

THE
AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. XII.

OCTOBER, 1861.

ART. I.—THE HOMERIC DOCTRINE OF THE GODS.*

By WILLIAM S. TYLER, D.D., Professor in Amherst College, Mass.

NAEGELSBACH's Homeric Theology has been a standard work ever since it was given to the public in 1840, and it still remains the most systematic and complete treatise on that subject with which we are acquainted. It is only necessary to look over his copious index of seven sections, divided and sub-divided, classified and arranged with the help of all the letters of the Greek and Latin alphabet, as well as the Arabic numerals, to see the exhaustive, *German* fulness and methodicalness with which he has treated the Homeric Olympus. And when we pass from the index to the work itself, we are

* Die Homerische Theologie in ihren Zusammenhange dargestellt von CARL FRIEDRICH NAEGELSBACH, Professor am K. B. Gymnasium zu Nürnberg. Nürnberg. 1840.

Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age. By the Right Honorable W. E. GLADSTONE, D.C.L., M.P. for the University of Oxford. In three volumes. Oxford: at the University Press. 1858. Vol II. Olympus: or, the Religion of the Homeric Age.

Upon this ground the "Act to preserve the public peace and order on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," passed April 17, 1860, prohibiting exhibitions or dramatic performances on Sunday, can be sustained; the Legislature being the sole judges of the acts proper to be prohibited, with a view to the public peace, and as obstructing religious worship, and bringing into contempt the religious institutions of the people.

That act is clearly *constitutional*, as dealing with and having respect to the Sabbath as a civil and political institution, and not affecting to interfere with religious belief or worship, faith or practice.

In the State of New York the Sabbath exists as a day of rest by the common law, and without the necessity of legislative action to establish it; and all that the Legislature attempt to do in the "Sabbath laws," is to regulate its observance.

ART. V.—THE MORAL ASPECTS OF THE PRESENT STRUGGLE.

THE United States are at this moment in the midst of a contest which, for the magnitude of its proportions, and the momentous character of its issues, is unsurpassed in the history of Christendom. We have ourselves not more than half waked up to an appreciation of its importance. It has already not only arrested the attention, but tasked the political sagacity, and seriously, if not vitally, affected the interests of the world. Foreign journals are declaring in the most confident terms, the utter impracticability of the task with which the government has charged itself, and, arrogantly pronouncing the great American Republic already hopelessly destroyed, call upon us in the name of a professed humanity, to make peace at once with rebellion and save the effusion of blood and the waste of hundreds of millions of treasure. Nor can we disguise from ourselves the fact, however sanguine we may be, that history has on record no example of an insurrection comparable to this, either in extent of territory or apparent popular unanimity and resoluteness of purpose, that has ever been effectually quelled. The cost in blood has not been great thus far. But the expenditure of a million a day, the actual enlistment, on

the one side and the other, of more than half a million of men, armed to a great extent with the most recent improvements in offensive and defensive weapons, the suspension and utter derangement of business from one end of the land to the other, the possibility that foreign nations may presently embroil themselves in the contest, the almost sure expectation of a bloody collision of arms to begin at any moment and end, God only can tell when and where, and the manifest probability of serious changes in the policy of the government, if not in the constitution of society, as the result of the war, combine to show us that the enterprise is one encompassed with difficulties and pregnant with most momentous consequences. It is a life and death-struggle of a mighty nation.

It is a matter of comparatively small moment, as respects the result of this struggle, what opinions foreign nations entertain in regard to it. We have wasted altogether too much time and sensibility over the question, what will England think, and what will this or that interested English journal or flippant correspondent of the English press say of our proceedings? It is high time we were weaned. If we respect ourselves, foreign nations, petulant and jealous old England among the rest, will be compelled to respect us. They should be carefully watched, and their designs promptly met if they show the slightest disposition to interfere. They should never be insulted by angry defiance, and all their rights should be religiously respected. But it is not the opinion of European nations that is going to determine this contest. We have nothing to expect from any of them, so long as it remains doubtful. If we fail, either in arms or statesmanship, be sure they will be against us. If we succeed, they will be for us, but it will then be of very little importance whether they are for us or not. The responsibility is ours. The merits of the cause and the course which duty demands of us we have to determine for ourselves. If the cause be good, we must *make* it respected, and carry it through by such means as are within our command. With a careful avoidance of every wrong measure, and a wise and liberal use of our abundant resources; with a

single eye to the single end which is the best good of this great people, South and North, we have to depend under God solely upon our own *right arm*.

But let it not be inferred that, even as an element of success, the intrinsic merit of the cause is a matter of indifference. We cannot afford to brave public opinion unless we can appeal from it to a better informed public opinion to arise in the future. Besides, "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind" has been recognised as due by this nation from the beginning. And for our own sakes and that of our posterity, for the respect we owe to our history, for the influence and standing we desire to maintain among the nations as a wise, upright and humane, as well as brave and strong people, above all, in view of our relations to the great King of kings, who, we must never forget, sitteth on the throne judging righteously, it becomes us carefully to examine the wisdom and rectitude of so momentous an enterprise, and set the reasons which actuate us clearly before our own minds and those of our fellow-men. If this contest be, on our part, one of revenge, of ambition, of empty national pride, of sectional aggrandisement, or of self-interest; if it be not a matter of high and sacred duty in the discharge of a responsibility solemnly imposed upon us by the authority of God and the claims of humanity, the "fratricidal war," as it is contemptuously called by some who wish no good to either party, is, it must be owned, as disgraceful to us as it might then be expected to prove futile and ruinous.

It is not our purpose at present to discuss at large the merits of the question at issue, but only to present a few of its most obvious moral features, thereby to strengthen the purposes and animate the hopes of the defenders of the right, and put ourselves and our associates on our guard against such misapprehensions of the end to be aimed at, as might divert our efforts into a false channel.

One of the first questions to be asked is, how came we into this contest? For more than three quarters of a century we have been a united people. The *Union* has been our boast South and North. Our fathers exerted their utmost wisdom to form and perfect it, and we had received it as our best na-

tional birthright from the Madisons, Masons, Pinckneys, Jays, Hamiltons, Shermans and Franklins of the revolutionary period. Ay, it had been committed to us, in his dying charge, as a trust for our posterity by the immortal Washington. Under it we had prospered and grown great as no other nation ever did. Our progress in all that constitutes the prosperity of a people, intellectual, moral, and religious, as well as material, had been the admiration of the world. Even they who did not like us feared to interfere with our affairs or put themselves in the way of our rapid and almost irresistible advancement. Nowhere in the world was there such universal comfort, such general intelligence, such scope for the exercise of all sorts of talent, such unmolested enjoyment of religious privileges. We had our political squabbles, but they were soon settled, and in all parts of the country, South and North, the great mass of the people, Whig or Democrat, Federalist or Republican, felt in their hearts that under any administration the privileges to be enjoyed far surpassed the burdens and grievances to be endured.

It lies upon the face of the recent outbreak that it had its origin exclusively among the population of the Southern States. Not that the people of those States are all involved in it, much less responsible for its occurrence; but it originated among them. The North had its supposed grievances, and at times had smarted keenly under them. Its hardy and industrious population, dependent on their own efforts and accustomed to form their own judgments, felt that their rights were trifled with and their moral and religious sentiments abused by the ever-restless, arrogant, and aspiring leaders of Southern opinion and policy. Southern politicians had monopolized a large share of the offices, and, by dexterous management with Northern parties, had controlled disadvantageously to the most substantial interests of the North, the policy of the country. But the North had sought its redress, not in revolution, nor even in threats of dismemberment, but through the legitimate channels of the press, the ballot-box, and the legislative arena. And it is worthy of note, that whenever the attempt has been made to fix on any portion of that section the charge

of *disunion* sentiments or purposes, it has been necessary to have recourse to ambiguous expressions uttered in the heat of some party contest years ago, as far back as the Hartford Convention or the Annexation of Texas. The North has had its faults, no doubt. It may have contributed its full share to the causes of the present deplorable rupture. But it cannot be disputed, and history will affirm it with an unwavering decision, that the North as a body has always been firmly loyal to the American Union.

In looking for the causes which have brought so large a portion of the Southern people to the position they have assumed, we must go back to a very early period of our country's history. The present posture of affairs is not a mere matter of accident; it is the result of no transient and easily avoidable influences. The seeds of the mischief lay deeply imbedded in the very soil on which our institutions were erected. We may wonder that Divine Providence should have permitted it—but so it is. The evil egg was deposited in the very flower of the nation's prime, and was sure from the beginning to break out into a consuming worm in the summer and fruitage of its prosperous maturity. We need not undertake to unravel the vast net-work of causes which have acted and reacted upon each other during three quarters of a century. The intricate lock has too many permutations and combinations to enable us to fix the exact numbers corresponding to the last movement of the bolts. But we may perhaps furnish from the obvious history of the country one or two master-keys, which, with slight adjustments, may serve for the most practical purposes.

The root of the difficulty is not to be found in an opposition of interests. The interests of the South are scarcely more at variance with those of the North than are those of the East with those of the West. Individual States, lying side by side, have a certain diversity of interest, and may be rivals with each other in determining the industrial policy of the country. The mine and the factory, the field and the ocean, the mart and the plantation have no doubt their particular facilities and opportunities, and in particular cases the advantage of the one

operates to the disadvantage of the other. But on the whole it may be affirmed with confidence, that what is for the interest of the South is likewise for that of the North and West. There never was a great people better adapted in this respect to play into the hands of each other, and to flourish by free interchange and coöperation. If the South were to become independent to-day, they would be obliged for their own sakes to form relations either with the North or some foreign country requiring equal if not greater concessions than those they have been accustomed to make in the national Union.

Nor is the source of the rupture to be looked for, as some have foolishly pretended, in a difference of race. In fact there is no such difference of race. All over the land, it is true, there is a mixture of elements; and every nation of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Celt and Teuton, Anglo-Saxon and Latin, have contributed their quota. The South may have a few more of the Scotch-Irish, and the North of the more aboriginal race of the Green Isle; the South more of the descendants of the Cavaliers, and the North of those of the Puritans. But with different proportions in the mixture, both communities are of the same stock or stocks. Indeed, not a few of those who are now most loud-mouthed in their clamor for Southern rights and Southern honor are themselves either emigrants from the Northern States or of Northern origin through one or both parents. As was beautifully said by one of the noblest and most chivalrous Southrons of them all, himself of Northern birth: "The sons of New England are found in every State of the broad Republic. In the East, the South, and the unbounded West their blood mingles freely with every kindred current. In the veins of our children flow Northern and Southern blood; how shall it be separated?" This process of mingling and commingling has been going on through our entire history, and at the present moment there are few Northerners or Southerners who have not relatives either by blood or affinity in the other section of the country.

Nor again is the cause to be looked for in a difference of political or religious institutions. The governments of these States were all founded on the same Republican basis; and

the same general ideas lie at the foundation of all their constitutions and laws. If we except the single State of Louisiana, every one of them, old and new, are on the same old platform of the common law of England. In the sphere of religion we have precisely the same denominations, and till recently have claimed connection with the same national churches. With few exceptions, we are all Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, and Congregationalists or Presbyterians. And the fundamental ideas of our worship, doctrine, and discipline present no marks of difference by which one section could be distinguished from the other.

Nor again has there been, on the part of the North, any such alienation of feeling as to justify the notion that the two sections might not live together in national harmony. No doubt there has been gaining ground at the South, for a considerable time, a hostile feeling. And at the North, it must be owned, there has been from the beginning, a deep-seated and almost universal disapproval of certain features of Southern society. But that the feeling has ever, in the great body of the Northern people, transcended the bounds of a friendly difference of opinion, or been the occasion of personal animosities towards the people of the South in general, we confidently deny. Indeed, if we are not mistaken in our observation, there has prevailed among us, to a great extent, a sentiment of partiality, so that in almost any company, the introduction of your friend as a gentleman or lady from the South, has been the passport to peculiar attentions.

We have alluded to "certain features of Southern society." But this is no time to talk gingerly or resort to euphuistic and indirect phrases. The *root* and *mother* of this whole difficulty, the subject matter of it and the pre-disposing cause, is SLAVERY. It has developed traits of character in the Southern population, which alone could have made such a result possible.* It has brought about what we are compelled to admit has been and is an *irrepressible conflict*. Many of us

* The opinions above expressed are fortified by that of that shrewd and philosophical observer of our country, De Tocqueville, uttered a quarter of a century

would fain have repressed it. We were willing to make all sorts of concessions, consistent with the plainest duty, in order to repress it. But it has proved itself too strong for the most powerful and determined pacificators.

This strange anomaly in our free institutions has had a home among them from the very beginning. Our fathers treated it as an existing fact, and as such, protected its interests, but regarding it as an anomaly, and expecting it to be but temporary, made little or no calculation for the contingency of its permanence. Jefferson's views on the subject are well known; so are Madison's, the father, if any one might be called such, of the Federal Constitution. The very words *slave* and *slavery* were excluded from the instrument, because the thing itself was not expected to continue. But, in the providence of God, and by the working of unforeseen causes, the event has been just the opposite of the expectation. Slavery, which soon died out in the Northern States, has taken deep root in the South, and grown to vast proportions. It has been elevated to the dignity of an *institution*, and, from being regarded as an unavoidable evil, has come to be lauded as the true basis of the best possible form of society. It has formed and governed the habits of thought, and fixed, in a great measure, the relative social standing of the people. It has assumed to be the ruling interest of the South, to which all others must consent to be subordinate. It has put rigid restrictions on the expression of opinion and the circulation of literature. It has assailed with fierce denunciations and epithets of contempt whoever has dared question either its authority or its excellence.

ago. "The dangers which threaten the American Union," he says, "do not originate in diversity of interests or opinions, but in the various characters and passions of the Americans. The men who inhabit the vast territory of the United States are almost all the issue of a common stock, but the effects of climate, and more especially of slavery, have gradually introduced very striking differences between the British settler of the Southern States and the British settler of the North. In Europe it is generally believed that slavery has rendered the *interests* of one part contrary to those of another part; but I by no means remarked this to be the case. Slavery has not created interests in the South contrary to those of the North, but it has modified the *character* and changed the *habits* of the natives of the South."

It has expelled Southern men from their homes for opposition to its assumed prerogatives. It has demanded recognition by the Northern people, not as a local but a *national* institution. It has aspired to rule, and to a surprising extent has succeeded in ruling the policy of the nation. It has even bound itself by an awful oath never to suffer a man opposed to its pretensions to occupy the chair of President of the United States of America.

We state these things simply as matters of fact, and not for the purpose of throwing reproach upon an entire community. We would not be unjust, even amidst the fearful evils which have recently been precipitated upon us. No person has a higher esteem for a very large portion of the people of the Southern States. Nowhere do we find men more honorable and religious—nowhere women more pure, refined, beneficent, and self-sacrificing. And as respects the unfortunate and dependent race whose relations are the occasion of this collision, we believe few Northern men or women would have half the patience with them, or bestow upon them half the self-sacrificing attentions, sick or well, living or dying, which not a few of them now receive from those who claim to hold them under the laws in the character of property. Indeed, with all the abuses to which the system is manifestly liable, and the immense irresponsible power which it puts into individual hands, we think it creditable to the Southern people, as a body, that the race is so well cared for as it is, and so few aggravated wrongs are actually suffered. Nor with all our deep convictions of the intrinsic evil of the system, social, moral, and religious, as well as political, would we cast indiscriminate censure upon the Southern people for its existence among them, or demand, even as a moral obligation, its *immediate* and *unconditional* abolition. It is a question no doubt encompassed with difficulties, and, for ourselves, we are quite disposed to leave to them the responsibility.

But while we say this, and would urge it as we have ever done on the consideration of the North, we must affirm with equal emphasis, that the North is not, on any right view of the case, to be blamed for entertaining and expressing a deep seated and irreconcilable aversion to the system of slavery. That

aversion has been ingrained in the very texture of their institutions and education. Many of them, and we think justly, regard their favorite doctrine of *liberty and equality*—the doctrine which stands emblazoned on the very front of the Declaration of Independence—as just as applicable to men of a dark skin as those of a white one. Their fathers abolished slavery, not because it was unprofitable, but because they believed it incompatible with the principles of liberty, political and religious. They regard it, with a few exceptions, as an enormous evil. This is not the opinion only of a few wild fanatics. The mildest, coolest, most considerate and thoughtful men, accustomed to judge deliberately and look on all sides of a subject, have long since been settled in that conclusion. This doctrine, held as we have said by the fathers of the Republic, was till recently that of three fourths of the wisest men in the Southern States. Witness the resolutions of the Presbyterian Church in 1818, passed with the concurrence of the great body of the Southern members. No large assembly of Christians has passed as decisive resolutions in recent times. “I am not very old,” said a distinguished member of the Mississippi bar a few months since, “and yet I can remember when intelligent men at the South not only doubted whether slavery were right, but there was a *general feeling* that it ought ultimately to be abolished. This feeling in Kentucky and Virginia in 1832–33, almost culminated into emancipation, and even in this State the Supreme Court decided that it was an unnatural and unjust relation, and that all presumptions should be indulged against it.”* If the South has got new light recently, it cannot be deemed an offence that the North, seeing no reason to change their opinions, should still insist upon the lessons which the South itself formerly taught them. Till it can be shown at least that the system is compatible with as much intellectual improvement as the race or individuals in it, are capable of; till the law of marriage, and the sacred command of the Saviour, “What God hath joined together let not man put asunder,” shall cease to be a nullity in the case of

* Speech of Wm. C. Smedes, Esq., Vicksburgh, Oct. 1860.

four millions of human beings made in God's image, thinking men out of the immediate influence of the system will not be likely to regard it otherwise than as an enormous evil. And not merely because we are members of the same body politic, but because we are of a common human family, most men will be likely to regard themselves as under obligations both to God and man, to speak out freely their opinions on the subject, and use their utmost influence to change the opposite opinions of their Southern neighbors.

It is no part of our present design to discuss the merits of the slavery question. We wish only to show how it lies among the leading causes of the existing rupture. It was not in the nature of things that the North should yield, while they had strength to resist, to the new claims of the South in behalf of this system. To all the guarantees of the Constitution, the South was, no doubt, entitled. The great body of the North, a few radical men only excepted, constantly declared them to be so. They acquiesced while territory after territory, purchased with the money, or won by the arms of the whole Union, had been given over to slavery. They joined the South in passing what were called the compromises of 1850, affording new guarantees against the escape of slaves, and which at the time all parties said should be a finality. But when they saw claim after claim preferred successfully, and the old compromise, which secured the Northern territories to freedom, swept recklessly away; when the doctrine was asserted and on the point to be enforced, that the Constitution itself, *proprio vigore*, carries the offensive system into every territory of the country; nay, that on the principles of natural right, slavery is the rule and freedom only the exception, they could not, without stultifying themselves and consenting to be bound hand and foot to the car of slavery, refrain from vigorous moral and political resistance.

Had the new doctrines been confined to the political arena, the case would have been less aggravated. But they had taken deep root in the Church; and ministers of the Gospel, as if to prove, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that they had freed themselves from the scruples entertained by their fathers,

ran great lengths before the more sober civilians, proving out of the Bible, the excellence of the cherished institution, and denouncing as *infidels* every man who presumed to call it in question. It was thus that the New School Presbyterian Assembly was ruptured. And the ground recently taken by Dr. Palmer, of New Orleans, of the Old School, does but give a public voice to what not a few of his brethren are well known at this moment to maintain. What would the Assembly of 1818 have said to such language as the following: "A nation often has a character as well-defined and intense as that of the individual. However derived, this individuality of character alone makes any people truly historic, competent to work out its own specific mission, and to become a factor in the world's progress. The particular trust assigned to such a people becomes the pledge of the divine protection, and their fidelity to it determines the fate by which it is finally overtaken. If then the South is such a people, what, at this juncture, is their providential trust? I answer, that it is *to conserve and to perpetuate the institution of domestic slavery as now existing.*" The italics are his own, as we extract the passage from his printed sermon now lying before us; *to conserve and to perpetuate the institution of domestic slavery as now existing!* And again, he says: "Without determining the question of duty for future generations, I simply say that, for us, as now situated, the duty is plain, of conserving and *transmitting* the system of slavery, *with the freest scope for its national development and extension.*"

Could the freemen of the North, brought up in the doctrine expressed by the General Assembly of 1818, consent to be silent under such startling assertions? Could the Church, for the sake of union and good-fellowship, consent to hold her peace? Could she continue to give letters of recommendation indiscriminately, and that for the occupation of Northern pulpits and theological professorships, with such doctrines boldly maintained in her midst, and say nothing about the matter?

The North was bound by the most sacred obligations, both to discuss the question freely in the moral and religious arena,

and debate and resist the new claim in the department of politics. No doubt, some have been intemperate and discourteous in their manner of discussion. With that we have been ourselves sufficiently disgusted. But that is only what occurs on all subjects exciting in a high degree the public mind. We are amazed, or should be, if any thing could amaze us from that quarter, to hear such a man as Bishop Eliot laying the chief stress, in his assertion of Southern grievances, on the fact that Northern newspapers, pamphlets, lecture-rooms, pulpits, senate-chambers, etc., in common with those of Europe, have "systematically" "slandered and traduced," "as incompatible with civilization and Christianity," the institution of slavery. We have always been accustomed to believe an institution which would not bear to be discussed *roughly*, could not have in it much inherent goodness or strength. And yet, if we have rightly judged, the North, as a body, have never been disposed to discuss the question of slavery in a particularly bold manner. We venture to say, the question cannot be named, involving as high moral and religious considerations, which has been handled as cautiously and almost nervously, if we except the discussions of the abolition party, as the question of slavery. And, as to political movements, although, of course, every party will be likely to see most vividly its own grievances, we think it may be asserted without reasonable question, that by far the majority of Northern men, in all parties, up to the moment of the present outbreak, and never more so than at that moment, were agreed in giving to the South every right which they believed could be claimed by them under the Federal Constitution. While, therefore, we assert, as before, that slavery is the grand predisposing cause of the existing rupture, we cannot regard it, *or the course which has been pursued in respect to it*, as in the slightest degree a justifying cause. Nor do we believe such a result as we now witness could have been brought about, but for the working of another cause, which has made use of this as its most effective instrument.

That cause, to which we now call special attention, is the *unscrupulous ambition* of political partisans. There is the

most satisfactory reason to believe that, for more than thirty years, there has existed, in some parts of the South, a deep-laid plot to dismember the National Union. Its first open demonstration was in the famous Nullification movement, which culminated and was defeated in its plans in the spring of 1833, and which took that shape, partly because the people were not prepared for open and avowed rebellion, and partly because Mr. Calhoun was not yet willing to forego his hopes of attaining to the Presidency of the United States. We well remember listening to a conversation, during the spring of that year, between a Southern gentleman of some political distinction, and one of the largest manufacturers of the city of Boston. After discussing, for some time, the then recent Nullification excitement, and the bearing of Mr. Clay's Compromise Bill, which had so modified the Tariff as to pacify the Nullifiers, the Southern gentleman observed: "After all, sir, you have not got hold of the secret of the difficulty. It is not the Tariff that these men are concerned about. It is the separation of the Union. I know them all," said he, mentioning names then perfectly familiar to the public ear; "they are my friends, and they are good fellows; but they have got it into their heads it would be a good thing to have a Southern Republic, and they mean to bring it about." The old dream of a Confederacy or Republic inclosing in its circuit the Gulf of Mexico, and possessing the mouths of all the principal rivers, which they imagined would give them the key of power and prosperity—the dream which is supposed to have turned the head of Aaron Burr, and almost brought that head to the gallows—was even then stirring in the ambitious brains of Southern aspirants. The plot was at that time confined chiefly to South Carolina and Virginia, in the development of which the South Carolinians acted openly, and the Virginians, standing in fear of the immense loyal majority among the citizens of that State, sympathized and assisted beneath a cover.

This disunion project, it is well known, South Carolina has never relinquished. She has lost no opportunity of gaining partisans, or making movements for its accomplishment. In 1850, she actually passed an ordinance of secession, but re-

pealed it because a new compromise prevented other States from following her example. And it serves to identify her last and successful effort with the first, that Mr. Rhett, immediately after the act of secession, last December, declared in the Convention: "We have only accomplished what our fathers taught us to do, thirty years ago."

In the first effort, the question of slavery seems to have performed no prominent part, except through the traits of character which the system had contributed to form. In the *Partisan Leader*, a work of fiction, said to have been written in 1836, by a professor in a Virginia institution, and a friend of Mr. Calhoun, in which, with one or two exceptions, the whole plan according to which the leaders of the rebellion now in arms are actually working, is detailed with a startling accuracy, almost forcing you to the belief that, instead of twenty-five years, its origin must have been within the last six months—no account whatsoever is taken of the subject of slavery. But this was only at the beginning. It was soon perceived by discerning eyes, where lay the true strength of sectional partisanship. Mr. Benton, in an address to which we listened five years ago, marked the precise date of the change in the disunion tactics. After describing in an eloquent manner the perilous position in which Mr. Calhoun found himself, when the Proclamation of General Jackson and the passage of the Force Bill, so nobly sustained by Mr. Webster in oblivion of all party differences, brought him suddenly to a stand, went on to relate, that, no sooner did the nullification leader find himself released from his dilemma, as he did by the passage of Mr. Clay's compromise bill, than he proceeded to address a letter to his political friends, in which he assured them it was, in his judgment, quite futile to attempt further to make a unit of the South on the question of the Tariff. They must adopt another, and he indicated, for that purpose, the question of *slavery*. Mr. Clay, said Mr. Benton, saw the letter, and taking alarm, wrote to Madison on the subject. And Madison replied that he had seen the letter, and augured from it *nothing but mischief*. Then and there, continued the veteran Democratic Senator, commenced a series of measures still in progress, hav-

ing in view the sectional unity of the South on the basis of that question—such as the employment of the press, the sending forth of lecturers or stump-orators, and the series of Southern conventions. Abolitionism, he added, made its appearance in the North just about the same time, and every extravagant thing that was said from pulpit or press, was carefully gathered up and reproduced in the South to make the people feel that the North were their enemies.

We have already expressed the opinion that there is and has been no prevailing animosity in the Northern mind towards the people of the South. The dislike and disapproval of slavery has never taken that shape, except sporadically, or in the heat of controversy. But we cannot say the same on the other hand. Left to themselves, we believe the Southern people would be generous and friendly. But under the influence of inflammatory demagogues, having for their object to “fire the Southern heart,” animosity and prejudice have sometimes been excited to an astonishing pitch. We find an illustration of this as far back as 1838, in the Memoir of Hon. S. S. Prentiss, a man eminently devoted to every true and honorable interest of the South, while he never narrowed his mind to the exclusion of any section of his country from his generous patriotism. At a public dinner at Vicksburgh, to which he had been invited just after his return from a visit to the North, we find him speaking as follows: “It is the fashionable cant of the day to denounce the Whig party in the South, in the most unqualified terms, as leagued with the Abolitionists, traitors to their own interests, enemies to their own institutions, and with other such like phrases. Southern Democracy, it seems, consists in a general abuse of the rest of the Union, a denial of the existence of any common interest with the North, and a bitter denunciation of every man who has the independence to refuse to assent to these strange dogmas. Indeed, to such an extent is this brotherly hatred now carried by some, that a man cannot exchange ordinary courtesies or civilities with his fellow-citizens of the North, without rendering himself obnoxious to the charge of being an enemy to the South.” Then, speaking of courtesies recently received by him during his

Northern visit, and which were offered, as he affirms, "chiefly as an expression of good feeling towards the State" he represented, he adds: "Yet have I been most bitterly abused for responding to these courtesies, for daring to break bread and eat salt with our Northern brethren, and, especially, for so far violating Southern policy as to have wickedly visited the cradle of liberty, and most sacrilegiously entered Faneuil Hall."

Thus it is, that, for a long series of years, the Southern mind has been poisoned. At every Presidential election the elements of the poison have been spread abroad most industriously; and Southern demagogues have then enjoyed the aid of Northern slanderers, who have shown no scruple in maligning the people of their own section. Thus has the mind of the South been prepared to acquiesce in almost any project, however desperate, which might promise to rid them of the power and influence of their hated neighbors. And thus have the people of the South been prepared to drink in, as if it were gospel, the infamous slander of Beauregard's proclamation, or the scarcely less infamous and false resolutions offered by Mr. Cobb in the recent Congress at Montgomery as the basis of a recommendation of a day of fasting and prayer.

Meanwhile, the plans of the conspirators were greatly favored, in the progress of events, by the vast increase of the cotton interest, which had become a necessity, not to a single country only, but to the world, and by the immensely enhanced value of slave property, as inseparably connected with its American culture. It was believed that cotton, and slavery as inseparable from cotton, might claim successfully to be the ruler of the world. The old dream of a confederacy or empire around the Gulf now assumed hues as gorgeous as those which once emblazoned the "Peacock Throne," and the gorgeous WEST, instead of the "gorgeous EAST," was expected soon to "shower on her kings barbaric pearls and gold." Texas had been secured to slavery, with four new States to be carved out of it as soon as they could be settled; and *fillibustering* expeditions to Mexico and Central America, sustained by Southern men and only nominally interfered with by a Southern Cabinet, were expected soon to extend the area of dominion to

indefinite limits. The reöpening of the slave-trade was indeed a necessary adjunct of the scheme, and that must be approached cautiously, since the sentiment of the South was not yet ripe for its adoption and the sentiment of the North and the world was utterly abhorrent to it. But tentative opinions had been put forth again and again bearing in that direction, and tentative expeditions had been fitted out and put in operation not unsuccessfully. A prominent politician of one of the Southern States, on retiring from office a few years ago, declared to his fellow-citizens, in the most emphatic terms, that, in his judgment, the reöpening of that traffic was absolutely essential to the occupation of new territory and the multiplication of Slave States; and that, though he was not prepared to advise the measure, the South must understand they had no alternative between its adoption and resting content with their existing boundaries. There is not, we think, the slightest doubt that, could Southern politicians have retained the general Government one or two terms more, the slave-trade would have been opened, and slave-ships, protected by American frigates, traversed the ocean with their human freight in defiance of the world.

Could this have been accomplished, and the Government secured permanently in the hands of Southern men, could Kansas have been gained to slavery, the Dred Scott Decision been acquiesced in as a finality, liberty obtained to carry slaves *in transitu* into any and all of the States, all restrictions upon slave extension removed from existing territories, or even from those below what was regarded as the line of profitable slave labor, and the Breckinridge clause of the Crittenden Compromise relating to *future* territory made the permanent law, there were those among them who, no doubt, would have been willing to let the Union remain unbroken, or at least try the experiment of pursuing their favorite plans a little longer under its banner. But failing in this, the resolution had been taken long ago, and had waited only for its opportunity, and for the pretext which should bring a sufficient portion of the Southern people to its support, to tear down the pillars of the Republic.

With these views and these extravagant hopes and desperate plans, the slave power, as it has been justly called, became, in the hands of the conspirators and those who supported them, fierce, insolent, defiant, and often violent to the utter contempt of law and principle. You could not approach it or make the slightest rustle of opposition without awakening a hiss, nor put yourself in the way of its designs without feeling a poisonous fang. Even the old friends and defenders of the South, those who had borne the brunt of Abolitionism at the North for a quarter of a century, found themselves among the objects of its fierce denunciations hardly less than the Garrisons, Phillipses, and Lovejoys, whom they had strenuously opposed.

But we must hasten on to the closing acts of the terrible drama. After a long struggle in Congress, through the press, and at the polls in successive Presidential campaigns; after the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, which startled the best friends of the South and upset all their notions of Southern honor and good faith, and the fierce battle for liberty on the one hand and slavery on the other in the territory of Kansas, resulting, fortunately for the world, in the triumph of free institutions—the success of the Republican party in the election of Lincoln was accepted as the ripe occasion for breaking out into open rebellion. We need not detail the series of measures which are yet but too fresh in the memory of American citizens. The fiction of *secession* we are constrained to believe was but a pretext to beguile unwary but scrupulous souls. The repeated declaration that separation was to be a peaceable measure, and that all the South wanted was to be *let alone*, was but a convenient cover to a policy which the leaders in it must have known would lead sooner or later to blood. But the net had been carefully woven round the limbs of the nation, North as well as South; and the secret machinations of a band of sworn desperadoes distributed through the country, the complicity of members of two successive Presidential Cabinets, who had destroyed the defences of the country or transferred them to the custody or within reach of the seizure of the leaders of rebellion, the distribution in all the offices of the Gov-

ernment of men known to sympathize with the intended movement, and already prepared by accepting the pestilent heresy of *secession* to absolve themselves from the obligations of their sacred oaths, the thorough organization of the whole conspiracy and the maturity of its plans, seemed to make them sure of securing their victim. In the excitement of the hour, the Gulf States were first *precipitated* into rebellion with no fair opportunity for the expression of public opinion, and, forthwith, an armed resistance was prepared, and armed aggression on the property and fortifications of the United States initiated the measure of WAR.

We all remember, but too well, the fearful days and months of the winter of 1860-61, when a great nation lay prostrate and powerless, completely paralysed with astonishment, or *etherized* with the delusive cry of *compromise* and *no coercion*, while a REBELLION more foul, and a CONSPIRACY more desperate and malignant than that of Catiline was fingering at its throat, and pricking with its poisoned dagger at its jugular vein. American citizens can never forget the strange and utterly unparalleled sensations of those black months. Should they live fifty years, they will ever haunt them at times in their nightmare dreams. We were like men astounded by the fearful throes of a startling earthquake. The very ground we trod trembled beneath our feet, and the key-stone of the great arch of our government shook and swayed, threatening to crush us.

It has been said there was no design on the part of the rebellious States beyond their own independence. But we know better than that. The utter dissolution of the existing nation, that a new one might be constructed out of its most available fragments, was among their plainly avowed purposes. Says Hon. Robert H. Smith, of Alabama, in a speech, delivered at Mobile in March last: "I earnestly hope that, not only will the kindred States join us, but abide in confidence that some of the great North-Western States, watered by the Mississippi, will be drawn by the strong current of that mighty river and by the laws of trade, to swell the number and power of this Confederation, and that we shall receive them on such terms of their organic law as we ourselves may prescribe; and in doing

so, GRASP THE POWER OF EMPIRE ON THIS CONTINENT, and announce to the startled North that it has reached its western limit, and must spread, if spread it can, towards the frozen sea. As sure as the Mississippi flows towards the Gulf, and bears on its bosom the great commerce of the West, and as sure as we are consumers of western products, and *our Tariff will be lower than that of the United States*, so sure will the trouble be not to have the West with us, but to keep it from us. The only escape from it is, by their government's adopting *our system* of low duties, or by New York's *cutting loose from New England* and spreading its gates of commerce wide to free trade. The political economist knows it, the merchant knows it, and the Black Republican statesman now feels it and stands appalled at the ruin he has done."

There is no need of mistaking such an announcement. What the sympathies of neighboring States, and the urgency of interest could not effect, was to be made necessary by unfriendly legislation. It is well known that New York City was expected, either to join the Confederacy, or to unite its fortunes with it by separating from the State and becoming a free city. And, as for Washington, though it has been denied that there was any intention at the outset to seize that, it is very well known that Mr. Wise, five years ago, declared his readiness to head a party for that purpose in case Fremont should be elected, and that Mr. Walker, the Secretary of War of the so-called Confederacy, declared openly, just after the taking of Fort Sumter, that it would be accomplished in a few weeks.

What then was the plain and obvious posture of affairs? The United States had before them the single alternative of WAR OR RUIN. This is, in our judgment, as certain as any problem in mathematics. The rebel States were actually at war all winter, while they were crying peace. The seizures and other acts of violence which they committed, not even the most unscrupulous of their partisans could have justified to themselves for a moment, on any other supposition. And while our government hesitated and talked of compromise and doubted about coercion, we came as near an utter and irretrievable overthrow as was possible without actually incurring it. Thank

God the booming of the cannon that shattered the walls and tore the flag of Fort Sumter, roused the nation from a dream that had well nigh proved its death. It was a glorious experience. Strangely, God seemed to give to the nation another heart. Patriotism that had so long slept, suddenly woke up in the breasts of twenty millions of freemen. The Government saw its duty, the sacred duty with which it had been charged, in behalf of the world and the generations, not by man only, but by God, and addressed itself with energy to its performance. The Church awoke too, and from all her pulpits sounded out the word of God, which declares, not in the Old Testament, but in the New, that the civil magistrate is "the minister of God, AN AVENGER TO EXECUTE WRATH on him that doeth evil," and "that he beareth not the SWORD in vain."

If ever there was a sacred cause on earth, we believe this is one. It is just the cause for which the New Testament explicitly commands the unsheathing of the sword in God's name. It is said we cannot carry it through. We reply, we did not take that question into the account when we entered on this struggle. It was a plain *duty* to undertake it. "Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish," we had no alternative. It was a case of life and death to the nation, and we must struggle until the power to do so no longer remained. Could we have met the judgment of the world, could we have met the judgment of posterity, could we have met the judgment of Almighty God, if we had suffered this great nation, this most benign government, freighted with the interests of millions and with the hopes of the Church, under God, as well as of the world, to be torn to pieces and its fragments scattered on the sea of anarchy, without a struggle? Peace is a blessing earnestly to be coveted. War is a fearful evil. But who supposes we could have had peace, had this foul conspiracy been suffered to triumph? What sort of peace could have been expected, when the Union was broken up and a new empire, under the name of a Republic, built up at our side on the sole basis of cotton and slavery? Mr. Stephens, the Vice-President of the so-called Confederacy, is not ordinarily an extravagant talker, yet he tells us, in vaunting terms, that the ideas

held by the fathers of the Republic on the subject of freedom and equality are wrong. "Our new government," he says, "is founded upon exactly the opposite ideas, its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests upon the great truth that *the negro is not equal to the white man*, that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition. Thus our new government is the first in the world based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth." Who supposes we could have remained at peace with a nation based on such ideas close on our border, and no natural barrier between us? Suppose we had retained all the Northern States, what hope of concord could there be between nations based on principles so diametrically opposite? What hope from a Confederacy, starting, as this did, with the unscrupulous renunciation of the most solemn oaths and obligations? No, much as we love and long for peace, indeed just in proportion as we love and long for it, we believe the utter crushing of this fearful rebellion is the only hope of its permanent maintenance.

But if we did not count the cost at the beginning, we have, we believe, counted it since. This war will cause us an immense expenditure of blood and treasure. It may be a long and wearing, wasting process. But we can carry it through. The mischief is not, after all, so formidable as it seemed at first. If this rebellion were, in the proper sense of the word, an uprising of the people, we might despair of subjugating them. But it embraces only a faction of the Southern people, and has, to our eye, all the aspect of a foul CONSPIRACY. We protest against regarding the contest as a sectional one between the North and the South. In the name of Kentucky and Maryland, Delaware and Missouri, and of loyal multitudes in other Southern states, we protest against it. And though in several of the States vast numbers of the people have no doubt been made to feel that they are fighting for their homes, their liberties, and the safety and honor of their wives and daughters, we know they have been grossly deceived, and believe that under a change of circumstances they will see that they been so, and take a different position. Already, we see more than gleams of encouragement in that direction. Western Virginia is heartily and bravely with us. Eastern Tennessee is only

waiting for support to free herself from the toils that have been thrown around her. The whole mountain region, the home of those bold hardy mountaineers, on whose support the author of the *Partisan Leader* confidently relied, is on the side of the Union. North Carolina begins to give tokens of a loyal movement. And all over the South there is, or was, a loyal element which, if now dead and twice dead, may have a resurrection. It only wants firmness, perseverance, unanimity, and singleness of purpose on our part, and, with a reasonable share of energy and statesmanlike wisdom, we believe this great Union may once more stand before the world in its integrity, and the beautiful "Stars and Stripes," dear to us now as they never were before, wave their cheering folds over every mountain and valley of our extended territory. We have suffered some defeats thus far, but we needed them and they will do the nation good. We shall have more, if divine wisdom sees them requisite, either to abate our hurtful pride, or drive a deeper furrow in the fallow ground, to be broken up. But we shall triumph at last, if we trust in God and persevere regardless of self-sacrifice.

As to the question, What is to become of slavery? we are not careful to answer or inquire. The flagrant crime of rebellion against the best of governments has been committed on the part of the Southern faction, avowedly in its interest. The war, on the part of the nation, has been undertaken solely for the support of the Government; in other words, of "The Constitution, the Union, and the enforcement of the laws." If slavery falls in this contest, it will be its own fault. But God's good providence will decide.

We hear that Christians of the South are praying over the subject, and with professions of devout confidence, laying their cause before God. At this we rejoice. Their own judgment we may think most erroneous. But in God's judgment we have the utmost confidence. In laying the case before Him they help not the cause of rebellion, but the cause which is their *own true interest*, though they think it not, that of rightful government. To him the appeal must be made. Let us do our duty, cost what it may, and let the righteous God do what seemeth him good.