

AN

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS,

DELIVERED TO THE STUDENTS OF THE

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,

DECEMBER 5th, 1842.

BY

DAVID ELLIOTT, D. D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY.

PITTSBURGH:

PUBLISHED BY LUKE LOOMIS, FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

1842.

NOTE.—It was first intended to publish the Inaugural Address of DR. ELLIOTT, in connection with the others; but as it was written a number of years ago, and in reference to a peculiar state of the church, which no longer exists, he preferred substituting the present Address in its room. The circumstance of this Address having been originally prepared at the request of a Literary Society, and for a popular audience, will account for the introduction of some things of a secular character, which would not have appeared, had it been prepared merely for the Students of the Seminary. These, it is thought best to retain, as it will now be read by others, who may be profited by having the whole subject before them. Although intended as an "Introductory," the Address was not delivered for some time after the opening of the Session, on account of the late arrival of some of the students.

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS.

THE influence of the ministry, in moulding the opinions and forming the character of society, is admitted on all hands to be great. Perhaps there is no class of men who have so much in their power, either for good or evil, as the ministers of the Gospel. Their position as public teachers of religion—the confidence which is reposed in them—their ready access to the families composing their respective charges—the reverence which is paid them, as ambassadors of Christ—their literary and theological attainments, all conspire to give them a controlling influence in society, of a very powerful kind. Hence, it is of the utmost importance, that they themselves be well trained; that they be men, not only of piety and integrity, but of well-balanced minds, and of enlightened and comprehensive views; well acquainted with the character and tendency of the various systems of truth and error, which claim the regard and confidence of the community. Qualifications of this kind are especially demanded in a country like ours, where freedom of opinion and of action are not only tolerated but encouraged; and where, in the workings of the human mind, many things are thrown up, which, without the restraints imposed by those who stand at the head of influence, may prove destructive to society, in its most vital interests. Nothing, therefore, can be more injurious in this state of things, than the introduction to the ministry of men who, instead of restraining evil influences when they arise, add to their power for the production of mischief, by giving them accelerated force.

Amongst the evils which have been thrown on society, in its different departments during the last few years, there is one which demands the most profound attention, especially of Divines and Statesmen, on account of its tendency to subvert all the settled principles of government, of law, and of religion. During the last winter, I had occasion to discuss this subject before a Literary Society in this city. The subject, however, is so important, and connects so deeply with

the religious interests of the church to which you belong, and of the community in the midst of which most of you will probably be called to labor, that I have thought I could not do better than to address to you what I had then written, making some slight alterations, such as the change of circumstances may require.

The subject then, which I propose to discuss for your benefit, is **RADICALISM; ITS NATURE, CAUSES AND REMEDY.**

I. **Its NATURE.** Radicalism does not consist in any single, abstract principle, or isolated opinion, nor in any formal or connected series of such opinions on any particular subject. It derives its name and character from the relation it has to the root, or foundation of things. In all sciences, and in every department of life—in literature, in morals, in government and in religion, there are certain foundation principles, which lie at the root. They are essential to the subject to which they belong. They are necessarily so, according to the arrangement of God. These sure foundations are fixed by the great Author of nature. If these are unsettled, vital injury is done to them. The root is affected. That on which the superstructure rests, is disturbed and deranged; and the evils which result, are of a radical nature. Any opinion or opinions, therefore, which injuriously affect foundation principles, which have been settled by the Creator, are radical; and such opinions held, avowed and carried out in practice, constitute Radicalism. This is the sense which usage has assigned to the word, and in which it is generally understood.

Radicalism is not confined to one subject. It is equally applicable to the domestic, the political and the religious state. There may be radicalism in the family, in the state, and in the church. Indeed, there is no form of social existence in which it may not operate. It may reach even to literature and science, to the mechanic arts, and to agricultural and professional life. But wherever it goes, or on whatever it is brought to bear, it retains its true character—the enemy alike of law, of liberty, of order, of sound morals and of true religion. Like the lust of power, described by the poet,—“in nature still invariably the same, and always bad.”

As to the modes of its operation, they are various. It sometimes operates by dissolving original, constituted relations, and reducing them to their detached elements, thus producing anarchy. It breaks up the relation between the governor and the governed—between the parent and the child—the husband and the wife—the master and the servant. It nourishes a bold independency in every human bosom,

which brooks no restraint, which bids defiance to law, and tramples upon government. The very wildest anarchy, is the element in which it revels.

At other times, it operates by destroying the balance between the constituted relations of society, and thus producing derangement and conflict. While there is not an entire dissolution of the social fabric, one part is loaded and another lightened, so that the action becomes inharmonious and jarring. The reins of government are loosened, authority is depressed, and a fitful and casual obedience is required. Hence, arise perpetual rivalries, and those contests for power, which keep society in a state of discordant action, alike destructive to its peace and its prosperity.

It, moreover, operates sometimes by the infusion of poisonous ingredients into the constituted relations of society; thus weakening and corrupting the whole, and defeating the ends of its organization. False principles in morals, in philosophy, or in religion, are introduced, by which the minds of men become poisoned, and their intellectual and moral powers perverted. The consequence is, that they not only fail to perform their appointed part in the relations in which they are placed, but they run counter to their obligations, and by the obliquities of their conduct, impede the progress of society in its healthful and vital functions. Thus decay and death are superinduced. The foundations are destroyed, and of course the superstructure tumbles into ruins.

The history of human events furnishes many examples of radicalism. A reference to some of these may give us a more full acquaintance with its character and modes of operation. In our own country, we have some choice specimens of radicalism on the subject of civil government. "Human governments," says Richard Thayer, of Massachusetts, "are not 'approvingly' ordained of God, but exist, as does all sin, only by his permission." "If it was sin in the Israelites to desire a king, (a human ruler,) is it not as great a sin for christians, (God's true Israel,) to desire human rulers, and to help clothe them with civil authority, by assisting to put them into offices of state?" "Human governments are based upon an assumption, and not upon an express command of God, as many honestly suppose: they are, therefore, sinful in their inception, God never having required men to establish them." In like manner, he asks and answers the following questions: "Can human governments be right, or have we any scriptural authority for regarding them as 'divine institutions?' No."

“Does it follow legitimately, from the premises laid down, that christians have no divine right to participate in upholding human governments, and that they sin when they do so? Yes.” These passages are quoted and endorsed, at least silently, by the editors of the *Non-Resistant*, Edmund Quincy, Maria W. Chapman, and Wm. Loyd Garrison. And to show that they are sustained by others, they publish a letter from a correspondent, who writes thus: “Friend Quincy: Go on—you need not be afraid of radicalism; there is too much of it in the land to be sneered down by a few sectarian priests and barking politicians.” See *Non-Resistant* of June 9th, 1842.

Here, then, we have a radicalism which repudiates all human governments, and which vaunts itself in the multitude of its adherents, and its security against the trifling efforts of the few who may attempt its destruction, and who are contemptuously called “a few sectarian priests and barking politicians.” And, let it be noted, that those who thus reject human government, in a political point of view, reject all government in the family, in the school, and in all the different departments of society—thus tearing away the deep foundations which God has laid in the very constitution of man’s nature.

We have specimens of radicalism in our country also, on the subject of property. Brownson, in his *Quarterly Review*, maintains, “that in order to social equality, and the greatest good of the greatest number, it is necessary that all be made equal in point of property; and that when a man dies, his estate, instead of descending to his heirs, must be divided among the population at large.” This is a revival of the ancient Agrarian Radicalism of the Romans. At an early period of the Republic, according to the statements of Livy and Plutarch, it was ordained that no one should possess more than five hundred acres of land; and that whatever more any one possessed, it should be divided among the poorer people, by commissioners appointed for that purpose. And, at a later period, it was proposed by one of the Tribunes, to give absolute power to ten commissioners to buy and sell all lands at pleasure, from whom and at what price they saw fit, and to distribute them as they pleased among the citizens. The passage of this law, however, was prevented by the eloquence of Cicero, the Consul. In the agrarianism of Brownson, then, we have only a resuscitation of the ancient radicalism of Licinius Stolo, Tiberius Gracchus, and Servilius Rullus; just as the anti-government movements of Garrison and his associates are a copy of the lawless proceedings of Munzer and his compeers on the continent, when, in

the sixteenth century, they "declared war against all laws, government and magistrates of every kind." Mosheim, vol. 3d, p. 325.

There are few, perhaps, as honest as Brownson, in avowing their Agrarian principles. But he must have been a careless observer, who has not discovered a strong tendency in this direction, in much that is said and done in our country. How often do men declaim against the aristocracy of the rich, and the necessity of bringing them down to a level with the poor! The aristocracy of wealth! is the fruitful theme of many a popular harangue. But, who has a right to demur, if God smiles upon the industry and frugality of men, and crowns them with wealth? Does it not accord with the arrangements of his providence, for the hand of the diligent to make rich? And is it not a part and parcel of Radicalism, to seek to deprive these men of the reward of their industry, by raising popular prejudice against them? Yet, such things are done by popular declaimers, greatly to the detriment of the poor, whose cupidity is nourished, and they are led to grasp after wealth, without the requisite industry for its attainment, contrary to the established order of Providence.

Another example of Radicalism is to be found in the doctrine of Robert Dale Owen, and others, on the subject of moral accountability. Owen rejects the notion that there can be merit or demerit in believing or disbelieving, and in loving or hating. It is, therefore, according to his views, irrational in the extreme, to maintain that man can be accountable for either. (Address to the Citizens of the U. States.) Thus, moral accountability is rejected. Man is responsible neither for his opinions nor his affections. He is the creature of circumstances and of education, over which he has no control, and which place him beyond the reach of moral law and government. In harmony with these views, are those of Counsellor, now Lord Brougham. "The great truth," says he in his Inaugural Address, as Rector of the University of Glasgow, "has fully gone forth to all the ends of the earth, that man shall no more render account to man for his belief, over which he himself has no control. Henceforward nothing shall prevail upon us to praise or to blame any one, for that which he can no more change, than he can the hue of his skin, or the height of his stature." Here is Radicalism in morals,—ancient Fatalism, dressed in modern attire, and sent forth as a "great truth," to enlighten the world, and release it from the bondage which the authority of God and the sanctions of his law imposed.

On the subject of religion and its ministers, the following may be

taken as a pretty fair specimen of Radicalism: "Of the multitude of topics," says Prof. Andrews Norton, "more immediately connected with christianity, there is scarcely one that does not require to be examined anew, from its foundation, and discussed in a manner very different from what it has been. Religion must be taken—I will not say out of the hands of priests—that race is passing away; but out of the hands of divines, such as the generality of divines have been; and its exposition and defence, must become the study of philosophers, as being the highest philosophy." From this, it appears that the very foundations of christianity are yet to be settled, not by divines, but by philosophers. Whether Emerson took the hint from Norton, we do not know; but in a volume of Essays published some time ago at Boston, he has philosophized on the subject, and here we have the result. "We learn," says he, "that God is; that he is in me; and that all things are shadows of him. The idealism of Berkeley, is only a crude statement of the idealism of Jesus, and that again is a crude statement of the fact, that all nature is the rapid efflux of goodness executing and organizing itself." "The simplest person, who in his integrity worships God, becomes God." "The supreme critic on all the errors of the past and present, and the only prophet of that which must be, is that great nature in which we rest, as the earth lies in the soft arms of the atmosphere; that unity, that over-soul, within which every man's particular being is contained, and made one with all other." Thus christianity, in the hands of these radical pretenders to philosophy, becomes a shadowy idealism, and the God of the Bible is converted into a huge pantheistic "over-soul."

In the attempt of Norton to elevate philosophers to the office of expositors of christianity, and to take it out of the hands of divines, there is an evident manifestation of dislike to the ministers of Christ, and a desire to depress and supersede their influence. Although this office of the ministry has formed an element in the Divine administration in every period of the world, it must now be rooted out and set aside, to make room for philosophic theorists to deal out, under the name of philosophy, the wild vagaries of Spinoza, or the more ancient theosophies of the East. Hence, the ministers of religion are the objects of dislike and attack by almost every radical reformer of every grade and of every country. "All ministers of the gospel," says Brownson, "are essentially the enemies of liberty." Of course, they ought to be put down, and men of more liberal views,—philosophers! inducted to their stations and to the exercise of their functions. The

revolutionary tournament of France on this subject, is to be acted over again here, in the face of all the disastrous results arising from her experiment. Accordingly, two grand conventions of men and women, entertaining views of this kind, were held in Boston, near the commencement of the present year, in one of which, a certain Mr. Rodgers spoke as follows:—"The clergy and the church, with their holy-house and their holy-day, are all of the devil, and they must all be overthrown." The United States' Gazette, of Feb. 8th, 1842, (from which we quote,) gives this as an example of "the spirit of the meeting;" and adds, "By a report of proceedings which we find in the Salem Register, we infer that almost every thing which now exists, is to be subverted,—banks, churches, clergymen, and bibles,—and a new revelation is to be made, for the benefit of the rising generation."*

Other examples of radicalism are not wanting. We might refer you to an effort which was made by a few persons in our own State, during the last winter, to repudiate the obligations of public contracts, in which the faith of the Commonwealth is pledged. These men put forth the monstrous doctrine, in reference to the State debt, that "the people are under no moral, legal, or political obligation, to bear any burden of taxation, or make any sacrifice of personal comfort, to keep the faith of the State unbroken." We might also refer you to the actual rejection of the obligation of public contracts, by some of the States; and to other kindred opinions, as indicating the wildest radicalism. We might, moreover, show you how the several forms of

* The following, from the Pittsburgh Daily Advocate, of Dec. 13th, 1842, shows the progress of these Radical opinions, in the region of Boston.

"No Government and Woman's Right Party.—A Convention of men and women, a few days ago, in Boston, passed the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That the assumption of authority by man over man, in the form of human governments, is a usurpation of the prerogative of our Creator, and a gross imposition upon the human family, which far transcends in wickedness, any of the acts of violence and wrong, which such governments are instituted to punish.

Resolved, That the use of the Elective Franchise, under the Constitution of the United States, involves the sacrifice of our common humanity, and the rejection of the Gospel of peace.

Resolved, That the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of every State in the Union, according to the Democratic theory of Government, and the Declaration of American Independence, are based on usurpation,—inasmuch as they prescribe one-half of the people, on account of their *sex*, from the exercise and enjoyment of what are called civil and political rights; and consequently, that whoever votes to sustain those instruments, votes to uphold and perpetuate an atrocious despotism."

radicalism shade off from their respective central points, assuming almost every variety of character. But the foregoing enumeration may be sufficient, for the purpose of illustration.

Before closing the discussion on this part of the subject, however, I would remark, that we must be careful to distinguish between radicalism, and the lawful subversion of those erroneous systems, either in church or state, which have their roots deeply sunk in long established prejudices, and which claim protection simply on the ground of their antiquity. In this latter case, there is no rooting up of original foundations; no dissolution of divinely constituted relations; no derangement of the equipoise established by the hand of Omnipotence; and no destruction of any of the essential elements which belong of right, or necessity, to the subject with which they claim connection. On the contrary, there is only the removal of an unnatural excrescence from the subject; the subversion or destruction of principles or practices adverse to the order which God has established; and the restoration of the original system to its proper character and legitimate functions. Hence, there was no radicalism in the conduct of the Barons of England, in forming the great confederacy in the thirteenth century, by which they succeeded in subverting the usurpations of King John, and extorting from him the famous deed, commonly called *MAGNA CHARTA*, by which the liberties and privileges of every order of men in the kingdom were secured. Nor can the charge of radicalism be justly made against the Protestant Reformers, who had for their object the subversion of that anti-christian tyranny, under which the church had groaned for centuries. Neither was there any radicalism in the conduct of the Fathers of our American Revolution, when they resisted the encroachments of unlawful power, and when, upon the failure of other measures, they threw off a tyranny which was too blind and stubborn to be reformed. Nor was the action of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, nor that of other States of the American Union, of a radical character, when, by statute, they provided for the gradual and total abolition of slavery within their respective commonwealths. Still more emphatically free from any radical tendency, were the inspired heralds of Christianity; although, in the attainment of their object, they broke down and destroyed every rival system which claimed the homage of men. In all these cases, and in others of a similar nature, there was only the removal of what was incidental and spurious, and the establishment

of what was true and genuine. Instead of breaking up and destroying original principles or laws, the actors in these great movements, sought to ascertain and settle them upon their own immoveable foundations. Such efforts, therefore, do not involve radicalism, nor are those who employ them, under the direction of right principles, properly denominated radicals.

We have thought it important thus fully to define and illustrate what we mean by radicalism. We use the term always in an unfavorable sense. So it is used and understood by all the popular writers of the day. And, such we believe to be the proper use of the word. There is a decisive objection against a different application of the term. To say that man is a radical, in a good sense, is to say that he forms foundation-principles; that he is the author of the constituted relations which exist in the universe; and that he originates whatever is good in the world. None of these things, however, is true. Radicalism, therefore, has relation to the root or foundation of things, only by seeking its injury. And he only is a radical, who, in principle or practice, labors to impair, subvert, or destroy the foundations which God has laid in the constitution of his works, or the revelation of his will.

II. Having thus explained the nature of radicalism, we proceed to speak of its CAUSES. As radicalism exhibits itself in different forms, so the causes which contribute to its production, are numerous. Nor, are we to look to the mere surface of things for them. Many of them lie deep in man's fallen nature, and in the pernicious principles which spring up from this corrupted soil. To attempt an extended enumeration of them, would be too great a tax upon your patience. A few only shall be noticed.

1. The first cause which I shall mention, and that which lies at the foundation of all radicalism, is the depravity of man's fallen nature. Man's nature was originally formed for order, and law, and the proper observance of all the obligations growing out of his relations. There was no tendency in his nature to interfere with the divine authority, or with any of the great principles of God's government. All was order, harmony, obedience. But by the introduction of sin, man's nature became changed, not in its constitutional faculties, but in its moral character and tendencies. The result has been, that man, corrupted by sin, is now the enemy of order, of law, and of authority. He seeks to break away from the restraints of the divine government, and to subvert the order which God has established in the moral

universe. His perverted nature revolts against the harmony belonging to the social relations, and leads him into eccentric and anomalous courses of action, which aim at the destruction of that which is fundamental in a system of moral government. Radicalism, then, is the natural product of the depraved heart of man. It is a shoot from this corrupt stock. It is indigenious to our fallen nature, is one of its spontaneous productions, and derives its most appropriate nourishment from the fierce passions which sin has engendered in the human bosom. This, then, is the great, originating cause of Radicalism, to which all others are subordinate, and by which they are modified.

2. Defective and erroneous views of the nature and obligation of moral law, constitute another cause of radicalism. What is moral law? It is that which defines man's relations to his Creator and his fellow-men, and binds to the observance of the various duties arising out of these relations. It is founded in the nature of God, and terminates on man, in all the varieties of his condition and circumstances. It reaches to his whole character, to all his social relations, and to every part of his conduct. Is man alone? It holds him responsible for his relations and duties to God and to himself. Is he in the midst of a family? It binds him to the faithful performance of all the duties arising out of the domestic relations. Is he a member of the political community? It enjoins and requires that he meet the obligations which he owes to the government that affords him protection in the enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Is he a member of the church? It demands the honest fulfilment of the vows he has made, and the religious compact into which he has entered. Is he a citizen of the world? His fellow-men have claims upon him, and the moral law binds him to their fulfilment.

But how many have very defective and erroneous views of this law. They do not look over the broad field of man's relations, nor recognize the extent and rigor of the law's exactions of obedience to all the duties which these relations involve. Their vision is confined to some single point, which they magnify above every thing else, and in giving development to which, they impinge upon other points which are equally vital. In this way, they subvert the great principles of order which God has enstamped upon his moral government, and which are essential to its healthful existence and administration. Here, for example, is a man who admits the authority of the law, in reference to the duties arising out of his relation to God. Him, he professes to own as his rightful sovereign. But, confining his view

to this single point, he loses sight of all the rest. Hence, he rejects all human authority, and flouts at acts of human legislation, as usurpations on the prerogatives of God, and the rights of men. The reason is, that he has defective and erroneous views of moral law. He forgets that civil government is an ordinance of God, and overlooks the fact, that the law of God binds him equally to fulfil the obligations arising out of his relation to the civil magistrate, and to his Creator. Here is another man, who takes some precept of the law, which pertains to one single aspect of the social relations. This he magnifies until he makes it absorb all the rest, and produce a course of action which is destructive to the regular operation of the social system. Such is the fanatic in religion, or in morals, who confines his prayers and his efforts to a single object, to the exclusion of all others, and to the consumption of his whole time, a portion of which should be given to other duties. He is a man of one idea. Another, again, lays hold of some general principle, and without regarding the modifications to which it has been subjected by the relations constituted by the Creator himself, sweeps it across the wide surface of society, demolishing the whole fabric of social order in its course. Such is the Agrarian, who, because "all men are created equal," insists upon an equal distribution of property; and such the Socialist, who, because woman has "the same intellectual and moral nature with man," claims for her an equality of power in all the civil and social relations of life. Their error arises from defective and mistaken views of moral law. And, hence, these radical and anarchical results.

It ought ever to be borne in mind, that the moral law knows no monopoly of obligation in any one of its precepts, to the exclusion of the rest; but binds equally to the observance of all, as they lie over the whole extent of man's relations to his Creator, and his fellow-men. The man, therefore, who under pretence of exalting the authority of the great Lawgiver of the world, repudiates and tramples upon human laws equitably formed, is a radical, and his radicalism is the effect of his ignorance and error, in reference to the true character and extent of moral law. And, on this ground, we may account for the subversion and destruction of the various social relations of life, as taught by the radical adventurers who have assumed the office of enlightening their fellow-men, by the discovery that the whole social fabric has been erroneously constructed, and must be new-modelled by the hand of philosophers. These men, it is true, make their

observations from different points. Hence, they vary among themselves, in giving greater or less prominence to different parts of the moral law, as their circumstances and habits may suggest. Some take one part, and some another; but all err in giving some single part a controlling influence over the rest, and thus deranging the order and symmetry of the whole. Such a derangement is fatal to moral government, and is a virtual subversion of it. It is a disease which is radical in the system, and must ultimately destroy it, if it be not arrested. There are, indeed, some who uproot the whole moral system at once. Such, as we have shown you, are Robert Dale Owen and Counsellor Brougham, who maintain that men are not accountable either for their opinions or their affections, over which they have no control. Of course, they are not under moral law, and are, therefore, under no obligations to yield obedience to its claims. This is going the whole length, and demolishing moral government at a single blow.

3. But I proceed to remark further, that false notions of liberty, and of man's ability for self-government, furnish another cause of radicalism. Liberty is recognized by the founders of our Republic, as one of the "inalienable rights" of man. And, to secure this, is declared to be one of the objects for which government has been instituted. But, government involves authority and law, imposing restraint, and requiring submission. True liberty, then, has relation to law and government. It is the restrained and regulated action of men, placed under wise and legitimate control. It regards the rights of men in their various relations, and in the stations which they occupy in the community to which they belong. Hence, it views with equal jealousy, and rejects with equal scorn, the tyranny of the despot and the licentiousness of the mob. It looks to the constitution and the law, as the rule of its action, and never exhibits its true character, only when moving within the circle which they prescribe.

There are not a few, however, who have very different notions of liberty. They look upon it as freedom from all restraint, the unbounded license of doing whatever their inclinations or their passions prompt them to do. With these radical notions, they disregard the restraints of law, and break over the barriers which the constitution has erected for the preservation of the peace and order of society. If the magistrate interposes, or their fellow-citizens complain, they reply, that they live in a land of liberty, and have a right to do as they please. Hence, they are not contented to wait for the slow

operation of the laws, but proceed at once, to "lynch" the unfortunate objects of their vengeance, or to "mob" those who venture to utter sentiments which they do not approve. And, all this in the name of liberty; that liberty, which they claim as their birth-right, or their adopted inheritance! They do not, however, understand its nature, and therefore, they strike at its foundations, and tear away the pillars by which it is supported. Under the name of liberty, misunderstood and misapplied, they wage war against social order, and trample upon the constituted relations of civil and domestic life. You are all familiar with the tragic scenes which were acted in revolutionary France, by which all the social elements were thrown into wild and deadly confusion, while on the blood-steeped banner which waved over the whole, were inscribed, "LIBERTY, EQUALITY, AND THE RIGHTS OF MAN!!!"

But, I have said, that radicalism is produced not only by false notions of liberty, but by erroneous views of man's ability for self-government. Man's ability to govern himself, is an accredited political axiom in our country; and to controvert it, might be hazardous. We have no disposition to controvert it, when properly understood. There is a sense in which its truth is freely allowed. So far as the affirmation excludes the necessity for a king, or a lordly aristocracy, for the government of men, it is admitted in its full extent. Men undoubtedly can be governed without either kings or nobles, or any of the long list of titled cormorants, who feed upon the scanty earnings of the poor, or the greater abundance of the rich.

But, that man has the power of self-government, independently of the great conservative principles of moral law, which God has established and revealed in the Bible, is not true. As a depraved being, as has already been intimated, the elements of rebellion and misrule are deeply seated in his heart, and the tendency of his fallen nature is to break away from the restraints of government, and to tear up its solid foundations. Hence, that he may be rightly governed, he must be placed under the restraints which God has erected in his law. The principles of that law must be imbodyed in a constitution, according to the controlling power of which he must consent to act. And, let it be recollected, that constitutional government, thus formed upon the principles of God's law, is an ordinance of God; and the very fact of man placing himself under such a government, is an admission that he is without the requisite self-control, and needs the external restraints of such a constitution, to hold him within the sphere of

legitimate action. And, it is a notorious fact, that all the communities, which have attempted to govern themselves by constitutions, which were not founded on the great principles of moral truth, revealed in the word of God, have failed in carrying out the experiment. And they will always fail. The reason is, that men are without the ability for self-government, independently of moral law; and, rejecting the only source from which the restraining power of law emanates, they must necessarily fall into anarchy and confusion. You recollect how it was with the people of France. Having put their king to death, in the exercise of their assumed popular sovereignty, they rejected the revealed law of God, and excluded from all their enactments, a recognition of its controlling principles. The consequence was, that their assumed power of self-government proved a failure, and showed that it was entirely impotent for the purposes for which it was claimed. Instead of establishing society on a solid basis, it threw it into utter confusion, and, after struggling for a time, with the distractions which it had created, it sunk back into the arms of a despotism more absolute than that from which it had escaped. Hence, we see how their false notions of man's ability to govern himself, led them into the most fearful radicalism. They separated man from his dependence on Revelation for the true elements of law, and order, and right government. They rested on the goodness of human nature, as a sufficient guaranty against disaster. They sought to govern themselves, without the restraints which God had imposed in his word. And, the result was, one of the most fearful convulsions which the world ever witnessed.

And so it will ever happen, in any such scheme of civil government, or of moral reform. If men rely upon their own strength, and assume an independent power of self-government, certain failure must be the result. We repudiate the doctrine, therefore, of man's ability to govern himself, founded upon the goodness of his nature, as one of mischievous and anarchical tendency. Man's nature is not good, and any scheme of government, or of reform, which rests for security on this basis, is radically wrong, and must end disastrously.

4. Another cause of radicalism, is the precocious activity of our youth, in reference to public concerns. Against the youth of our country, we would not utter a single unkind remark. On the contrary, we entertain for them a sincere regard. They are the hope of the nation and of the church, on whom, under God, the future des-

tiny of both greatly depends. Many of them give early promise of future distinction, and ability to wield an influence of the most salutary kind. Their intelligence, their energy, their patriotism, the elevation of their motives, the integrity of their principles, and in some, the genuineness of their piety, all furnish assurance, that when time and experience shall have matured their characters, the nation and the church, with their institutions, will be safe in their hands.

But, is there not danger that these flattering hopes, in relation to the youth of our country, may be disappointed, by forcing them out too early upon the troubled waves of popular excitement? In the conflicts of party, both in church and state, in morals, in politics, and in religion, each party sometimes seeks to acquire influence, by the accession of numbers to its ranks. Hence the young are invoked, and from the school and the academy, from the counting-room and the workshop, striplings who have not yet reached the years of manhood are forced out, to take the lead in some great movement; to be the orators of the day, or to constitute some great convention which is to give direction to the public mind, by its sage counsels and solemn decisions. Such are called upon to decide the most difficult problems in political and ecclesiastical jurisprudence; in the financial concerns of the nation, or in the casuistry of the church. Religion, morals, political and civil rights, the principles of banking, fiscal agencies, international law, federal and state sovereignty, are all submitted to the unfledged minds of these young men, for decision. And, what is the consequence? What must be the consequence? Can these youthful minds, whatever native strength and loftiness of purpose they may possess, be expected to understand all the deep questions belonging to law, and politics, and morals, and religion, which are brought before them; or to appreciate the sanctity and excellence of the institutions which wisdom and experience have formed? Undoubtedly not. The consequence is, that, having never fully examined these subjects; having no time for investigation, and being placed in a situation which demands prompt action, they are often led to reject the best established principles, and to denounce institutions which have been moulded by the maturest wisdom.

Besides, young minds are ardent and impatient of restraint. Exemption from the control of established opinions and usages, is very agreeable to youth. For the most part, they long to be free from authority, and to range at large in the broad field of liberty, where

they can act as they please. When, therefore, they are thrown into the lead in society, and are called upon to give utterance to their united wisdom, for the benefit of the nation or the church, is it strange that they should sometimes be found breaking through established principles; yielding to the fitful impulses of undisciplined passion, and floating on the broad surface of an undefined sentimentalism? It would be strange, if it were otherwise. And it is believed that the whole history of precocious public action, on the part of youth, will show that its tendency is to radicalism; to the subversion of order, and the erection of a lawless despotism, in some of its various forms. Who was it that advised Rehoboam to a course of policy, which was destructive to the principles of rational liberty, and which led to the revolt and separation of the ten tribes from his government? Was it not "the young men who had grown up with him, and who stood before him?" Who were the leaders and principal actors in the French Revolution, or rather, in those scenes of blood and carnage, by which the revolution was disgraced, and in the fearful anarchy and despotism which swept away all the established principles of order and law, of religion and good morals? Were they not, generally, men not far advanced in life? It is a fact,—and not the least remarkable connected with the history of those times,—that the Robespierres, and Danton, and Chaumette, and Carrier, and Brissot, and many others, were comparatively young men. So, also, were Ney and Soult, and Duroc, and Mortier, and Murat, and others, who, under Napoleon, assisted in erecting the throne of despotism upon the ruins of liberty. Even the Corsican himself, when he reached and exercised despotic power in the person of the First Consul, was only thirty years of age. And, who are the men in our own country, who are engaged in a crusade against the established relations of society, and who are laboring to prostrate every social institution which the God of order has established? Are they not, as a general rule, comparatively young men? Many of them precocious youth, ripe in the elements of bold and reckless action, but immature in wisdom and experience? And, the tendency which there is in the spirit of the times, to make men leaders, when they ought to be learners, is a most fruitful source of that radicalism, which is threatening the destruction of all that is valuable in our institutions. We desire to speak with respect, but cannot withhold the remark, that our young men's political conventions, composed as they often are exclusively of

young men, many of them yet in their teens, while they subserve the purposes of party warfare, may yet prove a most dangerous element in the popular commotions which may hereafter shake our republic to its centre. While their radicalism may not appear so anomalous and transcendental, as that of their fair sisters, who claimed to participate in the legislation of the world's convention, it may prove much more desolating in its progress, and much more destructive in its results, unless chastened and modified by the higher principles of law and of religion. Let our young Phætons drive the chariot, and the bright Sun of Liberty will soon cease to shine in the political firmament, and her genial rays, which now stimulate into healthful activity every artery of the body politic, being diverted from their course, will prove the means of conflagration and ruin to the republic. And, our youthful charioteers themselves, like the fabled son of Phœbus, may become the victims of their own precocious folly, and perish in the flames which their adventurous hands have kindled.

With political movements, we have only a subordinate concern. But the lessons of history, and the observations of experience, should not be overlooked nor forgotten. They teach wisdom by example, and furnish many valuable illustrations of the influence of principles and modes of action, on the happiness or misery of men in their social state. And it is only for the sake of illustration, that I have referred to the political history of the present, or of former times. In this aspect, it furnishes us with much valuable instruction.

5. Errors in education ought not to be omitted in our enumeration of the causes of radicalism. The different mental susceptibilities do not always receive their proper relative amount of training. One is cultivated, and another is neglected. Some particular moral susceptibility, for example, is nurtured and strengthened by cultivation, to the disregard of the intellectual states. Hence, the mind loses its proper balance. The emotions, under some of their forms of development, control the judgment; and the result is, irregular and convulsive action. And on this ground, we account for the radicalism of many, otherwise excellent men, the tone of whose moral feelings, is of a lofty character. There is a kind of functional derangement in the mind, arising from this irregular training, which leads to discordant and inharmonious action. On the other hand, the intellect may be cultivated to the neglect of the moral feelings, and the same result follow, only under a different form. But, important as it might be

to trace the operations of this cause of radicalism, and to mark its products, time will not allow us to enlarge. We, therefore, leave this branch of the subject, and proceed to notice, briefly,

III. The REMEDY for Radicalism. This remedy is composed chiefly of two great elements, EDUCATION and RELIGION.

1. EDUCATION. On the subject of education, as a remedy for social disorders, men have run to extremes. On the one hand, it has been overrated; on the other, it has been undervalued. Some have made it every thing; others, nothing. Both these extremes are to be avoided. As a means to an end, education has its proper place, and is to be employed for the accomplishment of its legitimate objects. When we speak of education, however, we mean that which reaches to the whole man—to his intellectual and moral nature, and moulds the whole into that form, which will best fit him for the performance of all the duties arising out of his relations to God, and to his fellow-men. Education in this comprehensive sense, the only sense in which it will avail to counteract the progress of radicalism, includes the inculcation of right principles, the cultivation of correct moral habits, and the exercise of just authority, on the part of those who conduct it. It is not enough that our youth learn, but they must learn what is good. It is not enough that their minds be well stored, but they must be well stored with truth. From the Bible, the great store-house of truth, they must be taught the foundation-principles of law and order, and have pressed upon their conscience and their hearts, the duties arising out of the relations which they bear to God and to men respectively. The love of virtue, of truth, of order, the love of God and of men, must also be inculcated. The youthful mind must be taught to love what is lovely, to delight in what is virtuous, and to practice what is good,—to respect and conform to every statute and ordinance, which has for its object, the integrity, the harmony, the purity, and the healthful development of the social system. In short, the whole moral nature must be thrown into the mould of truth, and made to reflect its image. The wild current of the passions must be stemmed; the irregular cravings of the appetites resisted; and every unholy emotion laid under strong restraint. At the same time, prompt, unreserved, cheerful obedience to lawful authority, must be insisted upon. Any system of education, which does not include this, is radically defective. If the child may despise the authority of the parent, if the school-boy may resist the command of his teacher,

and, if the full-formed youth may treat with contempt and scorn, the official requirements of the magistrate, then disorder must and will ensue. The original relations which God has instituted, are broken through; the harmony of the social system is obstructed, and the great principles, on which the whole order of society rests, are subverted. Radicalism rears its head, and with rash and impetuous steps, tramples under foot the most sacred institutions of the family, of the church, and of the country.

To counteract and prevent such mischievous results, our youth must be properly educated. By a careful system of training, we must seek to make them intelligent, moral, and obedient to lawfully constituted authority. The whole man must be educated. Every faculty must receive its full share of attention, according to its relative importance. In this way, the equipoise of the system will be maintained, and the youth, as he passes into manhood, may be preserved from wandering off into the trackless regions of a lawless radicalism.

But, while education may thus do something, as a means, for the prevention and cure of the evil in question, it is utterly insufficient to remove its most potent cause. It cannot overcome and subdue depraved human nature, in its disorganizing tendencies. "While that is corrupt," to use the language of the eloquent Foster, "it will pervert even the very schemes and operations by which the world should be improved, though their first principles were pure as heaven; and revolutions, great discoveries, augmented science, and new forms of polity, will become, in effect, what may be denominated the sublime mechanics of depravity."

2. But, here RELIGION comes to our aid. This is the other element comprised in our remedy for the evil which we are combating. The religion of the Bible, evangelical christianity, is the sovereign remedy for all the evils which afflict society. It comes arrayed in the panoply of heaven; armed, not only with the sword of truth, but with the power of God. At every point, it meets and disarms the reckless adventurer, who attempts to break down the order which God has established. Does he publish to the world, that "human governments are not approvingly ordained of God?" It responds, "the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." Does he absolve the child from obedience to its parents? It sends forth its injunction, "Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right." Does he say to wives, you are free from the control of your hus-

bands? It replies,—“Ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord.” Does he tell the servant, that he owes no obedience to his master? Its command is,—“Servants, obey in all things, your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, pleasing God.” Does he cast reproach upon the ministers of Christ? It throws over them the shield of their Master, and says, “It is enough for the disciple, that he be as his Master, and the servant, as his Lord: if they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household.” “Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” Does he talk of philosophy? It retorts, “Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy, and vain deceit.” For, “the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.” Does he insist on the goodness of man’s nature, as investing him with the power of self-government? It sends forth its solemn response, “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.” “It is not in man that walketh, to direct his steps.” “There is one Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy.”

Thus does Christianity meet and repel every attack which is made upon the constituted relations and order, which God has established among men. It holds man in his proper position. It defines his true character and relations, and binds him to the throne and government of the Lawgiver of the universe. But Christianity does not stop here. It is not satisfied with the inculcation of truth. It comes clothed with the power of God. The Spirit of truth is revealed to change the heart, to remove disorder from man’s nature, and to restore harmony to all the movements of the soul. And, thus the gospel of Jesus Christ strikes at the very root of the evil, and by the removal of the cause, provides effectually for the destruction of the evil itself.

Let it not be thought that we make no account of public opinion, which is justly considered so potent an instrument in the correction of social evils. We cheerfully accord to it, its proper amount of influence. But, public opinion must be formed, before it can be of any avail, either for the correction of evil, or the production of good. And to accomplish this, is the office of education and religion. These, are the only effectual means, by which a sound public sentiment can be formed and brought to bear, with subduing power, upon existing evils. Let the public mind be thoroughly educated, and deeply imbued with the principles of Christianity, and such a well-balanced

and vigorous public sentiment will be formed, as will effectually secure the foundations of society from convulsion and dissolution.

And is it not, I would ask, in conclusion, an object worthy the attention of every good man, and especially of every minister of the gospel, to promote the cause of education, and to diffuse more extensively, the power of Christianity? If these be the great means of preserving the principles which lie at the foundation of our social institutions, no efforts should be considered too great to give them their proper force. Especially, when there is a tendency in the spirit of the times, to rush forward to practical results, without a proper acquaintance with the true foundation of safe and legitimate action, the friends of social order should exert themselves with increased vigor, in the cause of education and religion. An additional reason for this, is found in the character of the American mind. Lofty and aspiring, like the mountains, in the midst of which it is nurtured, it aims high; but, vehement and impatient of restraint, like the storms which sweep along our vallies, and dash against our mountain-sides, it hurries forward to its object, sometimes at the expense of much that is valuable. We would not, indeed, if we could, alter a single constitutional feature of the American mind. We rejoice, and thank God, that he has formed us to be freemen, and not the tame and crouching sycophants of some hereditary despot. But, let it not be forgotten, that these lofty and bold, and liberty-loving attributes of American character, are not free from the divergent influence, which sin has introduced. Hence, the very vigor of their character, and the impetuosity of their movements, may hurry them off, with accelerated force, from the centre of moral order, and render their action more wild and anomalous. Here, then, more than any where else, and on minds like these, are needed the chastening and subduing power of education and religion. Let us, then, invoke their powerful aid. Let knowledge and piety preside in every bosom; let them breathe their hallowed influence over every social circle, and shed their mild, but subduing power, through the whole length and breadth of our land. Then, Radicalism, with all its train of evils, will disappear, and order, and peace, and the holy fellowship of renovated and kindred minds, will proclaim to all, that we are as WISE, as we are FREE, and as HAPPY, as we are PROSPEROUS.