

is one case in which all extremities are justifiable, viz., when our life is assaulted, and it becomes necessary for our preservation to kill the assailant. This is evident in a state of nature; unless it can be shown that we are bound to prefer the aggressor's life to our own; that is to say, to love our enemy better than ourselves, which can never be a debt of justice, nor anywhere appears to be a duty of charity."—Paley To this I would say, that although we may not be required to love our enemies better than ourselves, we are required to love them as ourselves; and that in the supposed case, it would still be a question equally balanced, which life ought to be sacrificed; for it is quite clear that if we kill the assailant we love him less than ourselves, which may perhaps militate a little against "a duty of charity." But the truth is that the question is not whether we should love our enemy better than ourselves, but whether we should sacrifice the laws of Christianity in order to preserve our lives; whether we should prefer the interests of religion to our own; whether we should be willing to lose our life for Christ's sake and the gospel's. We say, then, that Christianity has not declared that we are ever at liberty to kill other men; secondly, that she virtually prohibits it, because her principles and the practice of our Saviour are not compatible with it. The first of these positions will probably not be disputed, and upon the second, that Christianity virtually prohibits the destruction of human life, it has been the principal object of this essay to insist. I would, therefore, only observe the conduct of the Founder of Christianity, when His enemies approached Him with "swords and staves," appears to apply strictly to self-defense. These armed men came with the final purpose of murdering Him; but, although He knew this purpose, he would not suffer the assailants to be killed or even to be wounded. Christ, therefore, would not preserve His own life by sacrificing another's.

The annals of the Society of Friends afford many illustrations of the policy of the principle held out in the preceding essay from which I select two as being directly to the point. "Robert Barclay, the celebrated apologist, was attacked by a highwayman. He made no other resistance than a calm expostulation. The felon dropped his presented pistol and offered no further violence." "A. Leonard Fell was assaulted by a highway robber, who plundered him of his money and his horse, and afterwards threatened to blow out his brains. Fell solemnly spoke to the robber on the wickedness of his life. The man was astonished. He declared he would take neither his money nor his horse, and returned them both.—"If thine enemy hunger, feed him; for in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head."

G. S. T.

FRIENDS PROTEST AGAINST DISTRICTING VICE.

At a large conference of members of the Society of Friends held yesterday afternoon in the Friends' Meeting House, Fifteenth street and Rutherford Place, the following protest against the plan of "districting" or "licensing" social vice was unanimously adopted, to be forwarded to the Legislature:

"This meeting, held under the auspices of the Committee on Philanthropic Labor of Westbury Quarterly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, in the city of New York, hereby records its earnest protest against the enactment of any law to 'license,' 'legalize' or 'district' social vice, such as has been proposed in a bill prepared for introduction in the Legislature and recently made public, and it much regrets also the recent public utterances of sundry members of the Legislature in favor of such immoral legislation.

"We furthermore declare license legislation for the regulation of social vice to be unjust to women, degrading to men, a peril to public health, and a