

justice. *Is this thing right?* Questions of expediency and interest, are in their nature, quite subordinate to the question of right. That wrong may be attended with temporal gain, or temporal safety, does not alter the nature of wrong: that right may be attended with pain or sacrifice, does not lessen the obligation to do right. It is not unusual, however, in discussing this subject, to bear extreme cases brought forward as arguments that shall affect the general conclusion. But this, we conceive, is not fair. Let the question be, *Is lying right?* There may be instances in which a falsehood may save the life of an innocent man. Is it therefore inferred that lying is a justifiable practice, or that the principle of veracity ought not to be inviolable? Satisfied we are that Marmion would not draw such an inference; now, we submit it to him with all deference, whether it is not in this mode that he attempts to vindicate war. His case, if we rightly understand him, is this: "If we do not repel violence with violence—if we do not resist the evil person, or the evil nation unto death, we shall suffer, and therefore to resist our foes unto death is right!" In this manner the nature of right is estimated by the amount of suffering it involves. We are no casuists, but on this plan, we undertake to prove that slavery, idolatry, theft, and lying are sometimes right. Far be it from us to intimate that Marmion would be the apologist for such practices; we believe he would not. All we mean to assert is this, that by the philosophy of expediency, and by entertaining the question of right and wrong, with the secondary ones of interest and safety, the above customs may be justified. Nay more, the advocates of falsehood in some cases, and the vindicators of slavery, have always resorted to these secondary questions. And on the latter subject, by the question of expediency, the churches of Christendom and philanthropists, universally, were blinded for ages to the enormous sin of holding human beings in bondage. To return from this digression to the case in hand. *Does christianity sanction or prohibit war?* The distinction made between offensive and defensive war is not admitted into the Gospel of Christ, which gives no indulgence to the insensible or revengeful passions, by authorising violence towards a fellow creature on any occasion. We wish to look at war as the Apostles did, as Jesus Christ himself did, as a God of infinite purity and love still regards it. If he has legalized, in any case, its arts and intrigues, its falsehoods and deceptions, its pollutions and cruelties, its atrocities and horrors, its ferocious outrages upon the dearest rights and interests of mankind, its reckless trampling on all the laws of earth and heaven, its glaring contradictions of the spirit and precepts of the New Testament, we will relinquish our ground; but, if not, we shall call upon Marmion, as he reveres God, or loves man, to rally beneath the stainless banner of peace, and take his stand upon the everlasting gospel against this legalized system of vice and crimes, and wholesale mischief. You will perceive, Sir, that whatever you may think of our prudence, we mean to take up the subject fairly, and free from all equivocation or subterfuge.

Before attempting to show from the New Testament, that war, in no shape whatever, is allowable, it may be of some importance to premise, that in making this attempt we labour under great disadvantages. We cannot reasonably expect an entirely candid hearing. Even those, who imagine that they may be fully prepared to receive the truth on this subject, may nevertheless be under the influence of some secret and imperceptible bias. The truth is, the natural and unholy feelings of mankind are against us. If a man is greatly injured, he has a natural feeling, a sort of instinctive impulse, that it is right for him to defend himself; and under certain circumstances and to a certain extent, to attack, to retaliate, to charge home, to carry the war into the enemy's territory. And accordingly when our doctrine of the entire inviolability of human life in all cases whatever is proposed to him, he instinctively sets himself against it; and it is an hundred to one that he is not in a proper situation to listen attentively and candidly to the arguments by which it is supported. We mention this unfavorable state of things, in order that the inquirer into the truth of our doctrine may scrutinize his own feelings, and may use all suitable efforts to put himself in a situation, where every well-founded consideration will have its due effect. And we may add farther, that it is highly important and a duty, that he should take this course. And unless he does, and does it too in the full purpose and sincerity of his heart, we frankly acknowledge we have no hope of a favorable issue.

Our present argument addresses itself, it will be perceived, not to the Atheist, who believes in no God, nor to the Deist, who rejects the Divine Word; nor to the mere Moralist, who weaves from the elements of his imperfect reason the web of a spurious and unsound philosophy; nor to the mere speculative believer, who gives a nominal assent to the Gospel without imbibing or recognizing its spirit; but to the real, the devoted, the humble Christian; to him who makes Christ his great example, and truly desires to be animated by the same spirit of sublime charity, benevolence, and forgiveness, which glowed so brightly in the bosom of the Saviour. We have not the slightest idea of the name, character, or profession of Marmion; but he will permit us to say, that the kindly spirit he has diffused through his refutation of our sentiments, induces us to believe that he is in deed and in truth a follower of the meek and lowly Jesus.

In proceeding now to examine the subject of war in the light of the New Testament, we shall introduce in the first place, a few of the precepts uttered by Jesus Christ.

*Thou shalt not kill. Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good.*

*Be ye merciful, as your Father also is merciful. All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Be ye wise as serpents, and harmless as doves. Blessed are the poor in spirit—the meek—the merciful—the peace-makers.*

These precepts were exemplified in the life and death of the Prince of peace. His whole life was one series of meek endurance of the contradiction of sinners against himself. When a band of assassins came to take him, he went forth, and said unto them, Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus said unto them I am he, and then quietly surrendered himself into their hands, though he knew that an ignominious and cruel death would be the consequence. He gave his back to the smiters—when reviled, reviled not again,—was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. When he suffered, he threatened not, but prayed for the ruffians whose hands were reeking with his blood,

"Father, forgive them for they know not what they do." How very different, in our view, would have been the character of Jesus and of his religion, if he had died fighting in defence of his person, or of his doctrines. We recoil from the thought. And yet we would fain inquire, who may be justified, on christian principles, in making violent defence, if our Master himself might not. Aye, Marmion, though the apologist for defence by force and arms, would shudder at the thought of dying in the malignant spirit of warriors—with

*'War in their heart, and vengeance in their hand.'*

He would sooner die in the forgiving spirit of the Lamb of God—with the meekness and gentleness of the martyred Stephen, saying, *Lord lay not this sin to their charge.*

In the further prosecution of our subject, we shall refer in the next place, to the teachings of the holy Apostles.

*Love worketh no ill to his neighbor. The fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace. Follow peace with all men. Put on bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering. If thine enemy hunger, feed him, if he thirst, give him drink.*

*Overcome evil with good. Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing, but contrariwise, blessing, knowing that ye are thereunto called. If when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God, for even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps. See that none render evil for evil unto any man; but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all men. Recompense to no man, evil for evil. Avenge not yourselves.*

*Where envying and strife is, there is confusion, and every evil work. The works of the flesh are these—hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, envyings, murders and such like. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity. Love suffereth long and is kind—endureth all things.*

*In malice, be ye children. Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice. Who will render to every man according to his deeds; unto them that are contentious etc. tribulation and anguish.*

The comment furnished us by the lives of the Apostles, on the above admirable precepts, we have in their own words:—"God hath set forth us the Apostles last, as it were appointed to death. Being reviled we bless, being persecuted, we suffer it, being defamed we entreat." And in the same spirit did the first christians act—"After ye were illuminated, ye endured [not resisted by force] a great fight of afflictions, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods."—"Ye have condemned and killed the just; and he doth not resist you." "Take my brethren, the prophets who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction." "Be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled; but sanctify the Lord God in your heart." Nor should it be forgotten that the doctrine of the absolute inconsistency of warfare with the moral code of the christian dispensation, was one which prevailed to a very considerable extent during the early ages of the christian church. A christian soldier was as rare a creature then, as a christian duellist is now. The primitive christians, for more than the two first centuries of the christian era, did not fight, even in self-defence, as is abundantly proved by Clarkson, and more recently by Dymond, men who had ability and leisure to devote to such inquiries. Some most affecting accounts have come down to us of the first christians who were executed by the order of the Roman Emperors, because they did not feel at liberty, to gird on the sword, and to engage in the dreadful business of shedding human blood.

In order to complete the present branch of the argument, we have in the last place to remark, that there is nothing in the New Testament which has any appearance of contravening the force of the divine precepts we have cited—no counter precepts which give permission to governments to wage war against nations, or that even pts. in any case, their subjects from all obligation to obey the plain commands of Christ and his Apostles uniformly, and on every occasion. In vain will an individual search from Matthew to Revelation for any exception in favour of war for some purposes—for permission to wage war, under any circumstances. The ablest apologists for defensive war have never pointed out the chapter and verse of such a permission; not one of them has ever pretended that it could be done. They have, indeed, appealed to other sources of argument; but such appeals were a virtual acknowledgment of their inability to justify any species of war from the New Testament. And here we may be allowed in passing, to correct a small error into which Marmion has fallen—we refer to his acknowledgment that certain duties "might well be recommended to a society where a community of goods existed." It will be enough to remind Marmion and all our readers, that the precepts we have now quoted, were not addressed in particular to a Church where a community of goods was established. Such a state of things did not obtain in any other church but that of Jerusalem, and we have no apostolic letter addressed to the christians of the metropolis of Judea.

And now let any plain, unsophisticated reader of the New Testament, glance at the passages we have introduced, and then say, whether the spirit of war is not in direct and irreconcilable hostility to that of christianity—whether it does not demolish what Christ builds up, and builds up what Christ demolishes. The spirit in which it riots, and which it engenders, are lust of power and conquest, revenge, cruelty, blood thirstiness, contempt of the still small voice of conscience, and a reckless disregard of all laws but brute force. Wo to the peaceful and benign religion of Jesus, when the demon, War, rides through the land on his red horse! Or to use the language of Capt. Thrusch, in a letter addressed to George IV. on resigning his commission as a captain in the Royal Navy with all its emoluments.—

"What a strange anomaly, Sir, would be exhibited, were these truly noble and characteristic precepts of the christian religion placed at the head of every naval or military officer's commission, and at the head of every warlike order issued from the admiralty or war office, or at the head of every regimental orderly book! No incongruity could appear greater than such a mixture of War and Gospel—no impossibility more evident than the impossibility of obedience in both cases—no truth more clear than that war and christianity are utterly irreconcilable. When the christian and military duties are thus contrasted, the discrepancy is so glaring, that it has rather the appearance of burlesque, than of sober truth. But surely this striking contrariety affords no mean

argument that the duties of a christian and a warrior can never be faithfully discharged by the same person. Indeed there is scarcely a chapter in the New Testament that does not virtually condemn war—scarcely a command to which a professed warrior can pay unconditional obedience. I therefore, Sir, as a Christian, looking forward to existence beyond the grave, feel myself compelled to resign, and lay at your majesty's feet, that commission in your Naval Service, which I laboured with diligence and fidelity to attain; and on which, when attained, no one placed a higher value than myself. I see no alternative, Sir, between doing this and relinquishing those glorious hopes of immortality which our Saviour holds out to those, and to those only, who obey his precepts. Entertaining these opinions; believing that they will be approved by my future Judge; and as a christian, determined never to draw a sword, or pull a trigger, for the purpose of shedding human blood; nor yet to return a blow for a blow, or an insult for an insult: I feel myself perfectly unfit for your Majesty's Naval Service, and I think I shall not act either honestly or consistently, in retaining my commission." *Captain Thrusch's Letter to the King*

But we may hold up a picture of war, and compare its horrible features with the mild lineaments of the christian religion.

We will select but one description of a battle scene amongst the myriads which present themselves on every hand. It is from "Napier's History of the Peninsula, War," and relates to the scene after the storming of Badajoz:—"Now commenced that wild and desperate wickedness which tarnished the lustre of the soldier's heroism. Shameless rapacity, brutal intemperance, savage lust, cruelty and murder, shrieks and piteous lamentations, groans, shouts, imprecations, the hissing of fires bursting from the houses, the crushing of doors and windows, and the reports of muskets used in violence, resounded for two days and nights in the streets of Badajoz! On the third, when the city was sacked, when the soldiers were exhausted by their excesses, the tumult rather subsided than was quelled, the wounded were then looked to, the dead disposed of! Five thousand men, and officers fell during the siege, and of these, including seven hundred Portuguese, three thousand five hundred had been stricken in the assault. Let any man picture to himself this frightful carnage taking place in a space of less than a hundred yards square. Let him consider that the slain died not all suddenly, nor by one manner of death; that some perished by steel, some by shot, some by water, and some were crushed and mangled by heavy weights, some trampled upon, some dashed to atoms by the fiery explosions; that for hours this destruction was endured without shrinking, and that the town was won at last; let any man consider this, and he must admit that a British army bears with it an awful power."

Without any reference to the "wild and desperate wickedness," reproached by Col. Napier—looking only at the frightful carnage of the siege, and the loss of life in so many ways during the assault;—we may fairly ask, did christianity ever contemplate such a scene as this! The wounded were three days and nights bleeding to death! What a triumph this! What a work for christian hands to be engaged in! What a dying hour this for a disciple of the Prince of peace! What a condition in which to meet him who died for his foes! Need we pause to ask whether feelings which produce such actions are in accordance with the spirit of Jesus? Christianity cannot be uttered in the same breath with war, without sullying its unspotted purity.

"I have sometimes," says an amiable English writer, "given scope to my imagination, and fancied myself engaged in war, in the defence of the best cause for which the sword was ever drawn; I have anticipated the sound of the trumpet leading on to the charge, and then have plunged amidst the roaring of the cannon, or the clangor of arms in the heat of action—either leading on or led, my bosom swelling with the importance of the cause, my heart beating high, I looked on death with defiance, and on my foes with disdain, determining to conquer or perish in the attempt. All fresh from this bloody scene, I have brought my temper, my bosom, my heart, to the great Exemplar of christian perfection, and shame has covered me.—What trait of the mind of Christ did I follow when I defied death? Did I do it as a Christian?—Ah, no! Could my hopes of endless glory be certain during the eventful and bloody scene? Did the spirit of the christian religion, or the pattern of the holy Jesus inspire me with disdain for my enemies, while piercing their vitals, and sending their souls into the shades of death? On the whole, let that man stand forth, if earth can produce him, who can say that he goes into action and engages in the heat of war, in that spirit which he is conscious will be approved and owned by the Judge of all the earth, when all our subtleties and self-impositions must be renounced. But if it be admitted, that the temper of mind necessary for the action of war, is inconsistent with Christianity, I have all I ask; and those who argue for war have to support an allowed indefensible scheme."

If Marmion has read the life of the celebrated Suwarrow, his attention, has no doubt been attracted by certain directions to soldiers, commonly known as *Suwarrow's Catechism*. It would be well for the advocates of war to compare this celebrated production, with the Saviour's teachings on the mount. What the spirit of the sermon on the mount is every one knows; it breathes nothing but meekness, peace and love. But what says the martial catechism of Suwarrow? "Push hard with the bayonet. The ball will lose its way; the bayonet never. The ball is a fool; the bayonet a hero. Stabb once! And off with the Turk from the bayonet! stabb the second! stabb the third! A hero will stabb half a dozen! If three attack you, stabb the first, fire on the second, and bayonet the third!"—This is the spirit of war! These are the directions of a great warrior! And does Marmion believe that any war where such diabolical directions are enjoined, is right? Does he, can he seriously think that the bloodless code of laws contained in the christian religion, sanctions such diabolical advice? But have we misrepresented war—have we portrayed the monster in more hideous forms than it merits—have we coloured the picture too highly? Would to God it were possible for human language to describe war in more horrible characters than its blood-stained career warrants! "War," says the eloquent Robert Hall, "reverses, with respect to its objects, all the rules of morality. It is nothing less than a temporary repeal of the principles of virtue. It is a system out of which almost all the virtues are excluded, and in which nearly all the vices are incorporated. Hence the morality of peaceful times is directly opposite to the maxims of war. The fundamental rule of the first is to do good; of the latter to inflict injuries. The former commands us to succour the oppressed; the latter to overwhelm the defenceless. The former teaches men to love their enemies; the