

tives from the south side of the island, who had come to take part in the fighting.— These were soon put to flight; but the chief, who had concealed himself in a tree, shot one of the seaman, when it was supposed that all danger was over. An officer ran up to the tree, and cut down the native with his sword; but as he crawled away under some bushes and got out of sight, he was pursued no farther. The Tannese were astonished and awe-struck beyond measure, by those demonstrations of power; they seemed to be like men waking out of a dream; they seemed to have realized for the first time a thorough consciousness of their own weakness in the presence of such overwhelming forces, and that all opposition to such was utterly hopeless. So that, however much the loss of life is to be deplored, it is likely to prove the means of a great saving of life in time to come. From all that I have learned, the conduct of the Tannese at Port Resolution, since that time, has been very different to strangers from what it was formerly. When the *Dayspring* landed our teachers there in November, the natives appeared very humble, and the burden of their talk, was, "Tanna man no more fight white man."

As the same principles were acted on at Erromanga, I need not enter into any further particulars.

The Board need be under no apprehension that we are about to inaugurate new principles, or a new policy, in the way of conducting this mission; or that we are transferring our trust from the living God to place it on an arm of flesh. I can speak with some freedom on this point. I have been a missionary for nearly twenty-three years, I have lived, labored, sailed, and travelled, among the worst of heathens; yet I have never, during all that time, either owned or used either firearms or lethal weapons of any kind. I am, I believe, as much averse to apply to a man-of-war, as any member of the Board; not that I think it unlawful, but for the most part it is inexpedient and unavailing. It is in general so little that a man-of-war can do. Their visits are few and far between, and when they do come, it is next to impossible to reach the guilty parties. Even in islands that are christianized, it is often difficult to do so; but it is greatly more so when the natives are heathen. Some years ago H. M. S. *Cordelia* lay about six weeks in Samoa, and destroyed several hundred pounds worth of native property, before they could apprehend a chief who had killed a white man. If an attempt is made to punish them through their property, they have so little that there is scarcely any thing that can be destroyed. Hence it is seldom that any thing effectual can be done, and unless something effectual can be done, it

is better to attempt nothing, to attempt and fail only aggravates the evil. But in the present instance, on Tanna especially, there was a combination of circumstances which rendered the course pursued fully justifiable. the punishment was not only just, but likely to be followed by beneficial consequences. It was not a crusade to force missionaries and christianity on the Tannese; it was a demonstration of power in the interests of justice and humanity, and one that is likely to render life and property much more secure in time to come. The justice of the proceedings would be recognized all over Tanna.

There is a principle involved in this question, ignored I think by the *Record*, but which I should be unwilling to surrender. The *Record* evidently holds that missionaries ought never to apply to their own government for protection against the heathen, or for redress of grievances. But if magistracy is an ordinance of God, if the magistrate bears the sword that he may be a terror to evil doers; and if all governments protect their own subjects in all lands, as far as they are able, are missionaries alone of all men to be regarded as a kind of outlaws? Is the gospel of Christ such a spiritual unearthly thing, that all earthly protection must be withdrawn from the messengers who bear it? In the middle ages, the left hand extreme to which the Church of Rome held, was to get her clergy exempt from all civil punishment. In these days it would appear that a right hand extreme to which we are to be pushed, is this, that missionaries are to be barred from all civil protection. A christian certainly never forfeits the rights of a man. When I became a missionary, it never once occurred to me, that I should be expected to forfeit the rights of a British subject, and that it would be unlawful for me on all occasions, as the *Record* seems to teach, to appeal to British authority against the heathen. Paul appealed to Cæsar, and availed himself repeatedly of his privileges as a Roman citizen, to protect himself against his enemies. It has indeed been urged, that Paul appealed for protection only, not for redress of grievances, or for punishment of injuries formerly received. But if Paul, or any missionary, appeal to the magistrate for protection, it makes no difference in the principle, whether it is to be secured by punishment for the past, or threatening for the future; he puts himself under the protection of carnal weapons; the sword may or may not require to be drawn; but it is the fear of the sword, in such a case, that renders his life safe. To restrain from evil by fear, is a principle in the divine government, as well as to draw men to that which is good by love; the same principle is sanctioned in all forms of human govern-