

if, they would not fail to find, that the panoply of love is more impenetrable to the attacks of adversaries than that of steel.

We begin with *individuals*. Will private persons by a literal adherence to the precepts of loving our enemies, not resisting evil, and especially returning good for evil, rather invite than lessen their injuries? Will they be trampled upon with impunity by a patient endurance of wrongs? On this point we will reply in the language of no less an authority amongst divines than Dr. CHALMERS. In a course of lectures delivered in the University of Edinburgh in 1838 he speaks in the following terms:—

“Dr. Paley considers that the rules which are laid down in the sermon on the mount on the subject of non-resistance, are to be obeyed in spirit, but not in the letter; I think, however, that too much liberty is taken with the literalities of Scripture. We have just a slight observation to make, on what Paley says as to the effects of the christian character on society; more especially if the precepts of meekness and non-resistance were fully carried into effect. The first imagination is, that if a christian were to practice a literal adherence to the precepts of not resisting evil, and when any man smites him on one cheek of turning to him the other, he would be trodden down by the selfishness of those around. There are, however, many beautiful examples to the contrary; such as the estimation in which the Quakers are held, and the general respect and good liking which are felt towards the Moravians, and the quiet which is enjoyed by an inoffensive man; all proving that if we had the courage to enter on the precepts of the Gospel, its promises, which are for “the life which now is,” as well as “that which is to come,” would never fail us. We have long been persuaded, that an adherence to these maxims would not be hurtful to the interests of the individual, but would rather be advantageous to them. An author, whose name I forget, gives an interesting account of the Quakers\* during the Irish rebellion, at the close of the last century, when no neutrality was allowed. They had many hair-breadth escapes, but only one actually suffered, and he deserted his principles, and fell in battle. And that these precepts are binding on individuals, without mitigation or any qualifying clauses, I am strongly inclined to believe; and I am sure, that if we would venture on them, we should find a quiet walk in this world as well as a safe walk to heaven.”

But, separate from the opinions of fallible men, we lay it down as a truth established by the most satisfactory proofs, that a person of a humble, pacific spirit, leads the most quiet life. Is it not seen, that an inoffensive deportment, especially when it is united to uprightness and sanctity, preserves its possessor from many quarrels in which others are involved, and from many injuries which the quarrelsome sustain? “Who,” inquires Dr. Worcester, “are the persons in society that most frequently receive insult and abuse? Are they the meek, the benevolent, and the forbearing? Do these more commonly have reason to complain, than persons of quick resentment, who are ready to fight on the least provocation? There are three sects of professing christians remarkably pacific, and which, as sects, are peculiar in their opinions respecting the lawfulness of war, and the right of repelling injury by violence. Now, we ask, does it appear from experience, that their forbearing spirit brings on them a greater portion of injury and insult than is experienced by people of other sects? Is not the reverse of this true in fact? There may indeed be some instances of such gross depravity, as a person’s taking advantage of their pacific character, to do them injury, with the hope of impunity. But in general, it is believed, their pacific principles and spirit command the esteem even of the vicious, and operate as a shield from insult and abuse.”

“The question may be brought home to every society. How seldom do children of a mild, forbearing temper, experience insult or injury, compared with the waspish, who will sting if touched? The same inquiry may be made in respect to persons of those opposite descriptions of every age, and in every situation of life; and the result will be favourable to the point in question.”

Let the question now be settled by “the law and the testimony.” The apostle Peter in urging upon the primitive christians the duty of rendering good for evil, assures them that by this method the comforts of life will be secured, the favour of God engaged, and the malice of men in a great measure disarmed. He declares that meekness and patience, a virtuous and peaceable life, are the way for christians to be preserved, and to escape numberless evils; for God approves of such as behave in that manner, and mankind in general are disposed to treat them kindly. “Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing; but contrariwise blessing; knowing that ye are thereunto called that ye should inherit a blessing.”

“For he that will love life, and see good days,  
Let him refrain his tongue from evil,  
And his lips that they speak no guile:  
Let him eschew evil, and do good;  
Let him seek peace and ensue it.  
For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous,  
And his ears are open to their prayers:  
But the face of the Lord is against them that do evil.”

“And who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good? But, and if ye suffer for righteousness’ sake, happy are ye; and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled.” And we may boldly ask, Who is he that will harm the man who overcomes evil with good, and who by feeding his enemy when hungry, heaps coals of fire on his head? Of the striking effect of the moral power of a pacific and friendly course towards enemies, we have a beautiful instance in the history of Jacob and Esau. The latter resolved upon a bloody revenge from the time that Jacob stole his blessing, which murderous resolve he kept for twenty years; and on being informed of the approach of his brother on returning from Laban, he collected four hundred men, and went out to meet him with a view to be revenged upon him for fraudulently obtaining his birthright and blessing. Jacob was timely advised of this hostile movement of his brother, but instead of preparing to defend himself and company, he determined to overcome evil with good. He first implored the divine

\*The author referred to is Thomas Hancock. Dr. Chalmers might also have spoken as favourably of the safety of the Moravians. “During the rebellion in Ireland in 1793, the rebels it is stated, had long meditated an attack on the Moravian settlement at Grace-hill, Wexford county. At length, in fulfillment of their threats, a large body of them marched to the town. But the Moravians, true to their principles in this trying emergency, did not meet them in arms; but assembling in their place of worship besought Jehovah to be their shield and protector in the hour of danger. The hostile bands, who had expected an armed resistance, were struck with astonishment at a sight so unexpected and impressive; they heard the prayers and praises of the Moravians; they listened to their supplications in their own behalf; and after lingering in the streets a whole day and night, they with one consent turned and marched away, without having injured an individual.”

protection and favour, and then sent a princely present to his murderous foe, directing his servants also to call Esau, his lord. How completely Jacob heaped coals of fire on his brother’s head, or in other words, subdued his mortal enmity by this course, is well known to every reader of scripture history. “And Jacob lifted up his eyes, and beheld Esau came, and with him four hundred men. And he bowed himself to the ground seven times, until he came near his brother. And Esau ran to meet him, and embraced him, and fell on his neck and kissed him, and they wept.” Gen. xxxiii. Here was a triumph of love, condescension, and beneficence, over enmity, revenge, and malevolence! In a similar way Abigail, the wife of Nabal, happily succeeded in turning away the fierce anger of David, and his men of war. See 1 Sam. xxv. chap. The history of Saul and David furnishes other examples of the moral power of the pacific and friendly course. On two different occasions, when Saul with his warriors were seeking to destroy David’s life, the latter had opportunities of slaying the Hebrew monarch. He refrained however, from killing Saul, which act of clemency so affected the king, that he uttered the following language, “I have sinned: return my son David; for I will no more do thee harm, because my soul was precious in thine eyes this day.” 1 Sam. xxvi. chap.

And the history of the world presents a multitude of examples in favour of the utility and expediency of perfectly following the precepts and example of Christ, in respect to non-resistance, and overcoming evil with good. From a number of cases before us, we select the following:—“A Moravian missionary, in the desolate regions of the north was attacked by a savage. The Indian pointed a loaded gun at his bosom, and was ready to lay him a corpse at his feet. The missionary with the gentleness of a lamb, and with the moral courage and faith of a christian, looked the Indian full in the face, and said, “you cannot shoot me, unless Jesus Christ permit you.” The countenance of the savage changed, his gun fell, and he turned and went away.” In the early part of the year 1833, an agent of the Bible Society, was travelling in the Mexican province of Texas. “His course lay through a piece of woods, where two men waylaid him with murderous intentions; one having a gun, the other a large club. As he approached the place of their concealment, they rushed towards him; but finding that no resistance was offered, they neither struck nor fired. He began to reason with them; and presently they seemed less eager to destroy him in haste. After a short time, he prevailed upon them to sit down with him upon a log, and talk the matter over deliberately; and finally he persuaded them to kneel with him in prayer; after which they parted with him in a friendly manner.” And this is the direct tendency of a pacific and benevolent course; it touches a chord in every human heart; it has influence with the most abandoned; it has power even with the assassin.

Nor is this meant as a mere emphatic declaration which is to be taken with some diminution of its obvious import. We have no doubt, that a traveller would be more secure among uncivilized and barbarous people, where assaults and assassinations are frequent, without arms than with them, provided it were known, that he was unarmed. The whole history of Missionary institutions is a proof of the correctness of this opinion. The missionary takes up his abode among a people of ferocious habits; he has no military arms for his defence, but is in that respect utterly exposed and defenceless. And yet he is entirely secure; far more so, than if he were girt round with the unholy protection of weapons of war. In Ramond’s Travels in the Pyrenees, speaking of the desperate Spanish Smugglers, he says, “These smugglers are as adroit as they are determined, are familiarised at all times with peril, and march in the very face of death; their first movement is a never-failing shot, and certainly would be a subject of dread to most travellers; for where are they to be dreaded more than in deserts, where crime has nothing to witness it, and the feeble no assistance. As for myself, alone and unarmed, I have met them without anxiety, and have accompanied them without fear. We have little to apprehend from men whom we inspire with no distrust or envy, and every thing to expect in those, from whom we claim only what is due from man to man. The assassin has been my guide in the defiles of the boundaries of Italy; and the smuggler of the Pyrenees has received me with a welcome in his secret paths. Armed, I should have been the enemy of both; unarmed they have alike respected me. In such expectation, I have long since laid aside all menacing apparatus whatever. Arms may, indeed, be employed against the wild beast, but no one should forget that they are no defence against the traitor; that they irritate the wicked, and intimidate the simple; lastly, that the man of peace, among mankind, has a much more sacred defence—his character.”

We may now turn from individuals and from classes of men to *states and nations*. Now if it is seen, that a friendly, pacific course in an individual, saves him from many quarrels in which others are engaged, why should it not be so with nations too? Like causes produce like effects; and if nations were as exemplary in the virtues of patience, returning good for evil, etc. as individuals are, and as careful to avoid giving offence, and as slow in taking it—the number of their wars, to say the least, would be astonishingly diminished. The unarmed Quakers in America, and Ireland, were preserved amidst scenes of the greatest cruelty and desolation. “Strangers passing by their houses, and seeing them uninjured, with ruins on either hand, would frequently without knowing to whom they belonged, say that they were Quakers’ houses. Now we venture to maintain that no reason whatever can be assigned, why the fate of the Quakers would not be the fate of all who, relying on the protection of the Prince of Peace, should adopt their conduct. No reason can be assigned why, if their number had been multiplied ten-fold or a hundred-fold, they would not have been preserved. If there be such a reason, let us hear it. The American and Irish Quakers were, to the rest of the community, what one nation is to a continent. And we must require the advocate of war to produce (that which has never yet been produced) a reason for believing, that although individuals exposed to destruction were preserved, a nation exposed to destruction would be destroyed.”

A national example of a refusal to bear arms, has only been once exhibited to the world: but that one example has proved, so far as its political circumstances enabled it, all that humanity could desire, and all that scepticism could demand, in favor of our argument. We refer to the government of Pennsylvania under William Penn. Pennsylvania was colonized by men who believed that war was absolutely incompatible with christianity, and who, therefore, resolved not to practise. Having determined not to

fight, they maintained no soldiers, and possessed no arms. They planted themselves in a country that was surrounded by savages, and by savages who knew they were unarmed. If easiness of conquest, or incapability of defence, could subject them to outrage, the Pennsylvanians might have been the very sport of violence. Plunderers might have robbed them without retaliation, and armies might have slaughtered them without resistance. If they did not give a temptation to outrage, no temptation could be given. The English, the Dutch, and indeed all preceding settlers with their fighting principles, had been involved in perpetual hostilities with the natives. But the peaceful settlers of Pennsylvania were the people who possessed their country in security, whilst those around them were trembling for their existence. This was a land of peace, whilst every other was a land of war; affording us, to adopt the language of the Edinburgh Review, “a large though solitary example, of the facility which they, who are really sincere and friendly in their views, may live in harmony with those who are supposed to be peculiarly fierce and faithless.”

The security and quiet of Pennsylvania was not a transient freedom from war, such as might accidentally happen to any nation. She continued to enjoy it for more than seventy years, and subsisted in the midst of six Indian nations, without so much as a militia for her defence, and never during the administration of Penn, or that of his proper successors, was there a quarrel or a war. And during this period the colony continued to flourish, and its increase of population was unexampled.

And when was the security of Pennsylvania molested and its peace destroyed?—When the men who had directed its councils, and who would not engage in war, were outvoted in its legislature:—when they who supposed that there was greater security in the sword than in christianity, became the predominating body. From that hour, the Pennsylvanians transferred their confidence in christian principles, to a confidence in their arms; and from that hour to the present they have been subject to war. Such is the evidence, derived from a national example of the consequences of a pursuit of the christian policy in relation to war. The only national opportunity which the virtue of the christian world has afforded us, of ascertaining the safety of relying upon God for defence, has determined that it is safe. Now, are the European powers worse than the savages of America? For if not, why should it be thought that a nation of christendom acting on the righteous principles of William Penn would be destroyed, and that too by other christian powers? We know, much may be said of the complicated relations of European states as affecting the question: but if the Quaker had never made the experiment of establishing a colony upon peaceable principles, the advocates of War would have deemed it as impracticable and chimerical as for a nation of Europe to act upon those principles? In the interview of Charles II. with William Penn, when the latter was about to sail for America, the following dialogue took place:—

“I am just come to bid thee farewell,” said Penn to the king.

“What! venture yourself among the savages of North America? Why man, what security have you that you will not be in their war-kettle in two hours after setting foot on their shores?”

“The best security in the world,” replied Penn.

“I doubt that, friend William; I have no idea of any security against those cannibals but in a regiment of good soldiers, with their muskets and bayonets. And mind I tell you beforehand, that, with all my good will for you and your family, to whom I am under obligations, I will not send a single soldier with you.”

“I want none of thy soldiers,” answered Penn. “I depend on something better than thy soldiers.”

But christians in our day seem to think that soldiers and the apparatus of war, are the best means of protection under heaven! They seem to be slow to believe that “justice is stronger than ramparts; innocence is mightier than armies; forgiveness is fleetier than swift ships.”

In the light of the facts now adduced, we ask Marmion to produce one single instance in the history of man, of a person who had given an unconditional obedience to the will of heaven, and who did not find that his conduct was wise as well as virtuous, that it accorded with his interests as well as his duty? We ask the same question in relation to the peculiar obligations to non-resistance. Again, will Marmion produce one single instance in the history of the world, of a nation who acted upon the principles of William Penn, and yet were crushed and subjugated? We have, it is true, seen nations submitting to an ignominious yoke, impelled by fear or imbecility; but where the principles of action are totally different, we have no right to predict similar results. And yet, without a single fact to support his position, Marmion has the courage to write of the danger of the pacific spirit in a community! For nations to obey Jesus Christ, and love their enemies, returning good for evil, and doing unto others as they would they should do unto them, Marmion fears “would accomplish more mischief than the wildest dogmas of the *sans culottes* factions of republican France.” He would have us believe that the civilized nations of modern times are such bands of plunderers, that to act as William Penn did, and Great Britain would soon lose her islands and colonies? Now, we doubt this, and in the absence of all proof cannot believe it. There is no glory in beating down the weak and defenceless. Nothing but the deepest meanness could induce a nation to attack a defenceless people, whose only preparation for insult was a spirit of forgiveness, whose only return for wrong was a kiss. No laurels would be gathered on such a field as this, and the commander who should be sent to crush to the dust such a people, would shoot himself for shame. With Dr. J. Pye Smith we say, “there are but few warriors, who would not draw back their sword, before any one who would go to them; and say that they could not, from principle, resist, but would rather lose their own lives than take away that of their foe. There was a charm in it which would go far to unnerve the most savage opponent.” The fashion of settling disputes at the point of the sword has been pursued long enough to convince the most prejudiced observer that it is attended with incalculable mischief. Is it not then at least worth while to try whether a contrary method might not be productive of less evil? It cannot possibly succeed worse; but it may have unspeakably happier results. And in the only instance on record, in which such a line of policy has been steadily adopted, it proved completely successful.

Here our space obliges us to conclude for the present. We must beg the patience of Marmion and all our readers for another week, when we hope to conclude our reply. THE EDITOR.