

must say that we have scarcely ever heard of such a manifest perversion of justice.—There are some causes that we never know how bad they are till they are defended, and it is only when we see the naturally strong-minded and clear headed Mr. Inglis obliged to take this ground, that we see how indefensible is the whole affair.

We are, however, referred to the breaking up of the Tanna mission. Mr. Inglis was not in the South Seas at that time, nor for months before or after, and he has simply repeated what he heard on the subject. The account published at the time was no doubt dark enough. At that time Mr. Paton, according to his own account, had had twenty-six attacks of fever, and by these as well as his other trials his nervous system was entirely unstrung. In fact he was so broken down, that his brethren advised his leaving the field and visiting the colonies for a time. The other missionaries who investigated the facts on the spot were of opinion, that the accounts published did not at all convey an accurate view of the state of matters, and neither Mr. I. nor his friends can complain, if we take their view of the facts of the case. When Dr. G. arrived home, he informed the Board of Foreign Missions, that a principal object he had in view in coming home, was to disabuse the mind of the church of the erroneous impressions produced, regarding the state of those islands, by the publications referred to. And to the Board and others he presented the facts in a light very different from previous accounts. We begin to think that it is time that the whole church were correctly informed on the subject, and we may probably revert to it hereafter. At present, however, we may say that it is now clearly established, that when a Tanna chief pledges his honor for the protection of a missionary, that pledge is sacred *so far as his power extends*—that this has hitherto been found to be the case—that in the case of Messrs. Nisbet and Turner, the attack came from an inland tribe, but that the chiefs who had pledged themselves for protection of the missionaries fought for them, till several of their people had been severely wounded and their own lives en-

dangered—that when Messrs. Johnston and Paton's lives were attempted it was by persons from another district, and that under circumstances where it is a wonder that any white man was allowed to live on the island—that the station at Port Resolution was not broken up by a war against the mission, but through a civil war between different tribes—that Mr. Matheson's station was not broken up through the hostility of the natives, though they were in a very unsettled state, Mr. Matheson having declared on his arrival at Aneiteum that he would not have left, but that the state of Mrs. M's health rendered her removal absolutely necessary, and that at both stations the chiefs did all in their power to save the property of the missionaries. Upon these points we may furnish details on another occasion.

Mr. I. represents us as "holding that missionaries ought never to apply to their own government for protection against the heathen, or for redress of grievances." We never said any thing of the kind, nor do we hold any such views. If ever the lives of our missionaries are in danger, we say at once that we hold them warranted, if they have the opportunity, to seek the aid of the civil power for their preservation. Nor could we object to any lawful means for the redress of grievances. But in this case there had been no missionary on the island for more than three years, and there was no question of preserving life, except as it was expected that the measures of retaliation adopted would have an effect on other tribes and in the future. A resort to such a measure in such circumstances in the interests of missions, we regard as not only unexampled in the history of the missionary enterprise, but inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel,—opposed to the directions given by our Lord to his servants, and certain to be injurious in its influence upon the cause of Christ in those regions.

But even on the principles of right acknowledged by men of the world, we hold the affair indefensible, even laying aside the principles of Christianity,—supposing that there were no missions involved—supposing that Christ's kingdom were of this world, and his servants entitled to use car-