, to a great extent, must be attributed the ideas which the conquerors entertained respecting its inferiority. It was everywhere oppressed. It had no rights, no protection. All employments deemed noble or honorable, except those of the church, were reserved to its masters, the Barbarian nobility. It could not meet the Barbarian on equal terms. It could approach him only at a humble distance. It was in relation to the conquerors what the ancient Gibeonites were to the ancient Israelites, "hewers of wood and drawers of water." The distance between these two classes, two populations, was not to be passed at once. Not in one day was the slave to become the equal of his master, the serf, to stand up by the side of his lord, and all traces of conquest to be wiped out. Yet the distance between the two populations has been lessened. The two races have been brought together, and so intermixed, that their separation is henceforth impossible. Not all the noble families, in France or in England, can trace their descent to the

conquerors. The descendants of the conquered have frequently risen to the highest ranks, and those of the conquerors have fallen in many instances to the lowest. The English of to-day are neither Normans nor Saxons, but a people formed from the union of both. Robert of Gloucester says,

"The folk of Normandie
Among us woneth yet, and shalleth evermore.
Of Normans beth these high men thath beth in this land,
And the low men of Saxons."

But this cannot be said now. Some of the "high men" in the land are of Saxon origin, and some of the "low men" are of Norman blood. In France, the Franks are not now the exclusively noble. The Franks and the Gallo-Romans have commingled. There is now a French nation, as there is a French language. In this country, the fusion of the two populations is complete. We have no noble, no ignoble race. Saving the Negroes and Indians, not included in the civilized population, we know only one race; and we have adopted in state and in society, as well as in the church, the doctrine that "God hath made of one blood all the nations of men." Here few traces of the Conquest are discernible. We recognise no distinction of ranks, no inferiority or superiority of classes. No honest employment unfits any one for any social circle, any office of honor, trust, or emolument. There is not here and there a baron with his army of retainers, bondmen and slaves. All are barons, that is, men. No man is more than man, and no one is less than man. At least this is our theory, though it must be admitted that our practice does not as yet fully conform to it. All Europe is tending to this same result. The distinctions of rank are wearing away; the prejudices of blood are losing their force; the burghers are up with the lords, and, in point of intelligence, influence, and social importance, even beyond them. The People have become the nation; Royalty and Nobility are their servants, and maintain themselves standing, only on the plea of the public

good. The London Quarterly itself is forced to admit that De Tocqueville is right in saying, that all Western Europe has been for several hundred years hastening to democratic equality. The progress is assuredly in that direction, and no earthly power seems able to arrest it, or even for a moment to divert it from its course.

How has this change been effected? What are the causes which have produced it? Are these causes still in operation? And may we hope that they will be as efficient in accomplishing what remains to be done, as they have been in accomplishing what has already been accomplished?

One of the most efficient causes of this change is Christianity. By Christianity, in this connexion, we do not mean exclusively the church, but the new life revealed, the philanthropic movement commenced, by Jesus for Humanity, and of which we have spoken in a foregoing article. Christianity surrounds every man with a bulwark of sanctity. It declares the unity of the human race, that God has made of one blood all the nations of men, and that all men are equal before Him. This declaration cannot remain unfruitful. When it is once received, when the idea of man's worth as man, together with that of man's brotherhood to man, is once entertained, has once become a sincere, an earnest, a religious conviction, it becomes all-powerful for human enfranchisement. To the influence of this idea must be attributed the manumission of the slaves of modern Europe, which, in nearly all cases, has been the voluntary act of their masters, done from religious motives.

The church, properly so called, has done something. It opened its bosom alike to the children of both races. In the house of God, in its services for the sick and dying, and in its solemn funeral rites, the high men and the low men were reduced to a momentary level. They were alike amenable to its discipline; they alike partook of its sacraments, and alike

might aspire, so far forth as their blood was concerned, to fill the highest offices in its gift. The perpetual presence of a society that recognised no distinctions of blood, which, so far as itself was concerned, declared all men, as men, equal, could not fail to weaken the prejudice of race, and to attack all social inequalities. The bondman was not wholly vile in his own estimation, for he might hope that his son would find his way to the papal chair, and make the proud monarchs of the conquering race doff their diadems before him, and the most powerful of his oppressors court his favor and sue for his benediction. The passage from equality in the spiritual order to equality in the social order was neither long nor difficult, and more than once was it made by the simple-hearted and simple-minded peasants, under the guidance of the lower orders of the priesthood. An instance of this is in the Insurrection of the Peasants, in the time of Richard II. of England, led on by Wat Tyler, (Walter the Tiler,) John Ball, a priest, Jack Straw, Hob Carter, and Tom Miller, all men of low origin.

This Insurrection of the Peasants is generally regarded as a war of the poor against the rich, and much is made of it against every man who comes forward in defence of what are termed the lower classes. If one speaks in favor of equality and bears his testimony against the inequality which obtains, but which ought not to obtain, between members of the same community, forthwith he is a Wat Tyler, or, in allusion to another leader of the peasants at a later day, a Jack Cade. Yet we own we have a sort of fellow-feeling with this same Walter the Tiler, who led on his sixty thousand peasants towards London, singing,

“When Adam delved, and Eva span,
Where was then the gentleman?”

And we are inclined to think that no man, somewhat in love with Humanity, should feel it a reproach to be called a Wat Tyler, or even a Jack Cade. Many a

name is now banded about as a term of reproach, which will be seen one day to stand high on the calendar of saints.

These peasants attempted nothing for which they should be censured. Their condition at the time of their insurrection was anything but enviable. They were serfs in person and in goods, and obliged to pay enormous rents for the small piece of land on which they raised the means of supporting themselves and families, and which they could not abandon without the consent of their lord; whose husbandry, gardening, and labor of all kinds he chose to demand, they were obliged to perform gratuitously. The lord could sell them, their houses, their utensils of labor, and their children, born and even unborn. Their condition was worse than that of our negro slaves; for our slaves are fed and clothed and taken care of in sickness and in old age; but these were obliged to take the same care of themselves that they would have been obliged to do had they been freemen, and at the same time to labor as much for their masters as our slaves do for theirs. Resentment of the evils inflicted on them by the oppression of the noble families, joined to a total forgetfulness of the fact that these noble families were of Norman origin, since they no longer called themselves Normans, but Gentlemen, very naturally conducted them from the injustice they endured to the injustice of servitude itself, independently of its historical origin. In the southern provinces, where the population was numerous, especially in Kent, whose inhabitants preserved a vague tradition of a treaty concluded between them and William the Conqueror, for the maintenance of their ancient franchises, there were strong symptoms of popular agitation near the beginning of the reign of Richard II. Expenses of the court and the gentlemen were great in consequence of the war which was then carried on against France, whither each nobleman went at his own charges, and where he sought to distinguish himself by the magnificence of his arms and

equipage. The proprietors of the seigniories and manors, loaded their farmers and villeins with excessive taxes and exactions, alleging, as a pretext for each new demand, the necessity they were under of going to fight the French in France, to prevent them from making a descent on England. But the peasants said to themselves and to one another, "they tax us to aid the knights and country squires to defend their possessions; we are their bond-men; we are their flocks which they fleece; and yet, taking all in all, if England were lost, they would lose altogether more than we."

To such words as these, on their return from the fields, by the way, or in the clubs where they met in the evening, after the labors of the day were ended, succeeded words of far graver import. Some of the orators at these clubs were *priests*, who drew from the *Bible* their arguments against the social order of their epoch. "Good folks," said they, "things cannot and will not go right in England until there be no more villeins, nor gentlemen; until all are equal, and the lords be no more masters than we. Why should they be? Why do they hold us in bondage? Have we not all, they and we, sprung from the same parents, Adam and Eve? They are clothed in velvet, and crimson, and fur; they have flesh-meat, and spices, and good wines, and we have only miserable orts to eat and water to drink. They have ease in their beautiful manors, and we have pain and labor, wet and cold in the fields." At such discourses as these, the multitude cried out in tumult, "There must be no more villeins; we will be treated as beasts no longer; and if we work for the gentlemen, they SHALL PAY US WAGES!"*

Surely this demand of the villeins was by no means an extravagant one. It was simply that they should be no longer held in bondage, that they should hence-

* See Thierry's *Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre, par les Normans*, T. IV. pp. 309-317, et seq.

forth be treated as men, not as beasts, and that they should receive wages. They made no war on the rich as such; it entered not into their minds that these estates, held by the descendants of the conquerors, had been unjustly wrested from their fathers; they had no thought of stripping the gentlemen of their property; they merely wished to be accounted freemen, and to be paid for their labor. Was this unjust, unreasonable? Certainly not. The lower classes have never been known to make an unjust demand. They always claim altogether less than their rights, and, we may add, the terror they inspire by their demands is always in consequence of their justice, and not their injustice. The lords and gentlemen have always seemed to hear, in the faint voice of the feeble peasant, the awful voice of God summoning them to judgment. The simple demand of these peasants not to be treated as beasts, and to be paid for their labor, struck all the upper classes of England with consternation. However, the peasants gained nothing. The day of their deliverance had not yet dawned. They were cajoled by a few lying words of the king, their leaders were killed, themselves dispersed, and fifteen hundred of their number put to death by the common hangman. Their movements have no great historical importance, except as showing that they drew their arguments for equality from the Bible; that they legitimated them on the ground of the unity of the human race, that high men and low men have the same parents, even Adam and Eve, and therefore are brethren and equals.

Christianity also did much to effect the change of which we have spoken, by its spirit of tenderness and compassion, by the generous and humane sentiments with which it sought to inspire men one towards another, and by encouraging the practice of the kindly charities of social and private life. It did much by exalting the sentiments; and it elevated the poor by giving them the assurance, that though forsaken by men, they were yet remembered by God, and though

destitute, wronged, down-trodden here, they should be kings and priests hereafter. It did something too by inspiring the ministers of the church with courage to rebuke the king and the feudal lord, and to remind them, that the truest nobility they could aspire to was the practice of the Christian virtues.

Philosophy, or the spirit of inquiry, the desire for general intelligence, which had been kept alive by the church, and which took a new start after the feudal régime had become somewhat fixed, also contributed its share towards effecting the social change we have noted. The desire to philosophize, or to know the reason and nature of things, manifested itself in a striking degree in the twelfth century, and has been manifesting itself more and more strikingly ever since. The first subject to which it applied itself was theology. There was at first no disposition to disprove nor even to question the truth of theology, but a craving to establish its truth on rational conviction, and not on positive authority. Abelard attempted to do this, and gave birth to the Scholastic Philosophy, a philosophy more ridiculed than understood, and whose influence on the progress of society has been altogether underrated.

To the Scholastic Philosophy succeeded the Revival of Letters, and the study of Grecian antiquity. The study of ancient literature and philosophy enlarged the modern circle of ideas, and introduced a more liberal and just mode of thinking into the affairs of the world. From the study of antiquity and the human mind, men passed to the study of nature, and opened a new career to science. Scientific discoveries followed in rapid succession, and gave a new face to war, commerce, and manufactures, which in their turn reacted upon the social state, and lessened its evils. No small portion of the evils of the lower classes was owing to their ignorance. As soon as they began to think, to find out that they had thinking faculties, and to use them, their condition was ameliorated. The low-born man by means of intelli-

gence became the equal of the high-born; he became a minister of state, an influential prelate, one of the real nobility of his country. By means of knowledge the two classes were occasionally brought into contact, and the plebeian found himself the master of the patrician.

The habit of looking into the reason and nature of things soon disclosed the unreasonableness of the pretensions of the Church, the illegitimacy of the authority of the Pope, and brought about the Reformation. It carried more intelligence and order into the administration of government, into legislative enactments, and the interpretation of laws, which produced in return something like social order, and gave something like security to persons and property, facilitated industry, and by that elevated the industrious class.

But the cause, to which, more than to any other, we are indebted for this change, is to be found in the rise, progress, and dominion of the moneyed power, represented and sustained by what we term the business part of the community. Much is said against this power at present, and perhaps justly. It has attained its zenith. Business men have had their golden age. They have become the sovereigns of the world. Kings, nobilities, hierarchies, legislators, are their servants. The world, it may be, is growing weary of their dominion, and perhaps restless under the weight of their tyranny. A strong party is organizing itself against them; and in this country we are in the midst of a revolution which must overthrow the Money-King, and inaugurate Humanity. Nevertheless the Money-King was once a slave, as vile a slave, as maltreated a slave, as any on whom kings and nobility trampled, and his accession to power marks the enfranchisement of industry. Whether desirous or not of prolonging his reign, we must all admit that his reign *has been* for the best interests of the human race.

Owing to conquest as the proximate, if not as the

ultimate cause, the immense majority of mankind, at an early day, were reduced to a servile condition. Hence the reason why the working-men, the manual laborers, the creators, in one view of the case, of all the wealth, comforts, and luxuries of a nation, are themselves, always and everywhere, poor, ignorant, degraded, accounted the lower class, an inferior order of being. This is owing to conquest, not, as the advocates of aristocracy ignorantly allege, to the natural inequality with which God creates men. The laboring class has been always the lower class, poor, and ignorant, and menial, because the tribe or nation, to which it originally belonged, was conquered by another tribe or nation, stripped of its possessions which went to increase the stock of the conquerors, reduced to slavery, and compelled to perform all the labor of the community, and by its labor to augment that stock still more.

Rome was conquered by the Barbarians; the wealth of the Roman world, at least the greater part of it, passed into their hands; consequently the indigenous population was left destitute. Destitute of property, they were entirely at the mercy of their Barbarian lords. Poor, dependent, enslaved, they of course must be regarded as inferior, and as unworthy as incapable of associating with the conquerors on equal terms. Poor, dependent, enslaved, regarded as inferior, as low, vile, they must needs be deprived of all means of improvement, excluded from what was held to be good society, and debarred from all opportunities of cultivating elegant manners and refined tastes. It needs no argument, therefore, to prove that they must cease to be dependent, that they must acquire some portion of this world's goods, and a certain degree of leisure, intelligence, and refinement, before they could claim to be of an equal race with those who constituted the upper classes. The laboring or conquered population could rise to a level with the conquerors, and thus regain their lost independence, only by the acquisition of

wealth. They must become capitalists, proprietors. The man, who has nothing in this wide world that he can call his own, can hardly exhibit the bearing or the virtues of a man. A man must feel that he has something, before he can feel that he is something.

This is not all. The laboring class, so long as they are doomed to perpetual toil, must needs be ignorant and brutish. They cannot take their place with the upper classes of society, until they have become intellectually, and in point of intelligence, their equals. But their equals they cannot become in the lowest depths of poverty. Great wealth is no doubt unfavorable to mental growth; but a certain degree of wealth is needed, in order that the mind may have leisure to concern itself with something besides mere animal wants. The laborer must be able to live like a man, before he can think like a man, have a man's intelligence. The distinction between the upper classes and the lower, the conquerors and the conquered, could then be obliterated only by means of a physical amelioration of the lower or laboring class. The interests of this class, then, at first were necessarily identified with the moneyed interest. The first service to be rendered it was to open to it the road to wealth.

Now the road to wealth this depressed, enslaved population was obliged to open to itself, by its own efforts. Nothing was to be hoped from the upper classes. Whatever was obtained from them was to be obtained by main force. The conquerors will hold, with all their power, the conquests they have made. The conquered must rely on themselves alone. The odds are altogether against them. They are poor and naked, and the earth and nearly all the means of gain are in the hands of their masters. They are placed under almost every conceivable disadvantage. Nevertheless they must work out their own salvation; and by their own energy and perseverance rise from bondmen to freemen, and from slaves to be the sovereigns of the world. Their work is a great one, and

ages must elapse before we can perceive that they have made any progress. Yet progress they do make; and after centuries of secret, silent working, ever interrupted, but ever beginning anew, perpetually thwarted, but never despairing, we see that they have made a mighty advance.

The plebeian population, on the establishment of the Barbarians, though all equally vile, were not all in precisely the same condition. The agricultural portion was the most unfavorably situated. The land, whether cultivated or not, was all appropriated in the hands of a few, and for the most part locked up in entail. The agricultural laborers could therefore have no hope of becoming proprietors. All they could hope for was to be tenants on such terms as their masters should be pleased to grant. The inhabitants of the towns or cities were somewhat better situated. They were held to be as vile, as menial, and as far removed from freemen as were the villeins or agricultural bondmen; but they were mainly tradesmen and artisans, who could manufacture articles for sale, and carry on a species of traffic with the upper classes themselves. The Barbarian population, calling itself noble, disdained to be traders or handicraftsmen. Consequently trade and manufactures fell to the indigenous population, and of course to the inhabitants of the towns. Trade and manufacture, though insecure, subjected to innumerable risks, and loaded with vexatious and all but ruinous exactions, nevertheless enriched the traders and the artisans, who became in due time merchants and manufacturers. The mercantile and manufacturing population, as the most favorably situated for the acquisition of wealth, therefore take the lead in the enfranchisement of industry, and are the first of the conquered population to become free and independent.

Trade and manufactures require outlays, and when they are carried on to a great extent, they demand large capitalists. This gives rise to a division in the conquered population itself, a division between capi-

talists and simple operatives,—a division which may one day lead to a war between capital and labor, but which at this epoch could work no ill. The amount of capital in the hands of the industrious class, including the mercantile and manufacturing portion, in comparison with that possessed by the feudal population, was exceedingly small, and it was necessary to concentrate it in as few hands as possible, in order to increase its productiveness and augment its power. It was so small, that if equally distributed among the whole population, it would have been lost, at least have had no power to redeem the class. Every trader or manufacturer, who had capital which he invested in commercial or manufacturing enterprises, became a public benefactor; because he was increasing the amount of wealth belonging to the industrious class, and throwing into its hands the power with which it was one day to conquer equality with the feudal lord.

Trade and manufactures, though they did not distribute wealth equally among all the members of the industrious class, nevertheless augmented the gross amount of its wealth, enriched it as a class. But for them the capital of the world would have remained in the hands of the feudal society, in the hands of the nobility and of the church. In their hands it must have remained virtually unproductive. No addition to its amount would or could have been made. But just in proportion as capital came into the hands of the trader and the manufacturer, it became productive, and the wealth of the world was augmented. Individuals amassed large estates; but not by impoverishing others, as was the case when a nobleman became rich, or richer. The wealth they amassed they had called into existence; not, it is true, with their own hands, but by the profitable employment of the hands of others. In creating this additional amount of wealth, they did a real good, without doing any injury. The operatives they employed, indeed, did not become rich themselves, but they did not become the poorer. Their condition, on the contrary,

was much improved. The laborer at wages, though his wages were below what they ought to have been, was in a condition altogether superior to that of a bondman, which he was before he became a workman at wages.

Trade gives a spring to manufactures. It finds out markets, and thus creates a demand for them. By creating a demand for them, it aids their growth, calls a greater number of workmen into the factories. This in its turn increases the demand for agricultural products, and with this increased demand for the products of agriculture, agricultural labor rises in importance, and as a necessary consequence the agricultural laborer finds his condition improving. The smaller nobility, proprietors of a portion of the soil, turn their attention to the better cultivation of their lands, and take pains to increase their productiveness, because they find a market for their produce, or because they wish to obtain a larger supply of the articles furnished them by the merchant and the manufacturer. An additional amount of capital, a portion of that invested in land, is thus added to that employed in the interests of industry.

As the merchant and manufacturer, the tradesman and artisan, increase in wealth, they form a sort of middle class, or a class of commoners. Gradually they give to their children a decent education, and prepare them to compete, successfully in many respects, with the children of the nobility. Intelligence, polished manners, and refined taste are, after a while, associated with the names of some wealthy commoners. Some casual intercourse is commenced between them and the nobility. A marriage between one of their daughters and one of the sons of the nobility, desirous of replenishing his estate, now and then occurs,—and the process of amalgamation begins, never to cease till it becomes complete.

It is only by slow degrees that the money power is instituted, and business men obtain an influence in the affairs of the world. Business men require a

fixed order, security for persons and property. They can do little for themselves or for the cause of industry, when they can count with no tolerable certainty on a return for their outlays. Now through long ages of modern Europe, order, security for property or persons, there was little. The banker was not always a nobleman. The capitalist was not always a lord. From the fifth century to the tenth, moneyed men in no sense of the word constituted an aristocracy. No class of the community were more harassed or more exposed than they. Kings, lords, and bishops, harassed, vexed, taxed, despoiled them at their will. Nevertheless they contrived to prosper. Their wealth, power, importance, were ever on the increase. This is seen in the Communal movement, in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, of which we have already spoken. The burghers were then able, in a multitude of cases, to force the kings, lords, and even bishops, to grant them charters of incorporation, securing to them important privileges, and allowing them, within the walls of their town, to live under laws of their own making, and magistrates of their own choosing. Some, we are aware, pretend that these charters were granted to the towns, through the generosity or policy of the kings; on the one hand to aid the people, and on the other to secure their assistance in controlling the feudal lord, of whose power the kings were jealous. But they who attribute the least of the good, which they find the people enjoying, to the generosity or policy of kings, are the worthiest interpreters of history. Kings play a much less conspicuous part in the real history of the world than they do in the narratives of historians. The Communal charters, in nearly all cases where they secured any important franchises, were obtained because the Commune was powerful enough to conquer them, or rich enough to buy them. That the kings of France and of England, as well as some of the great feudal lords, and perhaps now and then a bishop, did grant charters of incorporations to some old

towns, and to some new ones, is very certain; but they did it as a means to obtain money. Whether, therefore, the burghers conquered or purchased their charters of incorporation, the fact of the charters being granted proves their growing importance, their increasing wealth, and their efforts to obtain a fixed order, favorable to trade and manufactures.

The Communal movement failed before the end of the fourteenth century, and in the fifteenth century, the towns and boroughs, as a sort of petty republics, have no longer any significance. But the wealth and influence of the burghers or commoners have increased. They constitute now one of the three estates of the States-General. They were first compelled to send their deputies to the Parliament to vote the supplies demanded by the king, that the town or borough might be held to pay it, because voted by its deputy. But this, which was at first a compulsory duty, becomes with the improved condition of the commoners, a valued right, not to be surrendered, and the origin of representative government. The commons remembering that they originally voted supplies, and forgetting that they did it because compelled, and in the interest of the king, not of themselves, come to claim the exclusive right to vote them, and therefore become masters of the government, and from an estate, become the nation.

These, of course, are only loose hints on the influence of the moneyed power in elevating the plebeian class, in creating the Commons, and in amalgamating the two populations which occupied the European territory at the commencement of modern history. We should be glad to be more explicit and minute; but we have been enough so for our present purpose. The moneyed power has been one of the great agents by which modern civilization has advanced, and the business men have contributed their full share to the progress of popular liberty. By means of trade and manufactures, the majority of the available wealth of Christendom has been thrown into the hands of the

Commons, and this has given the Commons a preponderance in the government of the world. It must be added too, that trade and manufactures have not robbed the feudal lord of the wealth, they have placed in the hands of the Commons. They have created it, and by so much augmented the wealth of Christendom, of the world. Having now, at least in England, France, and America, a majority of the wealth on their side, the Commons are the real rulers. They have as a class risen from their degradation, broken the yoke of the conqueror, and recovered their independence.

The progress of society has brought up the industrious class as far as it was identified with the moneyed power. But the work of modern civilization is not completed. The feudal lord restrained the absolutism of the monarch; the moneyed power has restrained, supplanted, taken the place of the feudal lord, and made the government of the world pass from the hands of the soldier to those of the banker, and substituted the pen for the sword. But it places that government still in the hands of a class, not in the hands of Humanity. It has brought up a much larger class than the old feudal nobility, and a class too, which has come out from the bosom of the people and can claim no preëminence over them, in point of blood, or race; but still it leaves the immense majority below the proper estate of man. The distinction between the capitalist and the laborer now manifests itself, and becomes an evil. Till the moneyed power had triumphed over the old nobility and lodged the government in the hands of the business men, the interests of capital and labor were one and the same. It was necessary to secure the victory to the moneyed power, in order to redeem the people, that population to whom the business men belong. That victory is gained; the class is redeemed, as a class; and the work now is to redeem the class *as individuals*, that henceforth the government of the world shall be in the hands of no class, but in those of Humanity.

This new work was seriously begun with the American Revolution. The world had, here and there, attempted it before, but without success. It was attempted in England, in the seventeenth century, but the agricultural population were too weak to perform their share of it. The soil, or the greater part of it, was in the hands of the nobility, and its cultivators were too poor and too dependent. The work failed, or rather was suspended, adjourned. This country had been discovered. The land here was unappropriated. Its cultivators became its owners. The agricultural population here became, therefore, independent proprietors, without ceasing to be laborers. Their influence, and a powerful influence too, was therefore capable of being thrown into the scale, not, as in England, against the laborers in towns, cities, and factories, but against the power of any dominant class.

Our Revolution was effected not in favor of men in classes; not in favor of orders or estates; but in favor of man, men as integers. It marks a new epoch in human progress. The influence of capital, or the moneyed power, as the ruling power, had then ceased to be legitimate. Man, not Money, was then to be sovereign; and the whole people, not the business men merely, were to hold the reins of government. But this was not fully understood at the time. Alexander Hamilton and his party thought matters stood as they ever had done, and that the moneyed power was still the legitimate sovereign. They were doubtless sincere. They had not that order of mind which is first to discern when old watch-words change their meaning. The country, in consequence of the war of the Revolution, was embarrassed with a national debt, and the aid of the business men was needed to pay it off. A national bank was therefore established, and the Money-King suffered to wear the crown yet longer. In 1800, an effort was made to dethrone the Money-King, and enthrone the People, and attended with partial, which would have

been complete, success, had it not been for the war of 1812. That war plunged us again into debt, and made it necessary, in 1816, to recall the money power. The debt is now paid off; the nation owes not a cent; and the great contest has recommenced between capital and labor, or more properly, between Man and Money; — between the moneyed power supported by the business men, and the entire people sustained by a majority of the agricultural and mechanical population.

It is not likely that this contest will be immediately ended, yet we cannot doubt the final result. Modern civilization has brought up the nobility against the king, and maintained them; it has brought up the business men against the nobility, enfranchised capital and capitalists, and sustained them; it now brings up the laborer, that portion of the plebeian class whose enfranchisement was adjourned, so as not to prejudice the interests of capital; and shall it fail now? It shall not. Humanity, from the depths of her universal being, utters the word, it shall not fail. The struggle may be long, arduous, and perhaps bloody; the oppressed may have to groan yet longer; the friends of Humanity may experience more than one defeat; but they will never give over the struggle, or despair of ultimate success. They have been too long victorious, and too often have they gained the victory, in darker days than these and with feebler forces than they now have at their command, to despair, or "bate a jot of heart or hope."

All classes, each in turn, have possessed the government; and the time has come for all predominance of class to end; for Man, the People to rule. To this end all modern civilization has been tending, and for this it gives valiant battle to-day. Its forces appear to us as numerous, as well disciplined, as skilfully drawn up in battle array, as ever; and unless God has changed his purposes, and inverted the order of his Providence, it shall come off conqueror; and Man be redeemed; and the work for his friends henceforth

cease to be the melioration of society, and become that of perfecting the individuals of each successive generation, as they appear in time and pass off into eternity. This done, and the wish of the workingmen is fulfilled; the visions of the prophets are realized; and the prayers of the philanthropist are heard in heaven, and answered on the earth.

ART. VI. — *Slavery.* By WILLIAM E. CHANNING. 4th Edition, Revised. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1836. 16mo. pp. 187.

WE have not introduced this little volume of Dr. Channing's for the purpose of reviewing it. It has been too widely circulated, and too generally read, to permit such a purpose to be either necessary or proper. The public have long since made up their minds respecting its merits, and are quietly giving it the high rank it deserves. In our opinion, though not wholly unexceptionable, it is the best book that the present discussion of slavery among us has called forth, and the only one, we have met, that we can read with anything like general satisfaction. With its general estimate of slavery, its lofty moral tone, and its profound reverence for the rights of man, we sympathize with our whole soul; but some of its special views, and the traces of a doctrine tending somewhat to centralization, which we here and there discover, and of which we believe the author to be unconscious, we cannot entirely approve.

We place this work at the head of this article merely for the purpose of testifying in general terms our high appreciation of its merits, and because it gives us an occasion of expressing our own views at some length on the subject of slavery. The subject of

slavery is fairly before the public, and it must be met. However much we may regret its agitation at this time, when all thoughts should be turned to the settling of the financial affairs of the nation, we must suffer it to be discussed, and take part in its discussion. We would merely add, let it be discussed calmly, without passion, and in a truly Christian spirit.

We say without any hesitation, that we are wholly and totally opposed to slavery, and that we do not consider it any question at all with the American people, whether it be a good or an evil. We believe that question is decided by the Declaration of Independence, and forever put at rest. To attempt to prove that slavery is wrong, that it is not to be perpetuated, and that it ought to be abolished, as soon as it can be, is to insult every true American's mind and heart, and that too, whether he live north or south of Mason's and Dixon's line. We have much mistaken the character of our Southern brethren, if there be one among them, that will for one moment contend that slavery is the proper estate of a man.

That man has no absolute right to hold his brother man in slavery, is but a necessary inference from the fact that slavery is wrong. It can never be right, no man can ever have the right, to do wrong. Every slave-holder, then, ought to do all he can do to rescue his fellow beings, whether black or white, from the servitude in which he finds them, or to which he may have reduced them. If slavery be wrong, his duty is plain. He must, if in his power, remove it. Here is no room for dispute, no need of argument.

Again; we hold that slavery must and will be abolished. The whole force of modern civilization is against it, and before the onward march of that civilization it must be swept away. To this result we do not believe that our Southern brethren are opposed. Some of them may believe that slavery is fixed upon them forever, may believe that its abolition is impossible, and therefore may undertake to invent good

reasons for its continuance; but secretly none of them love it, and the immense majority of them would rejoice to be rid of it.

But while we contend that slavery is wrong, that it is wrong to hold slaves, and that the slave-holder ought to labor with all his power for its abolition, we do not agree with our friends the Abolitionists, in denouncing slave-holders, and in declaring that no slave-holder can be a Christian. Reformers should war against systems, not against men. Paul was always careful to have it understood, that he did not "wrestle against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." For ourselves, we have learned that men may profit by institutions opposed to the best good of Humanity, without necessarily being bad men. Many practices, which, in one view of the case, strike us as altogether wrong, in another point of view, appear to us as excusable, if not even as justifiable. The older we grow, the more we see,—we speak personally,—the less and less are we disposed to be censorious. The world is *not* all wrong, everything is not out of place, and every man is not a devil. Thank God! we every day acquire fresh faith in human virtue; and while we bate nothing in our zeal or efforts for progress, we become able to look with more and more complacency on the world, and to feel that, of all God's prophets, we are not the only one that is left alive. There are more than we who have not bowed the knee to Baal.

If slave-holding were purely an individual act, we confess, we should doubt the possibility of the slave-holder's being a good man, save at the expense of his intelligence. But slave-holding, in our Southern States, for instance, is not an individual but a social act. Slavery is not an individual but a social institution, and society, not the individual conscience alone, is responsible for it. The question is not, Is slave-holding wrong? but, Can a man who adheres to, and

attempts to profit by a wrong, social institution, be a good Christian man? Must he necessarily be a sinner? This is the question, and we wish our moralists and divines would answer it. It is an important case of conscience, and reaches, perhaps, further than we are ordinarily aware of. Society always has been, and everywhere is, imperfect. All its institutions are more or less imperfect, more or less in opposition to absolute Justice. We may all of us be getting our living to-day by means of institutions, as unjust in themselves as Abolitionists have shown slavery to be. If no man who adheres to, or profits by, a wrong social institution, can be a good man, that is, a Christian, what shall we do with the upholders of monarchy, hereditary nobility, corrupting hierarchies, with Mahometans, Brahmins, all who live in an imperfect social state, and profit by unjust social institutions? Nay, what shall we do with ourselves; for who of us has anything which we can say positively has come into our possession without the aid of any wrong social institution? We should, it seems to us, view with suspicion all rules of judgment, which in their operation must overstock hell, and leave heaven an unpeopled desert.

For ourselves, we ask no questions of the slaveholder that we do not of any other man. Is the slaveholder faithful to all his engagements, in the discharge of all the private virtues? Does he cultivate piety towards God and love to man? Does he make slavery as light a burden as he can; that is, does he treat his slaves with kindness and respect? Does he inquire into the character of his social institutions, and do what he can to perfect them? If so, we must call him a good Christian. We know the Abolitionists may say, that it is his duty to free his slaves at once; and so should we, if it depended on his individual will whether he should free them or not. But this matter of freeing the slaves is a matter for the community, rather than the individual slaveholder. As a member of the community, the individual should do

all he can do, to hasten the period when the community shall unfetter the slave and let him go free. Before that period he cannot free his slaves, even if he would.

But we are told by the South, that this is their affair and not ours, and that we have no right to meddle with it. Is the South right? This brings us to the question, what rights have we at the North in regard to Southern slavery? This after all is the real question before the American people, and unhappily this question has become so entangled with other questions, that it is difficult to give it a separate and distinct answer. Our own opinion on the matter we have hinted in a foregoing article, but we deem it necessary, in justice to ourselves and to the cause of liberty, to go more fully into it, and to state more at large the grounds of our opinion. We do this the more readily, because nobody can for one moment suspect us of any desire to palliate slavery or to prolong it. All who know us, know well that we are heartily opposed to every form of slavery, and that our whole life is devoted to the cause of universal liberty to universal man, — a cause for which we have made some sacrifices, and for which we are ready, if need be, to make more and greater sacrifices.

In all that concerns their internal regulations, institutions, and police, we regard the several States which compose the Union, as distinct, independent communities. We are to be regarded as one people, as one nation, only in the several respects specified in the Constitution of the United States. In all other respects we are not one nation, but twenty-six independent nations, and stand in relation to one another, precisely as the United States as one nation stands in relation to France, England, or Mexico. We of Massachusetts have no more concern with the internal policy and social institutions of South Carolina, for instance, than we have with the internal police of Russia, Austria, or Turkey. Slavery, then, in the States is not a National institution; that is, not an

institution over which the people of the United States, in the sense in which they are one people, have any control. The right of the people of the non-slaveholding States, in relation to slavery in the Southern States, is precisely what it is in relation to it in Constantinople, or in any foreign slave-holding state.

In one respect slavery may in this country be regarded as a National and not as a State institution. The Constitution of the United States allows slavery to form one of the bases of National representation. All the States have a legal right to concern themselves with this question. We of the North, if we choose, may undoubtedly use all just means to amend the Constitution so that slavery shall not be represented in Congress. Whether it is desirable so to amend the Constitution, is a question of policy, which we do not now undertake to decide. Slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories belonging to the United States, is a different matter from slavery in the States, and, for aught we can see, may constitutionally be acted upon by the Congress of the United States. Whether Congress should act upon it in the District and the Territories, is a question on which good men will differ. For our own part, we wish slavery, when abolished, to be abolished by a concert of all the the slave-holding States, together with the Congress of the United States. We can see little utility in abolishing it at present in the District of Columbia and the Territories. To petition Congress to do it, is only to petition Congress to do indirectly, what all parties agree it may not do directly, that is, abolish slavery in the States.

Here is the ground of the objection, which the South makes to the reception of anti-slavery petitions by Congress. These petitions literally touch the question of slavery only in the sections of the slaveholding country, over which Congress has exclusive jurisdiction, but really, and in the minds of those who get them up, they are petitions for the abolition of

slavery in the States themselves. Does any body believe, that, if Congress should grant the prayer of the petitioners, slavery would stand a year in this country? Do not all the Abolitionists believe, that the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories, by Congress, would necessarily involve its abolition in all the slave-holding States? Is not this also the belief of the South? What, then, is the true character of the petitions with which Congress is flooded in regard to slavery? Are they not in fact, though not in name, petitions for Congress to interfere with the internal police of the Southern States? So the South regards them, and on this ground it opposes their reception. Is the South right in this? Have we a right to petition Congress to abolish slavery in South Carolina? Have we a right to petition Congress to violate the Constitution of the United States? A right to petition it to do indirectly, what it may not do directly, openly, avowedly? Yet we have unquestionably the right to petition Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and the South have been unwise and impolitic, to say the least, in denying it. By denying it, they have mixed up with the question of Abolition that of the right of petition, which has in reality no connexion with it. The Abolitionists have by this means been able to make themselves regarded as the defenders of the right of petition, a right dear to all New-England men, from the memory of the struggle of their fathers of England in the seventeenth century with Charles Stuart. And yet, virtually, the South are, in this very controversy, truer defenders of constitutional rights than the Abolitionists. The Abolitionists are technically, literally right, and the South technically, literally wrong; and hence their efforts work altogether against them, and recruit the ranks of Abolitionists by thousands. Abolitionists never rejoiced more sincerely than they did at the passage of Mr. Patton's Resolution. Congress, we believe, ought to receive the petitions as the less of two evils, and to treat them with all proper respect.

But to return to the question of the right of the people of the free States to interfere with slavery. What is this right? How far does it extend? The right of the people of the non-slave-holding States, in relation to Southern slavery, is precisely their right in relation to any of the social institutions of France or England. They have the same right to labor for the abolition of monarchy or the House of Lords in England, that they have for the abolition of slavery in any of the Southern States. What is this right? How far does it extend? In our opinion simply to the free and full discussion of the question. As men, as citizens, in this respect, of independent communities, and therefore divested of none of our natural rights by any other community, we have the right to discuss freely, and give our views unreservedly, on all questions which concern Humanity. We have, for instance, a perfect right to question the legitimacy of monarchy, to show, if we can, that it is a bad institution, that it is founded in usurpation, that it does great wrong to man, and that it ought to be abolished forthwith. We may also throw all the light in our power on the means of abolishing it, and offer what we believe to be sound and cogent reasons for abolishing it. So of slavery. We may examine it, publish all the facts we can collect respecting it, speak, print, publish, in the limits of our respective states, fully and freely, our honest convictions of its nature, tendency, justice, injustice, the necessity, the duty, the means of its preservation or removal. This we believe is the extent of our right of interference. A step further than this contravenes international law, and encroaches upon the rights of the slave-holding states.

The right here stated, and to this extent, we claim for ourselves. We claim it on the ground that we are men, and have therefore a right to interest ourselves in whatever concerns men, as men. We claim it on the ground that we are citizens of a State which allows, which guaranties free discussion, freedom of speech and the press, and which no other State

has any right to interfere with or seek to control. This right the South must not presume to deny us. While we respect her rights, she must respect ours. If we may not interfere with her legislation, she must not interfere with ours. Moreover, neither the North nor the South has any right to abridge or restrain freedom of discussion, because freedom of discussion is one of the rights of man, and therefore older than governments, and raised above their legitimate reach. The South has erred in denying us this right. In doing this she has struck a blow at our independence, made the Abolitionists, with no great consistency however, appear to be the champions of free discussion, and induced not a few to join them under this character, that never would have joined them as simple Abolitionists.

Still, we are inclined to believe, that the South has never intended to deny us the right to discuss, in our own way, the abstract question of slavery. All she has really intended to do, is to assert her right to manage her internal police as she judges proper, and to deny, as a necessary inference from this, our right to interfere with it. The real question at issue between the Abolitionists and the South is not whether slavery be good, bad, or indifferent, but whether one State has the right to avow the design of changing the institutions of another State, and of adopting a series of measures directed expressly to that end? This is the question. In all that concerns them as States, these United States are as independent on one another as are England and France. France has as much right to interfere in the internal police of England, as Massachusetts has in the internal police of South Carolina. Slavery is unquestionably a matter which falls within the powers of the States, as independent, sovereign States. In relation to this question, then, all the States stand to one another precisely as foreign nations. The question then comes up in this shape: Have we the right to avow the design, and to adopt measures to control the internal legislation

of a foreign nation? The question needs no answer. Every body knows that we have not, at least so long as we acknowledge the independence of that nation.

Nor does it alter the nature of the question, that the actual interference is by individual citizens and not by the state. What the state is prohibited from doing, it can never be lawful for the citizens to do. Interference in the affairs of foreigners is as unlawful on the part of individual citizens as of states. Who will pretend that La Fayette had any more right to interfere in the quarrel between this country and England, than France herself had? And who will pretend to justify La Fayette's interference by international law? France was at peace with England, and La Fayette, as a subject of France, was bound to keep that peace. We adduce not this case to censure La Fayette, whose chivalrous aid to the cause of American Independence we appreciate as highly as do any of our countrymen, but simply to show that the obligations of the state bind the citizen. Our Canadian neighbors are now in a quarrel. Has this nation a right to interfere in that quarrel? Certainly not under its existing treaty obligations to England. It may side with the Canadians, but not without involving itself in a war with England. Its duty, if it would preserve its peace relations with England, is to remain neutral. Is not the duty of the citizens the same? Can an American citizen take up for the Canadians, without losing his character of American citizen, and forfeiting the protection of American laws?

If the individual citizens may do in relation to an independent state, what the state may not do, the consequences are not difficult to be foreseen. If the citizens of this State may associate to do what the State itself may not do, all that is requisite to enlist the whole force of the State in that which it is unlawful for the State to do, is to waive the State, and band all the citizens together into what shall be called a voluntary association. If half a dozen citizens may

unite in an Abolition Society, pledged to emancipate the slaves, all the citizens of the State may do it. And when all the citizens of the State have thus formed themselves into an association, what is that association but the State under a different name? The interference of such an association would be as efficient, to say the least, as that of the State itself. And if the citizens of a state may thus lawfully associate for changing the institutions of foreign nations, we ask, what security can one foreign nation ever have in relation to another? It is of the greatest importance to the peace and safety of nations, that citizens or subjects observe with scrupulous fidelity the engagements of their respective governments. The Abolitionists themselves were of this opinion in relation to the interference of our citizens in the affairs of Texas.

Nor, again, will it do to say that slavery is an institution of so peculiar a character, that we may claim the right of interfering with it, without claiming the right to interfere with the whole internal police of foreign nations. In the first place, it is not an institution peculiar in its kind. Something similar to it is found in every State, in which the law makes any discrimination between individual citizens. The principle which legitimates Southern slavery may be found incorporated, if we are not much mistaken, into the constitution and laws of every State, in the Union. In every State in which restrictions are placed on eligibility, as in this State, or in which the law presumes to say who may and who may not exercise the right of suffrage, or in which there are monopolies or exclusive privileges recognised by law, there is the seminal principle of slavery. But waive this, as not essential to our argument. In the next place, we say we have no right to make any inquiry concerning the institutions of foreign nations, for the purpose of ascertaining which of them we have or have not the right of undertaking to abolish. We cannot do this without denying the independence of the nation in

question. Do we acknowledge South Carolina, for instance, to be a free and independent State? Do we acknowledge her sovereignty to be absolute, so far as not limited by the Constitution of the United States? Then what right have we to take the revision of her doings? Can we do this without virtually denying her sovereignty? Can we deny her sovereignty without giving her just cause of offence? And when we admit her sovereignty, do we not acknowledge her right to establish such institutions as she pleases? If then she pleases to establish slavery, is it not her affair, and one of which we have debarred ourselves, by the acknowledgment of her sovereignty, from taking any cognizance?

But it may be said, that slavery is unjust, that no State has the right to establish an unjust institution; therefore, South Carolina has no right to establish slavery. Grant it. What then? Who has the right to determine the question, as to the justice or injustice of the institution, South Carolina or we? If she be an independent State, she has the right to be her own judge as to the rectitude of her decisions. She is not accountable to us, and we have no right to arraign her before our tribunal. If we believe her decision unjust, we may undoubtedly tell her so; but so long as we admit her independence, we must speak to her as an equal, not as a culprit. We must concede her right to judge for herself; we must disavow the right, and the intention, of dictating to her; and we must confine ourselves to the simple statement of our reasons, as one man may state to another man his reasons for not agreeing with him in opinion. If, however, instead of doing this, we begin by formally declaring her in the wrong, by denouncing her as awfully wicked, by stirring up wrath and indignation against her, by solemnly pledging ourselves not to cease our exertions till we have compelled her to reverse her decision, and by adopting all the measures in our power which we believe conducive to that end, do we not then fail to treat her as an independent

state, refuse to acknowledge her right to judge for herself, and are we not, to all intents and purposes, waging war against her ?

It will be seen from what we have said, that we do not question the proceedings of the the Abolitionists on Constitutional grounds. We do not believe that we of the North have made a compact with the South, by which we are debarred from interfering with slavery. We find in the Constitution of the United States no such compact. None such in fact was needed. Slavery exists in the States by virtue of no Constitutional guarantee, but solely by virtue of State sovereignty. The question in relation to it stands precisely as it did before the formation of the National government, and we have precisely the same rights, and only the same rights, of interference with it, that we should have had, had no National government ever been formed. The States are older than the Union, and they retain in their own hands all the rights of sovereignty not, in so many words, conceded to the Union. Now as the disposition of slavery is not conceded to the Union, it belongs as a matter of course to the States. By belonging to them it stands precisely as it did before the Union was consummated. As the States before the Union were so many independent nations, the question of slavery in them is to be treated solely as a question between foreign nations. Interference with it in one State by the citizens of another State is to be regulated by international, and not by constitutional law. Had the Union not been effected, everybody knows that efforts by the citizens of Massachusetts to free the slaves in South Carolina, efforts begun and carried on with express reference to that end, would have been a violation of international law, especially if accompanied with perpetual denunciation of South Carolina, and by their very character threatening to disturb her internal peace and tranquillity. Now this, which would have been true without the Union, we contend, is true under it. The South, we think, must therefore

place her defence on the ground of State sovereignty. It is as striking against State sovereignty, as denying the independence of the several States, as claiming for the citizens of one State jurisdiction over the legislation of another, that we view the proceedings of Abolition Societies with suspicion and alarm. To say the least, they assert the justice of a species of propagandism, which, if admitted, must strike at all national independency, and which will not fail to disturb the peaceful intercourse of nations, embroil them in war, and deluge the earth in blood. He who comes forth as the champion of liberty must bear in mind, that he is under no less obligation to defend the rights of communities, than he is the rights of individuals. He who loves America, and would live and die for American liberty, should look well before he adopts a course which may embroil the several States in a civil war, or in the end change the relations which now subsist between the National government and that of the several States. Liberty is as much interested in maintaining inviolate the rights of the National government, on the one hand, and especially of the several States which compose the Union, on the other hand, as she is in freeing the slave. In the measures the Abolitionists adopt, there is a deeper question involved than that of Negro slavery. All who are accustomed to look below the surface of things, may see that it is a question of no less magnitude than that of changing the whole structure of the government of this country, and possibly that of destroying the liberty of the whole American people. When hundreds and thousands of our citizens are banded together to trample on the rights of independent communities in the holy name of Freedom herself, we confess we are not a little alarmed for the rights of the individual. One barrier leaped, another may be; and when communities can no longer make their rights respected, what can the individual do?

But we shall be told that all our fears are idle, all

our reasonings groundless, for Abolitionists do not propose to do anything more than we have conceded them the right to do ; that is, to express freely their honest convictions on the question of slavery. We deny this. The Abolition Societies, as everybody knows, are not formed for the discussion of slavery, but for its abolition. Their members are pledged to the "immediate emancipation of the slaves without expatriation." Lawyers may have been consulted, and the wording of their constitutions may be technically within the letter of the law, but we know, and everybody knows, that the real end, the avowed end, of their formation is not merely to give utterance to certain opinions on the question of slavery, but to effect its abolition. They are not formed for deliberation, for discussion, but for action, and action, too, within the limits of States of which Abolitionists are not citizens.

But we shall be told again, that, admitting the Abolition Societies are formed for the abolition and not the discussion of slavery, they do not contravene international law, because they adopt for the purpose of carrying their end only legal and constitutional means, such means as the laws of nations permit them to adopt. This undoubtedly is the real ground on which the Abolitionists rest their defence. We object to it, because we are not yet able to perceive that the legitimacy of the means, in themselves, can legitimate an unlawful end. It is admitted that the Abolitionists have no legal right to emancipate the slaves. Yet the emancipation of the slaves is what they propose to do. They propose to do what the laws of nations prohibit them from doing. Are any means directed to that end lawful to be used ?

The Abolitionists, it will be said, do not propose to emancipate the slaves, except as the effect of the expression of their opinions and feelings on the subject of slavery. We question this statement ; but admit it for a moment. The Abolitionists, unless they choose to break with the slave-holding States, to

refuse to sustain the relation of friends to them, and to come into open war with them, are bound by the laws of nations to refrain from all words and deeds which will disturb their peace and tranquillity, stir up insurrection in them, sully their reputation, or excite public indignation against them. Now we may undoubtedly discuss the question of slavery, but not so as to produce any of these results. Free discussion is itself subjected to this restriction. So long as we wish to be at peace and amity with foreign nations, we are bound to treat all their institutions, as their institutions, with respect. We have no more right to denounce them, to slander them, to speak to their prejudice, or to injure them in any way, because their institutions differ from ours, or from what we believe just, than we have an individual whose creed we happen to disbelieve. We may reason against such a man's creed, but we are bound to see that our reasoning against it do not result in any injury to him. If we should represent him as one with whom his neighbors should hold no intercourse, brand him as a sinner of the deepest dye, hire editors of papers to publish him to the world as such, and hold public meetings and pass public resolves to the effect that, if he do not change his creed instantly, he shall be placed out of the pale of Humanity, we should most assuredly transcend our rights in regard to him, and give him just cause of complaint against us. Now the Abolitionists pursue a course like this towards the slave-holding communities, and they do this for the express purpose of freeing the slave. They may in all this be only giving utterance to their honest convictions and feelings, but have they, under plea of free discussion, a right to utter themselves in this manner? Can they do this and be in a state of peace with those communities?

The Abolitionists say they use only moral and rational means, merely arguments addressed to the reason and the conscience. Is it so? To what kind of a reason or a conscience is denunciation addressed?

Is it so? What mean then these fifteen hundred affiliated Societies, spread over the non-slave-holding States, pledged to the immediate emancipation of the slaves? Are these Societies' arguments addressed to the individual reason and conscience of the slave-holder? What is the rationale of this argument? What is its legitimacy? Many hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children, all solemnly pledged to effect the immediate emancipation of the slaves, are banded together in some fifteen hundred Societies; therefore slavery is a sin; therefore no slave-holder is a Christian; and therefore every slave-holder must immediately emancipate his slaves! We confess this is a species of logic that passes our comprehension. That these Societies, by banding together the majority of our population, may so concentrate public opinion, and bring it to bear with such force on the institution of slavery, that the slave-holder shall feel himself unable to withstand it, and therefore compelled to free his slaves, is what we can understand very well; but this is neither a rational nor a moral argument for the abolition of slavery. A man finds a loaded pistol presented at his breast, and to save his life gives up his purse; and the slave-holder finds the community pointing the finger of scorn at him, and to save his reputation, which he holds dearer than life, emancipates his slaves; which is the more moral and rational argument of the two? An army, organized and marching upon the South to free the slaves at the point of the bayonet, would, in principle, be an argument to the individual reason and conscience of the slave-holder, equally as forcible, appropriate, and convincing, as an associated multitude pointing the finger of scorn, or shouting denunciation, and threatening the vengeance of Heaven.

Nor is it true that our Abolitionists contemplate no action on the subject, but the action of truth and moral suasion. They do contemplate political action. They let pass no possible opportunity of bringing the subject of slavery before the State legislatures; and

they are constantly at work to get it discussed on the floor of Congress. What, we ask, is all this agitation for? Why is Abolitionism organizing a political party in the States and the Nation? Why does it want Abolition members in our State Legislatures? Why does it interrogate candidates for office as to their views of slavery? Is there no political action intended? Give it a majority in Congress, and will it not legislate on the subject? It will at once abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories. Will it stop there? Who so simple as to believe it? It will usurp, or alter the United States Constitution so as not to need to usurp, the power to abolish it in the States. What are paper constitutions in the way of a body of men, women, and children, inflamed, drunken with a great Idea, and so much the more drunken because the Idea with which they are filled is a holy one, — what are paper constitutions in their way, when they have in their hands the actual power to advance? He knows nothing of the power of an enthusiastic multitude, who thinks such feeble barriers would arrest their progress. Their leaders might rush before them, the wise and prudent might beg them to pause; but leaders, and the wise and prudent are as chaff before the wind, and on will the multitude press, sweeping them away, or trampling them under their feet, to the realization of the Idea which inspires them. Here is the danger. Let the Abolitionists get the majority banded together in or under the control of their affiliated Societies, pledged to the immediate emancipation of the slaves, and they will throw into Congress the power to do it; that is, power to regulate the internal institutions of the States; gone then is the independency of the States; and then goes individual freedom; and then all power is in the central government; Greece or Rome is reproduced; the absolutism of the state is established, which merely precludes the absolutism of the Emperor. God grant, that in the honest and earnest defence of Liberty we dig not her grave!

We speak on this subject strongly, but we have no fears of being misunderstood. There is not a man or woman living that can accuse us of defending slavery. This whole number of our Review is devoted to the defence of the rights of Man, not to the rights of one man, of a few men, but of every man. We can legitimate our own right to freedom, only by arguments which prove also the Negro's right to be free. We have all our life long sympathized with the poor and the oppressed, and we yield to no Abolitionist in the amount of the sacrifices we have made, wisely or unwisely, needlessly or not, in the cause of human freedom. It is not to-day, nor this year, that we have pledged ourselves, for life or for death, to the holy cause of universal liberty. But everything, we say, in its time. First, we must settle the bases of individual freedom, settle the principle that man measures man the world over, and establish our government upon it, and secure the action of the government in accordance with it, and then we may proceed to make all details harmonize with it.

To explain ourselves; the work to be done in this country to-day is to place the government in the hands of the people, not only in principle, but in fact. Hitherto the government, in point of fact, has been in the hands of the business men, who have shaped legislation to their especial interests. We are struggling now to get it out of their hands,—not to the disadvantage of the business men,—but to hinder them from having an exclusive control over it. The business men form a part of the people, a large part, and a respectable part, and we must not wish to turn the government in any respect against them; but we must seek so to arrange matters, that they shall share only an equal protection with all the other sections of the community. The object is to effect such changes, that there shall henceforth, in all governmental relations and actions, be no classes, but simply the People. This done, we shall have established the principle of universal liberty, and opened the door for

every man to enter into the possession of entire freedom, under the dominion of equal laws. We shall then have all the individual freedom of the savage state with all the order and social harmony of the highest degree of civilization. This is the end to be gained, as we have attempted to show in the article which precedes this.

Now, our danger is not from an excess of individuality, but from centralization. The danger to be apprehended is from the strength, not the weakness of the government. Nearly the whole North has a strong tendency to merge the individual in the state. The North is enterprising, fond of undertaking great things, which are to be accomplished only by concentrating the power of masses, to be wielded by a few directing minds. This tendency is good, and springs from noble qualities; nevertheless it may, in its eagerness to reach its end, so centralize power, that the individual from an integer may become a mere fraction of the body politic. It therefore needs a check, a counterbalancing power, at least until the bases of legislation and social action become so fixed, that there shall henceforth be no danger that the state will swallow up the individual.

This check is found in the strong individuality of the South, arising from the individual importance which each man there possesses in consequence of being himself a sort of petty sovereign. The Southern planter keeps alive here the very element of individual freedom, represented by the feudal baron in Europe. The South therefore becomes the defender of individual freedom, as the North is the great advocate of social freedom. One represents the individual element, as the other does the social element of human nature. Hence the North demands a strong government, and the South a strong people. The North have been Federalists, the South Democrats. Now if we weaken the Southern individuality before the Northern centralization be fixed by laws, which leave the individual in possession of all his natural

rights, we destroy the equilibrium between the individual and the state, and endanger the freedom of both. This is one reason why we regret the present agitation of the slave question, and why we see danger, not to the Union merely, but to liberty herself in the Abolition movements.

This strong individuality of the South is the effect of the institution of slavery. The South without slaves would have had the same tendency to centralization that we have at the North. The cause of it here is the fact that no individual here feels himself of much importance by the side of the state. Individually he can do but little, and feels himself small. Hence his strong desire to lean on the state, his uncommon fondness for associations, corporations, partnerships, whatever concentrates power and adds to individual strength. Then again our commercial and manufacturing pursuits also tend to make us desire somewhere the social power, we can call in to supply our individual deficiency in strength, capital, or skill. The Southern planter is a sort of prince. Living in the centre of his plantation, of his own principality, absolute lord and proprietor of a number of human beings, he feels that he, individually, is a man; that his rights as a man are of too much consequence to be swallowed up in the rights of the state. It is true, he ought to reflect that his Negroes have the same rights by nature, as himself, and so he will one day; but first he must secure his own rights. After he has secured his own rights as a man, and finds them no longer in danger from the Northern tendency to centralization, he will perceive that he has, in defending them, been defending those of his Negroes; and then he will take up in earnest the matter of freeing them. To free them before were of no use, because before he has secured his own rights, there can be no security for theirs.

Here is the aid which slavery itself, through the providence of God, is made to contribute to liberty. Good always comes out of evil; and Southern states-

men are nearer the truth than we commonly think them, when they say, that "Southern slavery is the support of Northern liberty." We confess, that as things were, we see no way in which freedom could have been established in this country, without the strong sense of individual freedom which slavery tends to produce in the planter. When the world has become Christianized, we shall support individual freedom on the maxim, that "you are as good as I;" but in an earlier stage of social and individual progress, we must do it by means of this other maxim, "I am as good as you." Now this feeling of personal importance, of egotism, if you please, was in no way, that we can see, to be introduced but by slavery, and without this, our Republic would not have had the checks and balances needed. The time will come, when this will not be needed, and then slavery will cease. Before, it will not.

Another means of saving individual freedom is in the sovereignty of the individual States. Destroy the States as sovereignties and make them only provinces of one consolidated state, and centralization swallows up everything. The individual finds the government so far from him, and his own share in it comparatively so insignificant, that he soon comes to feel himself individually of little or no importance, and when he so feels he ceases from all manly defence of his rights, and loses himself in the mass. Now the South, in consequence of having peculiar State institutions to defend, has been the foremost in defence of State Rights, the Sovereignty of the States in its plenitude, so far at least as all their internal affairs are concerned. It is because they have had slaves, not to be retained without the supreme control of all State institutions, that they have been so earnest in defence of State sovereignty. There is some analogy between the relation a State holds to the Union, and that held by the individual to the State. The arguments which defend the rights of the individual defend those of the State, and those which defend the rights

of the State defend those of the individual. The South may have sometimes carried her doctrine of State Rights too far, but her repeated assertion of it has done not a little to save American liberty.

Now, until we have settled the controversy about state rights and individual rights, and obtained the amplest security for both, it is as unwise as it is useless to touch the question of slavery. As yet there is no security given, or capable of being given, that the slave will be a free man even if declared free by the laws. Let this security be obtained before you attempt to emancipate him. He is now, paradoxical as it may seem, aiding in laying the foundation of universal liberty to universal man, and when the superstructure is reared, and the multitude throng its courts, he shall appear in the temple a free and equal worshipper.

Hard undoubtedly is it, that liberty should be purchased at the slave's expense, and we confess we have no fondness for the idea; but less injustice is done the slave than we commonly imagine. The Negro on a Southern plantation is unquestionably a superior being to the Negro in his native Africa. By being enslaved, he has been elevated, not degraded. Degraded he no doubt is in comparison with his master, but his captivity shall redeem his race. The years of his bondage shall not be so long, his labors, sufferings, and sacrifices in becoming a civilized man shall be far less, than ours have been. So far as we may judge from the Past, it is the settled order of God's providence, that man shall be saved only by crucified redeemers. Man is never to receive freedom and civilization as a boon; he can obtain them only by toil and struggle and blood. Why it should be so, is one of the mysteries of Providence, for which we might perhaps assign some good reasons, but which we do not undertake to solve. The world is full of mysteries, and this is no more dark and perplexing than a thousand others. Time will clear it up.