

Shall we then disband our police force?

No, because it has much to do that does not involve violence.

Well, then, shall we rob our constables and sheriffs of the right to resort to clubs and revolvers? Doesn't the knowledge that clubs and revolvers may be used do much to obviate the necessity for using them? How could any offender be arrested if the civil authorities were all non-resistants? And how could the philanthropist educate and improve and make over into a good citizen the rascal who runs at large?

I am not going to sneak out of this corner by saying that I am willing to get the benefit of force used by other people who do not think it wrong to fight. My way out is to show that the walls are imaginary and that there is no corner. It is a waste of time to argue about what would happen if our city, state and national Governments should presently adopt the principle of non-resistance, and throw away all means of physical compulsion. It is a waste of time because the case is absolutely un-supposable. We must bear in mind two things, first, that the force of an example of consistent adherence to principle is strongly felt, even by rogues who run at large; and second that when the number of people convinced of the rightness of non-resistance is sufficient to make it the basis of government, their moral force will be great enough to supplant completely the physical force now depended upon. When we are able to adopt the policy we shall be able to successfully apply it. For the adoption of such a policy pre-supposes a people, the majority of whom are actuated by an unselfish love for their fellows; and in such a community wickedness cannot flourish. Offenders would be dealt with in a way that would help them; they would not be ignored, and crime would not be aggravated by vindictive punishments.

But is not this begging the question?

Not at all; we are just getting ready to answer the question. We have seen that when an individual—as Jesus—practices non-resistance, though he lose his life, the good accomplished is infinitely greater than it would be did he defend himself with arms. We have seen the success of the early Friends who practiced non-resistance and flourished—as individuals among the cruel persecutors of England and New England, and as a community in contact with the savages in Pennsylvania.

For every new convert to the doctrine of non-resistance, the world is more peaceable. By the time enough people believe in it and practice it to make it a general policy it will be possible to apply it.

How far, then, shall *we* hold to the doctrine of non-resistance? If we believe it is right in principle, as I most certainly do, we should hold to it to the end. Let everyone learn to subordinate the lower instincts to the higher; let every one have faith that he will not be accountable for any harm that may come from his doing what he believes to be right; let us acknowledge that there is no good but good, that two wrongs do not make a right, that the end does not justify the means; let us try to love our neighbor as ourselves, which means to work for his good as faithfully as for that of ourselves and our families; and then shall we be "not overcome of evil," but shall "overcome evil with good."

E. B. RAWSON, New York.

BALTIMORE YEARLY MEETING.

[Our regular yearly report of Baltimore Yearly Meeting not having yet arrived, we glean the following from a private letter.—ED.]

We arrived in Baltimore at 4.46 p. m. on Sixth-day, where our friend Eli M. Lamb met us and took us to his hospitable home, where his wife and three daughters gave us a warm welcome and told us that we were to make our home here during the Yearly