

THE SERAPH-LIKE.

BY MRS. CRAWFORD.

I never looked on face so bright
Of earthly mould or mortal feeling;
It seems a temple full of light,
Salvation in that light revealing:
So beautiful, and oh, so pure!
Those lifted eyes in saintly rapture;
Those clasped hands, that would secure
Each wandering soul in holy capture.
That vestal veil of modest guise
Was woven in the loom of heaven,
Not earthly wrought for sinful eyes,
Whose worship is to mortals given.
Go, place the forms of worldly grace,
The beauties sung in bardic story,
Beside this spirit-breathing face,
This lovely blessed child of glory;
Now mark the contrast: here the world
Has set its seal, full broad and gaily;
Those scented locks so trimly curl'd
Those lips so trained to smiling daily;
That rich attire, those jewelled arms,
That bosom without virgin shading,
Exposed in all its naked charms
For man: alas! the sight degrading!
I turn from them, as garish flowers,
In gay but scentless beauty springing,
To this sweet bud of cloistered powers,
Around the cross of Jesus clinging;—
I turn; and as I turn, my soul
Doth seem as o'er some fountain bending,
Whose waters to Elysium roll;
While winged seraphs, round attending,
Fill from that sweet and silvery tide,
The golden cup to sinners given,—
That cup, for which the Saviour died,
That man might drink, and live—in heaven.

DISCUSSION ON PEACE.

For the Pearl.

THE EDITOR'S OPINIONS OF NATIONAL WAR CON-
TROVERTED.

"Beware
Of entrance to a quarrel, but being in
Bear it, that the opposer may beware of thee."—SHAKESPEARE.

SIR,—Your polite invitation, coupled with the offer of your columns for the discussion of the propriety of national war have induced me to step forth into the arena of public controversy. And although I differ widely with you on the principal point selected for the present disputation, although I justify national war under certain circumstances, I am no advocate for newspaper war. The causeless clashing of ink-horns; the ebony effusion of the decoction of nut galls; the atrabilious rancour of the doughty knight of the goose quill, produce in my mind a dread, scarcely, if at all, inferior to that which pervades when, in a better cause, the "maddening wheels of brazen chariots rage."

In the same spirit of candour and good feeling that you invite this discussion, in the same and no other, I accept your invitation. And I merely premise, that if you, Sir, are correct in the view you take of this matter, if your feelings of benevolence and humanity are not leading captive the inflexible principle of justice, and the more sober dicta of reason, then you cannot too assiduously promulge your pacific doctrines. (1) If not however, if a little too hastily you have assumed an untenable position, and are mustering up specious but unsubstantial testimony in support of it; if on a clear examination of the principles upon which national wars are sought to be justified, you would be persuaded to entertain even a doubt of the doctrines you so sedulously propagate, then Sir, you are incurring a weight of responsibility, "a load that would sink a navy." (2)

But more immediately to my purpose—and I will first dispose of that part of your case supposed to be made out by citing the opinions of such authorities as Professor Wayland. I duly appreciate this testimony, and I am willing to give it all the weight opinions of such great men deserve. But abstractedly considered it is the lowest kind of evidence ever adduced to prop a feeble cause. By its despots govern, by its tyranny is supported, by its innocent have perished, by its guilty have escaped, through its instrumentality superstition has swayed its leaden sceptre, and upon its authority the lurid flame of the faggot has wrapped in its tenuous folds a host of helpless victims. It is, as we all know, what logicians term *argumentum ad verecundiam* (3) and if upon it alone the case were to be adjudged, there would be but one opinion as to the result. From every country, from every clime, in every age, in every nation, men of the first attainments would bear ready testimony to the propriety of national hostilities. With such a phalanx I might overwhelm you in a moment. But in addition to all this, I feel myself safe in taking higher grounds and will rest my case on a surer foundation.

We all admit the necessity of the "social compact," in other words of civil government. It would, I presume, be but a waste of words to descend into the proof of so primary a principle, and I therefore take it for granted. If its existence is necessary for the protection of our persons, our property, and our rights, then the

next admission necessarily to be made is, that all due measures for its preservation and continuance are equally indispensable and consequently justifiable. (4)

The social compact by virtue of which we as British subjects receive protection, to which our allegiance is required, and heartily rendered, as regards the privileges conferred, the security granted, is second to none in existence. Through its instrumentality enemies without are averted or compelled into civility, enemies within, those who fear not God nor regard man, such as far as human means can effect, are deterred from the commission of crime, or punished and prevented from its repetition. We secure ourselves from the covetousness of the desperate, and the daring, by the terrors of our municipal institutions. Will any man pretend that aught else than the fear of punishment prevents the overwhelming commission of crime even in civil society? The history of every nation under heaven, so far as we are acquainted with it, conspires to establish this point,—without punishment and the dread of it, society would return immediately to the first elements, and might supplant right. (5) Let my learned opponent first make appear satisfactorily that forgiveness to the felon is the readiest mode of correcting him; (6) let him show how the continuation of forbearance to call upon or collect from the tardy paymasters, or dishonest subscribers, (if any he have) to the Pearl, will induce them to liquidate their just arrears, or stimulate them to future promptitude, (7) and then I may consent to admit his case half proved. But on the contrary, is it not a fact commending itself to every man's experience, that escape from punishment but emboldens criminals. If however as you seem to suppose, the example of forgiveness and forbearance among societies and nations would be sufficient to prevent them from acts of injustice, rapine, and violence, one towards another, why will it not among individuals. (8) But both yourself and Professor Wayland more than intimate that even in the latter case such example would prove effective. If this, however, is the point you seek to establish, and from it to show the conclusion, that national offences should be forgiven and a similar result would follow, then I have only to add that that principle once admitted, most effectually abrogates the necessity, at all of a social compact. More explicitly thus: If the example of love to our enemies, the reception and forgiveness of injury among individuals would produce reciprocity, what need of civil government at all? Why should the many governed be constantly taxed and their substance taken to support the few who govern? It would be absurd; the social compact in such a case is but political priestcraft, and the multitude the dupes of the designing. But this would be a position too monstrous for your approbation. If then as among individuals, the social compact is necessary with all its penalties (9) to punish the guilty, and by so doing protect the virtuous, as among societies and nations similar restraints for similar reasons are indispensable; (10) for what avails it if to secure justice, fair dealing and good faith from our fellow subjects, we are willing and do sacrifice a portion of our natural rights, if nevertheless we are to be subjected to spoliation and depredation at the hands of foreigners and strangers. And I put a case. Is a British ship manned and equipped for any and every emergency, is she, Sir, in the lawful and quiet performance of her voyage, when hailed by a pirate craft of half her force and warlike capability, and ordered to surrender at discretion, is she, or is she not to submit without resistance? If resistance is justifiable, fifty human beings not the fairest of God's creation, but pirates mind ye, most probably must sink to rise no more, must be lanced into eternity, with their crimes black and bloody, unrepented of, and unforgiven—if resistance is unjustifiable, a hundred citizens, in the pursuit of their peaceful avocations, by the relentless hands of demons incarnate, whose motto is "dead men tell no tales," their blood must smoke upon an unhallowed, untimely altar. It is a chilling alternative, but I press the question, "whose blood must be shed, and who must be the shedders of blood? I ask an unqualified answer." The case is suppositious, but it involves an important principle, and I am confident you cannot, you dare not, condemn a resistance defensive; but you shall answer in due time for yourself. Better, said one of old, that one man die, than that a whole nation perish, and the reasoning was more to be commended than the application. Was it not better that a handful of uncivilized Algerines should be sacrificed, and the nation truly taught to respect the eternal principles of right and reason, than that ten times that number of unoffending foreigners should be murdered, or be compelled to drag out a miserable existence in chains and menial servitude, their property pillaged or destroyed, and international law set at defiance? I do confess frankly I cannot comprehend how any reasonable person can for a single moment entertain a doubt on the question. (12) I cannot indeed, unless it is expected that, on patient sufferance of wrong, there will be some special interposition of Divine Providence on behalf of the injured. But this I believe has not been so much as hinted at hitherto. (13)

If we take history or experience for our guide, we will at once learn that that nation unwilling or unable to protect itself, and its possessions, must soon fall a prey to every plunderer, (14) or what is sometimes worse, will speedily tumble into discord and civil confusion.—Think of Spain as she was in the days of Charles the V. and look at her now. Think of Poland when she stood proudly among the nations, and look at her, nay, rather think of her convulsive struggles for a forbidden existence but yesterday, (15) aye,

let Great Britain herself act upon the doctrines you inculcate; and an Island would soon be lost here; a Colony would be a valuable booty for the first possessor there; those specious principles you promulgate would, I fear, soon accomplish more mischief, than the wildest dogmas of the *sans culottes* factions of republican France. (16)

With regard to the collection of Holy Scripture upon which much of your case depends, I have but one answer. The Bible was never intended for a code of municipal, much less of international law. The duties enjoined in many of those passages, might well be recommended to individuals of a society, where a community of goods existed; but they lose their force and application when nations are the subject of conversation. An Apostolic Church, and a modern Republic, are composed of materials too widely differing in their disposition, their wants, and their wishes, to be well governed by the same code of laws—and I almost wonder the distinction had not suggested itself in a moment to the Editor of the Pearl. The Old Testament would make an ample text-book for my purpose, (18) but I ever maintain that disputed points in divinity alone should be "nailed with Scripture."

And now in conclusion, I think, Sir, and you will I am sure appreciate the honesty of my observations, I think, Sir, you have selected a very injudicious, inopportune period for the propagation of opinions so diametrically opposed to the defence and protection of the Country. A very wise man has somewhere said, that "to every thing there is a season and a time for every purpose under heaven," "a time of war and a time of peace," (by the bye, am I not travelling out of the record as lawyers say?) but I do think, with an enemy at the gate, this was no time to persuade the people, it was unlawful to defend the city. (19) I deprecate the necessity of war as much as any man, *Arma virumque*, I seldom hymn, and nothing but a concatenation of very special circumstances, would have prevailed upon me at present to furnish this tedious article for your columns.

MARMION.

Amherst, 21st March, 1859.

REPLY TO MARMION.

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil."—JESUS CHRIST.

"Christianity in its regards, steps beyond the narrow bounds of national advantage, in quest of universal good; it does not encourage particular patriotism in opposition to general benignity; or prompt us to love our country at the expense of our integrity; or allow us to indulge our passions, to the detriment of thousands. It looks upon all the human race as children of the same father, and wishes them equal blessings; in ordering us to do good, to love as brethren, to forgive injuries, and to study peace: it quite annihilates the disposition for martial glory; and utterly debases the pomp of war."—BISHOP WATSON.

"If public war, be allowed to be consistent with morality, private war must be equally so. Indeed, we may observe what strained arguments are used to reconcile war with the Christian religion; but in my opinion, it is exceedingly clear, that duelling, having better reasons for its barbarous violence, is more justifiable than wars in which thousands, without any cause of personal quarrel, go forth and massacre each other."—DR. SAMUEL JOHNSON.

SIR,—We presume to commence this Reply with a profession of great respect for your talents, and amiable spirit as a public disputant. With so friendly an antagonist we trust we shall be preserved from the manifestation of any feelings opposed to the meekness and gentleness of our great Master. We mean not to be belligerent for peace. We design to wield no weapons but truth and love. We shall hope to be frank, but liberal; firm, yet conciliatory. We disavow a Procrustean spirit; we have no iron bedstead on which we intend to put honest minds to the rack; but we shall invite all the friends of God and man to a kind and fair consideration of this whole subject in the light of a common guide. We shall denounce none for not coming up fully to our views; but we shall urge all to follow faithfully the light they have, and to lend us their aid in abolishing a custom which they regard equally with ourselves, as the greatest sin and curse of Christendom. Our object is a common one; and no diversity of opinion respecting the lawfulness of wars strictly defensive, should keep us from cordially uniting our prayers and efforts in this great work of a world's pacification.

Your letter controverting our views of the impropriety of all national hostilities, does honor to your abilities as a writer, and to your urbanity as an opponent. We cannot, however, admit that in support of war of any description, it has effected the least change in our mind. War is a state of violence, a sanguinary conflict between two or more nations, in the issue of which, the interest and happiness of the people composing those nations, are partially or wholly involved. Does Christianity sanction, or prohibit such vindictive appeals to arms? This is the inquiry divested of all adventitious circumstances. The maxim, that "what is morally wrong can never be politically right," is self-evident; and on all moral questions, our ultimate appeal must be to Scripture. From the conflicting opinions of men we must appeal to the immutable standard of right and wrong. Neither human prescription, nor ages of practice, nor the rule of expediency, nor weight of interest, nor the stubbornness of selfishness, nor all these together, can warrant that which God has forbidden.

Now, let the question of National War be looked at in the light of Christianity;—as a question of stern righteousness—of stern