

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE III.

THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS VALUE OF OUR
NATIONAL UNION.

BY REV. B. SEARS, PRESIDENT OF BROWN UNIVERSITY.

THOUGH it is not the usual practice of this journal, devoted to theological sciences, to turn aside from its main purpose to discuss topics connected with passing events, there is something so extraordinary and so momentous in the state of public affairs at this moment, that we cannot well refrain from giving it the consideration which, from its great importance, it deserves. We propose, therefore, in the present Article, to hold up to view, and to present in various lights, the subject of the moral and religious value of our national union.

Preliminary to all other inquiries on the general topic, is this fundamental one: What are we, the people of these United States, *historically*? What, in respect to us, are the tendencies of all past history?

We are too apt to consider our history as beginning with the landing of the Pilgrim fathers. We must go far back of that event, if we would apprehend our history in all its vast extent. For the existence of this nation there were preparations in the past, too distant in the view to be seen even by the wisest of the founders of our National Union; and there were reserved for the future, developments affecting the destiny of our country which no human wisdom could foresee. Our present remarkable condition is owing more to the great laws of historical development, than to the designs of men. The force of the accumulated wisdom and experience which moves the great mass of humanity in its progress, advances also individual nations in their career, unless they put themselves out of the line of progress. Not only the present age in general, but the present position of our country in particular, is a result which it required all the

past to produce. Our government, which may be regarded politically as the purest and truest exponent of what is peculiar to modern civilization, could never have come into existence but for the elaboration, by all the historic nations that have preceded us, of those processes for advancing the race which it was their province severally to work out. We could not have attained to what we now are, without the preliminary work of the primeval ages, and the industrial improvements inaugurated by the great empires of the East ; without the treasures of literature and art bequeathed to us by Athens and Rome ; without the renovating and invigorating influence of primitive Christianity ; without the tumult, the strife, and the fermentation of the Middle Ages ; without the great Reformation of the sixteenth century ; without the maintenance of the Protestant faith in England ; and without that remarkable training and discipline which made the English colonists of North America so different in character and influence from the Spanish colonists of South America. When the glory of the classic nations of antiquity was passing away, Christianity saved the world from absolute decay, by supplying a moral basis for the perpetual existence of society which had been wanting before ; and when, by the revival of learning and by the Reformation, ancient civilization was resuscitated and placed on a Christian foundation, the elements of modern civilization were for the first time combined. The Protestant faith and the Saxon race were brought into contact by a Providential arrangement ; and these together have produced a national character never known before in history. From such a lineage, temporal and spiritual, did our Puritan ancestors descend. They brought with them to this country those traits of national and Christian character, and those ideas of government, which they shared in common with the best portion of the English population, leaving behind them what was faulty in the English government and institutions : the aristocratical remains of earlier feudal times. This constitutes the chief difference between the English and American nationalities and governments of the present day.

It was the peculiar province of Greece first to develop the idea of *liberty*, founded on the supreme dignity and authority of the individual soul; and of Rome to develop that of *law*, restraining liberty and keeping it within just limits from a consideration of the higher authority of the state. These two elements of all good government, which were never combined in due proportions in any ancient state, have, under Christianity, the inspirer of a truer liberty and a juster system of law, been united and held more nearly in equipoise in modern times. But even now, in the most favored countries of Europe, this equipoise exists much more extensively in the theory of great political writers than in practice. Even in the British empire, the best governed of any country in Europe, there are disabilities on the one hand, and hereditary privileges on the other, which abate much from the true theory of liberty. In France, neither law nor liberty is what it should be: the one has too much of arbitrary power; the other, if it be allowed any existence at all, degenerates immediately into licentiousness. On the rest of the continent of Europe, if we except one or two petty states, there is little else to be found but law without liberty. Ours is the only great nation in all the world where the modern doctrine of liberty has an unqualified recognition.

To sum up in a few words the results of our historical position as a nation on this continent, we were at the outset British colonies; but not like other colonies, made up of adventurers and outcasts. Our fathers brought with them the high intellectual qualities, the religion, the learning, and the arts of the English people, in the flowering period of their growth and vigor. We were enjoying the spring-tide of Christian civilization when we began our career. On the first day of our colonial existence, we stood, in respect to all that makes a people truly great, where other colonies stand only after centuries of prosperity. The ideas of reform in church and state which our fathers cherished in common with their English brethren, were brought with them, and were planted at the beginning, in a virgin soil, as

the seeds of better civil and religious institutions in time to come. While the process of germination was going on, it was, no doubt, well that the ocean separated us more completely from Europe than it now does from Asia. Hereby a watchful Providence was making provision for the spontaneous growth and unrestrained development of civil and religious freedom, and the institutions growing out of them. Such was the infancy of our nation, itself the select product of the most perfect form of European civilization and social organization, and designed to introduce into the world a new political era. We hold it to be a self-evident truth that, while we owe everything to our English descent, it was just as important that our progenitors should leave England in order to carry out their principles, as it was to be born and educated there. There were home influences, not a few in number, nor unimportant in character, to be thrown off. There were dead weights and clogs to social progress from which it was vitally important that they should set themselves free. There was the incubus of a proud aristocracy, and of a state church, then and still withering the strength and destroying the beauty of the social system of the the mother-country. All these were to be dropped; and only those parts of the English constitution and laws which were sound and healthy were to be adopted and maintained in the new world.

The experience of the colonies under the British rule, the degree of liberty and independence secured to them, partly by their charters and partly by their distance from the governing power, gradually prepared them for the part they were to act, when, by the laws of nature quite as much as by the misgovernment of the mother-country, they were summoned to assert their independence, maintain it through an arduous struggle, and lay the foundations of a government which should give expression to the advanced ideas of a new age.

Just at the time, in a later period, when our government was well consolidated, the ground-work of our national character substantially laid, and our political experience properly

matured, the great natural barriers to intercourse which had hitherto kept distant nations asunder, and which especially separated us widely from the old world, were removed, and a great and salutary change was made in our position and relations to the rest of the world. This and other radical changes, wrought by the discoveries of science and their applications to art, were just what the world at that time most needed as a means of progress. But no part of the world was more benefited by them than our new and enterprising country, where there were such vast undeveloped resources. The great enterprises which have of late so distinguished the American people, could not have been carried on without these discoveries. Nor could we, without them, have had that intimate connection with the older nations of Europe, now so safe, and at the same time so necessary for the largest and most liberal culture of our population. Under all these favoring circumstances, the productions of our soil, so extensive and so rich; of our mines, so inexhaustible; our manufactures, aided by an abundance of the raw material, and by rare natural facilities for converting them into articles of use; our internal trade, carried on by means of our numerous and great rivers, canals, and railroads; our coast trade and fisheries; our foreign commerce, already rivalling that of the most prosperous commercial nations; the intelligence of our population, educated under our admirable system of public schools, so as to render us the most reading people in the world; the religious culture, growing out of our voluntary system of supporting churches; the love of country, and of the form of government under which we live;— all these means, we say, and evidences of national prosperity, have been so marvellously developed in our country within a single generation, as to make our national career a subject of wonder and of profound interest to thoughtful observers in the old world.

In immediate connection with this, another stupendous change, no less influential upon our destinies, has taken place. By one of those adjustments of Providence which

make wants and supplies correspond to each other, the excessive population of one continent, and the deficiency existing in the other, caused a tide of emigration to rise in the east and set westward, which is a marked feature of the present age. Such is the depression of the industrial classes in several of the European states, — arising in part from the necessity of supporting an overgrown aristocracy, whose chief occupation it is to squander what others earn, and partly from the swarming population, which makes labor unproductive and the means of living both scanty and uncertain, — that the leading publicists and political writers of those countries admit that, in the present organization of society, there is no remedy to be found but in emigration. It is not possible, say they, to make any provision, as things now are, by which all the people shall be able to earn a living that is both comfortable and respectable.

Meanwhile, our country was in want of settlers to cultivate all the unoccupied lands between the Mississippi, in its whole length, and the Pacific. Of foreign immigrants to this country, not less than five millions arrived in the period of ten years, from 1850 to 1860. Though this great accession to our population threatened, for a time, to interfere with the homogeneousness of the people, the effect of residence and education here, even upon the first generation, has been such as to show that when their descendants, born on this soil and educated from infancy among us, come to maturity, they will consider themselves, not as foreigners, but as Americans; and will proudly speak, not of their 'adopted,' but of their native, country, and will bravely contend for the maintenance of its institutions. We are now in the present war going through the process of fusing the nation together, in a manner that must be as gratifying as it is surprising.

Whatever evil tendencies there may be among us, — and they are many and great, — there is evidently an increasing spirit of philanthropy among the people, and a more profoundly ethical view of society and government. A Christian sentiment, more or less genuine, is infused into the public mind; and the ideas of right and wrong are applied

to many questionous which were once discussed on the ground of interest. Man, society, and government are now viewed not only in the light of nature, but of Christianity. The deistical age, which drew its ideas of social rights and duties from what it was pleased to call "a state of nature," has passed away; and its shallow philosophy, learned from Rosseau and Voltaire, has yielded to one drawn from conceptions entertained of Christ and of his religion. While in some things there is a departure from the elevated patriotism of our Revolutionary fathers, there is, on the other hand, a wide-spread tendency to put beneath the fabric which they so wisely and so nobly reared, a more distinctively Christian foundation. As the age of the Revolution is receding from our view, the wisdom of Washington rises, and that of Jefferson sinks, in our estimation. The sceptical philosophy of the latter, drawn from his French teachers, seems doomed to pass away with theirs, while the faith of the Father of his Country reaches down to a permanent foundation on which rests all that is stable in society.

Such, in rude outline, do we conceive the present historical position of the American people to be. Whatever is not included or implied in this, is, as we believe, a negative and not a positive element; something that is incidental and temporary — refuse matter floating upon the surface of the great current which is to carry us forward in the course marked out for us by Providence.

And here other questions arise, of great moment and solemn interest at the present time. How far have we, as a people, a right to what is so clearly pointed out by history as our national inheritance? And how far is it our duty, as citizens, and as Christians, to assert and maintain that right?

In the first place, every nation has a right, given of God to, its nationality; provided it be developed in harmony with the laws of history and of Christianity.

The doctrine of the modern philosophy, now generally received by political writers, is, that every human being is equally a human being, and that all are equally entitled to

what belongs to man as man. The essential principle involved in this statement, is that of personality. Every human being is a *person*, and not a *thing*; and ought, consequently, to be treated as a person — never as a thing. To a given extent, he has within himself an end for which he exists, and ought never to sink to the rank of a mere means to ends to be realized in others. A brute may be (humanely) used exclusively for the benefit of man. A human being cannot properly be so used by his fellow-man.

The right to exist as a person, implies the right to develop, in a legitimate way, one's individuality. A man's own nature, powers, tastes, and facilities are to dictate the kind and manner of his activity. No other being has a right to interfere with his individuality, which, for wise and good purposes, was given him by his Creator, so long as the action growing out of it is conformed to the law both of his individual and social being. It is by means of such individual freedom, properly limited and guarded by society, that men most properly fulfil the end of their being, both with reference to themselves and to others.

The same is true of a nation. There is in their descent, whether they are of one race or mixed blood, in their history, in their immemorial usages, in their political attachments, in their hereditary or acquired ideas, something that gives them peculiar aptitudes and tastes; and so long as the national spirit, growing out of all these circumstances, is exercised in a natural, normal, and moral way, the right to cherish and follow it is one of the most sacred rights of humanity. It signifies nothing to be told that, in some other way prescribed by a superior foreign power, the people shall be made comfortable, that they shall be mildly governed, that they shall enjoy facilities for acquiring wealth, and even honor. They will still claim the right to be themselves, to enjoy their own nationality, to cherish as sacred the recollections of their ancestry and their former history, to have an unbroken continuity of national existence. These are the dearest objects of earthly affection. Attachment to them is as strong as to kindred; and for their preservation

kindred will be given up to hallow their native soil with their blood, if necessary. Whatever doubts and difficulties may exist in extreme cases, surely where a people is large enough to constitute a powerful nation, and occupies a country that has its natural boundaries separating them from other nations, and has, moreover, a history, giving it a legitimate place among the nations of the earth, and in addition to all this is progressive under the influence of great moral ideas tending to the good of all mankind, that people has a right to its continued nationality, as clear as if it were written upon tables of stone by the finger of God.

In the second place, the interests of all are best subserved when the governing power of a nation issues directly from the better elements of the national character and spirit. If different nationalities actually exist, and are as much founded in nature as the individualities of persons, then, unless nature has utterly failed in her intentions, the welfare of society requires their preservation. There is no such thing as man in general, except in thought. There is no one type of humanity which ought to be, or can be, impressed upon all mankind. The natural diversities of man, whether in individuals or in nations, ought to be preserved and cultivated, because they are natural. Forcibly repress these, or attempt to modify them beyond what is required by culture, and you weaken the power of those in whom they reside. No one could make a good Roman of a Greek, or a good Greek of a Roman. Neither would prosper under the rule of the other. The old English kings, who struggled so long and so fruitlessly to extend their dominion over France, could, if they had succeeded, at most, but have destroyed French nationality, and with it the peculiar power which France, under her own independent rule and free development, has exerted, intellectually and socially, upon the other nations of Europe. If Napoleon could have subdued Germany, and united it permanently to France, the effect upon the character of the Germans may be inferred from the decay of the German spirit in the short-lived kingdom of Westphalia, and in old Alsatia, on the Rhine, from the day of its an-

nexation to France. What has Poland been since it has ceased to be Poland? Who can tell how much Italy has suffered from its dismemberment, and the crushing of its nationality for long ages? Suppose France had succeeded in getting possession of the British colonies on this continent; is it probable that the English colonists would have developed themselves as well under a French government as they did under the English? We will say nothing of the expediency of the union of Scotland and Ireland with England. Their individual weakness and their near proximity to each other may have rendered the union necessary for the sake of peace with one another, and the common safety. But how is it with the genuine traits of the old Scottish and Irish character since the loss of its nationality by each? Would not the same amount of labors and expenses for their intellectual and moral improvement, if applied to develop rather than to suppress their nationality, have produced a greater effect? The common progress of the race demands the peculiar contribution which each nation can best make in its own way. Will any one attempt to say that the obliteration of England, France, or Germany, and the absorption of it by either of the others, would have advanced Europe beyond where she now is in power, wealth, science, philosophy, literature, and art?

Ours is a new phase of society, a new variety among existing nationalities. It is less exclusive than any one of those named. English in its basis, it is largely modified by climate and soil, by free institutions, by a mixture of races, and by the more progressive and cosmopolitan tendency of its civilization. We have no hereditary hatred of the French making us abominate whatever they do or think or approve; no aversion to the German mind, nor disposition to disparage its labors in the walks of abstruse science or antiquarian learning, in history, poetry, and art. It is the native tendency of the American mind "to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good," instead of despising all other nations, institutions, persons, and things, and holding fast to our own. It is for the interest of mankind

that this great, natural, and safe experiment upon the structure of society, upon free government, spontaneous development, universal industry, universal intelligence, and universal philanthropy, be fully, fairly, and satisfactorily made, especially as in so doing the American people contribute their full share to the inventions and improvements, to the productions and commerce, of the world. We are not living upon the charities of others, nor do we receive from any nation under heaven more than we give.

And what is there in our national union that should render its perpetuation disadvantageous to the just interests of any of the nations of Europe? We cannot suppose the people of England desire that the nation which, by its example and influence, is doing most to promote the freedom for which they themselves are sighing and struggling, should be enfeebled by dismemberment. Such an event could not fail to retard materially the steps by which they are achieving their own liberty, and even to hazard the permanence of those reforms which have, by great effort, been carried through parliament during the present century. The failure of our government would be held up as a warning against all measures tending to increase the power of the people.

It is not long since a distinguished body of statesmen and scholars entered upon the execution of a great and noble plan for delivering the common people of England from the wretchedness and degradation to which prevailing ignorance had doomed them. It is incredible that these same people, after having tasted the sweets of knowledge, and risen to political importance, should desire a reaction, that would put them back where they were before the existence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Nor can the projectors of that scheme, or others who have warmly espoused the cause of national education, but be grieved at the prospect that their American brethren, who have such great advantages over them in the work of popular education on account of their free institutions, should be discouraged and embarrassed by the overthrow of the

government which afforded such facilities for common-school education.

Can the case be otherwise with the great body of English dissenters? Surely it might be supposed they had suffered enough of humiliation and oppression to wish well to their brethren, who crossed the ocean and dwelt among savages that they might obtain for themselves and for their posterity "freedom to worship God." They cannot be so blind as not to see that the dissolution of the only government in Christendom that grants to its subjects unconditional religious freedom, would tend to put off to a distant day their own deliverance.

The laboring classes, too, who in poverty and rags, give their life-blood to the support of a landed aristocracy and beneficed clergy, can hardly be indifferent to the success of an experiment which shall demonstrate to the world that government can be administered quite as well without an aristocracy as with it; and that the people can be quite as well instructed in religion by pastors chosen and supported by themselves as by those placed over them by an unsympathizing, costly, and lordly establishment. Their hope of disenthralment must, in no small degree, be founded on our success. That their deliverance from spiritual tyranny can come only from an imitation of our example, and would be defeated by any reactionary movement in their country, consequent upon our fall, is so plain as to require no argument.

We say nothing of the historical position of England among the great European powers, as the professed friend of all the oppressed, and the representative of free constitutional governments. If she is true to her past history, and to the boasts of a long line of her great statesmen, she will find a more natural ally in our government than in any other. Either she must drift away in the direction of the Russian, Austrian, and Prussian monarchies, with France sometimes for her, sometimes against her; or she must stand up bravely for the right and for constitutional freedom, relying upon her own power and moral influence, upon the justice of her cause, upon the sympathy of the people of Europe,

and upon the cordial friendship of the whole western continent.

Whatever may be true of the French government, the interests and natural sympathies of the French people are largely with us. The liberty which they so often win and forfeit, and which loses none of its value for being so often snatched from their grasp, must, in the long run, rise or fall with our own. If their oft-repeated experiments fail, and our experiment, thus far the best illustration of a free representative government, also fails, what will there be in history to which they can refer as substantiating their theory of liberty?

That the people of the various German states feel a deep interest in free government, and regard themselves as having a large stake in our continued national existence, is sufficiently proved by the unanimity with which they choose to emigrate to this country rather than to others. No one who has lived in Germany, and been conversant with the people there, can be ignorant of the fact, that political oppression and a longing for liberty have had more to do with their emigration to this country than any other cause.

In all these countries there may be temporary causes of irritation. The disturbed state of our commercial relations may bring temporary distress upon millions; and, under the pressure of their sufferings, they may forget their principles and their true interests. But upon more mature reflection, and with a truer knowledge of the nature of the conflict that has been forced upon us, they will, in the end, come to form a right judgment.

We trust there are not a few high-minded men, men of large knowledge, of philosophic habits, and of philanthropic principles, who, in contemplating this great subject, will look beyond all partial and temporary interests, and consider by what means each successive age can be made better than the preceding in respect to all the interests of humanity. Without any national prejudices, without being enslaved to theories, they will ponder carefully the eternal laws by which all the problems of history are worked out. They will see

an Almighty hand so evidently shaping the order of affairs in America, that they will look with scorn and indignation upon the paltry attempts of party politicians, corrupt capitalists, and paid writers to make the world believe a lie, and to induce men to commit outrages upon justice and humanity, that they themselves may the more effectually compass their selfish ends. Truth is great, and will prevail. Justice is everlasting, and will shine forth all the more gloriously when the tempest of passion shall have subsided. Men of the character here described, have already appeared; and they, and others like them, the teachers of mankind, will, in the end, speak with an authority which will awe kings and cabinets. The man of the closet will hold the field, and the vile partisan will be remembered only to be cursed.

With our brethren of the Southern states, it may be thought that the case is different: that they have rights, duties, and interests which no foreigners can have. What rights, then, let us inquire, have they? They have, or rather had, when they were living in peace with us, subject to the laws of the land, rights in common with us to all that is guaranteed in the Constitution, the only pledge of our national existence, and bond of our national union. Their political rights in respect to slavery were as clearly defined as rights generally are, or as other rights are in that instrument. The decision of the question whether slavery shall exist in the states, is left with themselves. Doubtful and debated points are referred to the supreme court, with whose decisions the South has no cause to be dissatisfied. The extension of slavery beyond the slaveholding states is, and always has been, subject to the action of Congress, as is also the admission of new states. People north and south may or may not be pleased with the doings of Congress. The Constitution promises nothing in this respect, except that, in a constitutional way, the majority of the people, represented in Congress and in the President of their own election, shall rule. When the will of the people, on points referred to them by the Constitution, is fairly expressed, the

popular will, so expressed, is authoritative until it shall be modified by a subsequent exercise of the same power, in the manner provided for by law. If any state legislature, north or south, passes acts inconsistent with what is guaranteed in the Constitution, that is a matter for the general government, in its wisdom and best discretion, to control. Has the government of the United States ever denied these rights, or any one of them, to the seceding states? Has it been partial to the Northern or Western states, in any of these respects? Has the general government ever given just cause for the present revolt and attempt at separation?

It is said that the anti-slavery policy advocated by northern politicians, is the cause of the separation. But this same policy existed when the Constitution was framed, not only at the north, but to a great extent also in the south. The compromise which was mutually entered into then, has been adhered to undeviatingly, ever since by the government; and never have the northern representatives in Congress complained, or desired it should be otherwise. Neither statesmen nor moralists have, as a general thing, ever proposed to violate the Constitution in this respect. And if the whole history of congressional legislation were examined, and the tenor of the debates of northern and southern members compared, it would probably appear that there are quite as many evidences of a design to turn the whole machinery of government into a means of propagating slavery, and giving it a preponderance which it had not originally, as of attempts in a contrary direction.

Did the North ever pledge itself, or could it reasonably and with a good conscience pledge itself, to close the intellect and heart against those ideas and sentiments which come from the intellectual and moral progress of the race? Inheriting a Christian civilization, it could not do otherwise than favor Christian ideas, and join with the rest of the Christian world in attempting to grasp them in their whole scope, and to set them forth in the way of philosophical and moral discussion, before the whole world. While the men of reflection among us have entertained such views of their rights and duties as

individuals and as Christians, which no human government can justly curtail, they have just as scrupulously recognized their civil and political obligations to the people of the states where different views are held and a different practice prevails. The people of the North have generally held, with great tenacity, to the doctrine that they have no right to interfere with the institution of slavery in the slaveholding states, because it is recognized in the Constitution to which they owe allegiance. Indeed, they have kept this distinction so clear in their minds, and carried it so far, that they have thereby incurred the grave censure of the great body of the moral and religious men of England, France, and Germany. The chief accusation brought against the people of the Northern states, by their brethren in the British Islands, on the continent of Europe, and even in remote Asia, is, that they attach so much sacredness to the compromises of the Constitution. One of the most difficult and most important tasks which we have undertaken to perform, is that of justifying ourselves before the tribunal of the public moral sentiment of Europe, in refusing to violate the Constitution at the very moment that we are carrying on a war of unparalleled magnitude to maintain it in its integrity. They are not satisfied that our government should strike at slavery among the rebels merely as a war-measure, on account of its being used as a means of overthrowing the government. They call upon us, or rather upon the President of these United States, as our civil and military chief, to assail the Constitution, the very instrument from which he derives all his authority, and which he has solemnly sworn to observe and maintain, and to revolutionize the government on the subject of slavery by a *coup d'état*.

Will our Southern brethren pause to notice this; and then consider a little more carefully whether we have, by violating the spirit of the Constitution in respect to slavery, given them cause to make war upon us?

Another view often presented is, that the people of the Southern states, though they cannot allege that any political compact has been violated, are, nevertheless so annoyed by

the social influence of the North, that they have at length become weary of their political connection with us, and are therefore resuming their original sovereignty. We need not repeat what has so often been said of the tendency of this doctrine to dissolve all existing governments. If the principle be a sound one, then any state, however large, or however small, may be dismembered by any part of the same. This is about as good reasoning as it would be to say that either of two parties, having entered into the marriage contract, may, if he becomes weary of it, annul it and return to his original state. The family can be divided, and the estate distributed accordingly. But can the mother's affections be made a subject of barter? Can a husband and father undo the dependences he has created? Have children no rights growing out of their parentage? The obligations of a people to their legitimate government are as sacred as those springing from domestic ties. We are entitled, by solemn compact and by inheritance, to a country—to our own country, to our native land, its hills and valleys and streams. We cannot part with them. There is a common glory, won by the joint labors and sufferings of our ancestors, dearer to us than life. The fame of our Washington cannot be divided. Bunker Hill and Mount Vernon are parts of one and the same rare old picture, which cannot be cut into parts and disposed of separately. Our history, our hitherto successful national experiment, our traditions, our thrilling memories of the past, that undefinable, indescribable *tout ensemble* of things which fills the imagination, warms the heart, and stirs the lowest depths of the soul of the traveller abroad when he thinks of his native land, the home of his affections, and the object of his most ardent love, is too holy a thing to be rudely torn in pieces and destroyed because some of the children of the family have become angry with the mother that bore them. We have a well-established right to our whole inheritance. The whole country belongs to the whole American people. It is an undivided and indivisible patrimony. It is an organism; its parts must go together. It is a body with bones, and muscles, and veins, and arteries,

that can act only in concert. Only one soul can dwell in it and direct its movements. The coasts, the slopes, the rivers and valleys threading the length of the continent, cannot be artificially dissected, and yet perform their organic functions.

Another apologetic view put forth in behalf of our Southern brethren, is, that the two civilizations, Northern and Southern, are so radically different that there can be none but an unnatural and forced union between them, and that this circumstance itself justifies separation. The argument is not without plausibility. It may be said that Holland and Belgium, once united, was, within our recollection, divided on account of difference of religion, language, and popular feeling. The Belgian, with his Catholic sympathies and French tastes and language, could not live happily with his Protestant Dutch neighbor.

But the people of these United States have a common origin, a common language, and a common religion. Even politically, our good friends, now somewhat out of humor with us, would soon quarrel with England or France, and fall back with pride upon our American institutions and national power, and, like a lover after a quarrel, desire "to make up" with us.

Besides, if this principle is to be adopted without qualification, then Scotland and Ireland ought to be separated from England, Lower Canada from Upper Canada, the Rhenish provinces from the Kingdom of Prussia, and Holstein from Denmark. Here a balance is to be struck between two conflicting principles: the one, the homogeneousness and natural unity of the people; the other, the proper magnitude of a state, as compared with its geographical situation, and its relation to other powers. It is for the interest of no nation to be weak, or to attempt a division of territory which the laws of nature do not admit. Early experiments show that several small states could not exist side by side with each other, either safely or prosperously, in such a country as France or Spain. It is the present curse of Germany to be divided into many petty states without a national unity. While they may be individually saved from

foreign invasion so long as the two great powers, Austria and Prussia are agreed, — though the former are always at the mercy of the latter, — let those two states be divided, for whatever cause, and all these smaller ones become a prey to their more powerful neighbors. It would be no better with several independent governments, if they existed in our country. The Northern and Southern states belong to each other territorially, as much as the right and left hands belong to each other. Nature has marked out our country as the theatre of one great empire. Adhering to her plans and to our traditions and history, we shall be perfectly safe against the machinations or the assaults of the unscrupulous governments of England and France, which, like Herod and Pilate, would become friends for the sake of putting us in a vice between Canada and Mexico, and crushing us.

Now suppose the interests of slavery are of such a nature as to be incompatible with our national unity. Then the question arises: Which of the two conflicting things ought to yield to the other? Has the slaveholder a better title to slavery than the American people have to their own government and national existence? If we were to be put back, to-day, where we were before the war broke out, and it were evident to all that either the government were to be subverted, or slavery destroyed, would not the nation have just as good a right to abolish slavery as the slaveholder would to overthrow the government? If violence were to be done to the letter of the Constitution, would not the necessity of saving the state be greater than that of saving the institution of slavery? But the actual state of the case is very different from this. We are now practically dealing with a party who have renounced the Constitution and trampled on it, while we, on our part, have sacredly kept all our obligations, both to the Constitution and to them. While we remain where we were, they are no longer within the pale of the Constitution. They have chosen to be belligerents, revolutionists, rebels. What, now, are our obligations to them in respect to their slaves? Having given up their constitutional rights, and planted themselves upon belligerent rights, what do they expect of us?

Will they have the coolness to claim both classes of rights? There can be no doubt that we, as belligerents, have a right to weaken the power of the enemy in any manner consistent with civilized warfare. We have a right not only to capture cattle and men, but to draw to our use any *tertium quid* that may be found along the line between man and beast. The enemy's slaves are ours if we can get possession of them, whether they are taken by the sword, or drawn to us by a proclamation. There is nothing to be said about the constitutionality of the measure. The party most concerned has renounced the Constitution and torn it in pieces. There is, here, only one important question, and that is: Does the measure prove effective? It may be piously objected that, in this way, the children of the rebel slaveholders may be wronged, and deprived of their patrimony; that before they come to maturity, or signify their will to our government, the slaves may be beyond their reach. We are sorry for them, but do not see how we can help them. We have, in a manner that may, perhaps, seem to them unkind, ceased to take care of that species of property for them. Since they have appealed to the sword, they must take all the risks of property involved in their own measure. If slavery is weakened, or even destroyed by the legitimate and necessary results of this war, which they were so eager to initiate, they must hold, not us, but the authors of the war, responsible for those results. Whenever a father, by his improvidence or folly, becomes bankrupt, we suppose the children lose by the transaction. They can inherit only so much as he saves. What, then, is to be the future status of slavery? That is not our concern. If it destroys itself, we cannot help it. The Constitution provides no remedy for such a case. It has a great legitimate power; but it has no magical power.

If the cause of slavery has no political advantage over the government in the struggle for life or death on the ground of stipulated obligations, the question must be settled on grounds of moral necessity, backed up by force. The government has no option. It assumes that it has a right to exist, and that on the ground of its having long had an

existence which is unquestionably legitimate. The state is bound to maintain its own existence, to the last, against both rebellion and foreign invasion ; and what it must do, it will do.

Now, before the tribunal of the world, we maintain that we are called on by Providence to preserve and defend the moral order of society by supporting a legitimate, prosperous, enlightened, beneficent government, — a government not only lawful and just, like so many others, but, as we have seen, one which, in several important respects, has advantages over every other government. It would not be morally right to suffer such a mighty instrument, prepared, not by human ingenuity, but by Divine Providence, for promoting the general good, to be destroyed unlawfully by those whom we have the power to restrain. The ruler of such a nation is a minister of God for the punishment of evil doers; and he bears not the sword in vain. The keeping of this gift of God, the government to which we all—rebels no less than others—owe allegiance, — this precious legacy, received from the wisest and best of men, our venerated ancestors, to be held and used by us and our children forever, for our good and for the good of mankind, is committed to us, the rulers and people of the land ; and the most enlightened men of the age, and with them the millions abroad who are sighing and praying for liberty, will hold us responsible for the manner in which we execute that trust. We know with what solemnity our action is invested ; how many eyes are turned upon us to see in what way we dispose of the cause of universal freedom, now upon trial in our hands ; and we shall act according to our convictions of duty and our sense of responsibility in the matter, and commit the issue to God.

And now we turn to the other side of the picture, and inquire into the nature and value of the deposit committed to the safe keeping of those who are arrayed against us. How much would their own posterity lose, if slavery should not be handed down to them unimpaired ? How much less, fifty years hence, would there be of profitable industry, of

well-directed enterprise, of economy in preserving the soil from exhaustion, of true manhood, of that knowledge which is power, and of those social and moral qualities which exalt a people and give them an honored and untarnished name in history? How much would the nation at large lose, if, in the general preservation of our government, that feature of it should fade out and disappear? How much would the interests of humanity, the social and moral progress of the world suffer, if all the men on this continent should, by some uncontrollable necessity, become freemen? Would the evil be greater than that which would result from breaking this great nation into fragments, and exposing us all to incessant border warfare, to inroads from any powerful nation, and giving up all our southern waters to the piratical expeditions of slave-ships? We have weighed the relative value of the two interests, and have, as a people, come solemnly and deliberately to the conclusion that, if the one or the other must be given up, the surrender shall not, with our consent, be that of our national government, nor of its flag, — at least not till all our power of resistance is exhausted. Then we shall be able to say, with a good conscience and with clean hands, we have done what we could; and God will care for the rest.

One more inquiry remains to be made: How far is the Christian church concerned in this matter? and what are its duties in the present crisis?

We have already alluded to the religious origin of the New England colonies, and to its influence upon their political destinies. We are now to consider more particularly what the American church, both in its ministry and in its members, has, in later periods, accomplished for our country and for Christianity. Our object does not require us to speak of the different Christian denominations separately. Prominent among the causes of the power of the church in this country, is the character of its clergy. The people, more particularly in the New England states, have from the beginning manifested those traits of character which would be expected of persons who had been instructed by an intel-

ligent and pious ministry. Some denominations at the outset, and all in the end, have, by theological schools or otherwise, provided for the special education of their religious teachers. Nowhere, except at Wittenberg and Geneva, and in the schools formed from them on the continent of Europe, have theological studies flourished more than in America. The name of Franklin is not more eminent in experimental philosophy, than that of Edwards in theology. Men like Andrew Fuller and Robert Hall, themselves no mean judges in such matters, did not hesitate to place him at the head of theological writers in the English language. His influence upon the American clergy has been greater than that of any other theologian; and among the English Dissenters it has been scarcely less. Next to him, in celebrity and influence, must be named President Dwight, whose "Theology" was, until quite recently, on both sides of the Atlantic, the standard work on the subject. Modern biblical criticism and philology have indeed introduced important changes, and necessarily created a demand for a corresponding change in the form of theology. We need but allude to the names of Bellamy, of Emmons, of Mason, of former times, and of the theological seminaries of Andover and Princeton, and the many others modelled after them in later times, to explain the remarkable fact, that we have a larger body of men in the ministry who have received a thorough theological training, than can be found in England, Scotland, or France. Our theological literature has for many years past been far in advance of theirs. We say this in no boastful spirit. On the contrary, we observe with gratitude and pleasure the great progress which England is now making in biblical learning. We refer to it merely to explain the deep-toned religious sentiment of the numerous congregations in our country, which have been instructed by a ministry so formed and educated. We have the concurrent testimony of men in high official stations abroad, that wherever American clergymen or missionaries have been called to labor side by side with those of other countries, they have not, in respect to intelligence or energy, suffered in the comparison.

With all the deficiencies which exist in our churches and religious congregations, and which we do not wish to overlook or disguise, truth requires us to say, that there are few countries where the clergy exert a more wide-spread, legitimate, and salutary influence than in those parts of our country which are supplied with the class of pastors and teachers above described. Under the guidance of such men, has sprung up an active laity, whose labors and charities are widely known and felt. In relieving the destitute and instructing the ignorant in their own neighborhoods; in contributing to the establishment and maintenance of Sunday schools in all the land, to funds for the publication and distribution of religious tracts; in supporting home missions in the new settlements along all our western borders; in aiding young men preparing for the Christian ministry; in sustaining colleges and theological schools; in replenishing the treasuries of foreign missionary and Bible societies, they systematically perform an amount of service for Christ and his church which distinguishes them among their brethren of different Christian lands.

Nearly all our schools, from the lowest to the highest, are indebted to Christian influence for their existence and support. The academies and colleges are mostly creatures of the church. The public schools, in which five millions of persons, or one fifth of our free population, is taught, are to a great extent instructed and superintended by persons of Christian character.

The number of persons educated in our one hundred and twenty colleges is a little more than thirteen thousand, of whom more than three thousand go forth annually from these Christian seats of learning, to engage in professional studies or in the duties of active life.

A similar statement might be made of the great number of highly educated females in our country. In no country of Europe does so large a proportion of females receive an equal amount of thorough and solid education. Indeed, higher as well as lower education with us is democratic and eminently Christian.

The view which we have given of religion and education is by no means limited to the older states. One of the most remarkable features of our national growth and Christian civilization, is the extent to which religion and education have gone westward with the tide of emigration. Wherever the traveller directs his steps in the new settlements from the East, he finds the school, the church, Christian congregations, and Christian laborers, almost as in the older states. This is a marked feature in New England civilization. Certainly the cases are not numerous in which a new country is so rapidly settled, and at the same time, is so successful in resisting the tendency to degeneracy and barbarism. Taken all in all, our country must be admitted to present such a spectacle of moral enterprise to other nations, that the latter cannot, unless they are under wrong biases, be indifferent to our future prosperity.

Let us now look at the influence of our country upon the extension of Christianity and Christian civilization abroad. We invite the attention of the reader to what America has done for Christian missions; to the great number and high character of our missionaries; to the amount of literary labor they have performed; to the number of languages they have reduced to a written form, supplying them with dictionaries, grammars, and other books; to the contribution they have made to our present knowledge of countries, nations, and tribes but little known before; to the numerous instances in which they have opened the way to commercial and diplomatic relations with our country; to the cruel superstitions which, in many countries, they have been the means of abolishing or mitigating; and to the seeds of civilization which they have caused to take root in many countries, not to mention their more directly spiritual work. In view of such facts, known and acknowledged in all the world, we see not how it can be denied that America has been of some use to mankind; and that any great calamity that should befall her would be a calamity to all, both to the weaker and to the stronger races of men.

When we consider the natural vigor of the Anglo-Saxon people, and the comparative purity of the Protestant faith cherished among them, and connect with this the present attitude of the two powerful nations which represent them, we can hardly suppress the conviction that it is reserved for British and American Christians to take a leading part in the philanthropic work of raising the nations of Asia and Africa and the inhabitants of the Pacific islands from the degradation and barbarism long endured by them, and to give to their vast population the blessings of civilization and Christianity. Nor do we see any reason why America should not emulate England in this work. We certainly are not behind our English brethren in the scale of our missionary operations. There is no reason why our commerce should not always equal hers. We have some peculiar advantages, arising from the easy access to all the East from our Pacific coast; and perhaps from the circumstance that we have no military rule over any eastern people, and no design to conquer them, we may be none the less cordially received as teachers and benefactors, or less favored as a commercial people, seeking none but amicable relations with them.

If the foregoing view of the religious character of our country be correct, the Christian people of the country have an interest in the maintenance of our nationality to be measured only by their power and facilities for doing good. They cannot willingly see these diminished. They need just such a theatre of action as that which they now have. A narrower scope for their influence and activity would not be suited to their character and circumstances. The tide of Christian intelligence and benevolence rising in the Eastern states and setting westward, ought to meet no barriers this side of the Mexican line and the Pacific coast. The greatness of New England is not in her territory, nor in her political power. In these respects, she bows to the will of Providence, and rejoices in the growth of her larger and more powerful neighbors, belonging, as they do, to the same political family with herself. But she has a legitimate

moral power in her men, her institutions, and her means of education. The industry, economy, and energy of her sons fit them for some peculiar kinds of service which others cannot render so well. She asks for the honor of serving God by serving the people of the whole country. We wish to educate sons and daughters to go to the newer states, and to carry with them all that is good in our training, habits, and principles. But if the country should lose its unity, all such reciprocity between the different parts of it will be lost. We can neither receive, freely, as we now do, whatever is produced by any part of this vast continent, nor can we send out educated men to be pioneers in great enterprises, religious or secular, if at different points we must cross national boundaries. The Yankee schoolmaster, professor, preacher, lawyer, editor, agent, statesman, author, would be sent back to his own country. Each government would have a pride in employing only its own citizens. Public utility would be sacrificed to petty national jealousies. Now, wherever we go over the wide continent (bating the rebel states), we go as American citizens, and are received in that character. We are at home so long as we stand upon the soil of our native land. Is it well, either for ourselves or for mankind, that these social relations shall be severed, never again to be united ?

When we go abroad, we need the respect and the protection which the American flag never fails to give to a worthy citizen. We are a powerful nation, and are respected because we are such. We are a great commercial nation, and our vessels are welcomed to every shore. We are an enterprising people, carrying our active, inventive, progressive spirit wherever we go ; and kings and chiefs of the remotest tribes of men are eager to cultivate intercourse with us as a nation. All this will be changed so soon as we cease to be a united people. Some, of whom we had a right to expect better things, begin to despise us in advance. They seem anxious to lay hands upon us before the time. Even towards the seceding states they have thrown off the mask, and speak already as the strong are accustomed to

speak to the weak and dependent. May Heaven deliver us, North and South, from becoming like the petty Italian states, with Austria pushing them with the bayonet on the one side, and France on the other. We should be bartered and sold like Poland and Greece, or dragooned into obedience like Hungary and Venetia.

We do not forget the clerical character of the majority of our readers. The service now required in the field and on the arena of political discussion must, indeed, be performed chiefly by laymen. But there is something behind armies and political action, which is the necessary support of both. Our success in the present struggle for national existence will depend quite as much upon the conscience of the nation as upon its apparent interests or upon its policy. Present mercantile interests are in danger of outweighing the higher and permanent interests of posterity. Selfishness may overrule patriotism. Policy in the cabinet or in the field may fluctuate. It is the moral sense of the people and the unflinching determination growing out of it, that must keep treason in its hiding-places, and hold the men standing at the helm of government firm in their position. While the lovers of gain rather than of their country, and party politicians, are endeavoring to subject everything to their selfish and ambitious designs, and while others, desiring a better state of things, are discouraged by the obstacles thrown in their way, it becomes the enlightened moral teachers of the land to direct the attention of the people beyond what is temporary, beyond the present, to the distant and future; and thereby make them strong in heart for enduring the sufferings, bearing the burdens, and performing the work devolved upon them by an Invisible Hand. We need the spirit which animated the first settlers of the New England colonies and our revolutionary fathers, who endured all things for the sake of freedom, and for the benefit of coming generations. To create and sustain this spirit is, under God, the appropriate office of the Christian minister. It is his duty to ground the people in right principles, to inspire them with lofty ideas, and to attach them

by the strongest bonds to truths that are everlasting, to rights that are inviolable, to interests that are spiritual and imperishable. It is these that give to society its importance, and to history its dignity. Let the clergy of our country understand their true position and their legitimate influence and power on all great moral questions; and then let them be found at their posts, contending for the truth and standing up for the right with unfaltering fidelity and constancy.

ARTICLE IV.

ATHENS, OR AESTHETIC CULTURE AND THE ART OF EXPRESSION.¹

BY REV. W. S. TYLER, D.D., PROFESSOR, ETC., AMHERST COLLEGE.

AMONG the distinguishing characteristics of Athens, as they are sketched by a master-hand in the funeral oration of Pericles,² especial prominence is given to freedom of individual culture, together with the versatility of character and the variety of pursuits and attainments which are the natural result of spontaneous development. These, in the estimation of that consummate orator, statesman, and ruler, who has given his name to the golden age of Athenian glory, made Athens *worthy* of the heroes who fell on the field of battle, and upon whose patriotic and heroic virtues he was chosen to pronounce a eulogy. Unlike the Spartans, and most of the other nations of antiquity, the Athenians excelled alike in the arts of war and the arts of peace. The land and the sea were equally subject to their dominion.

¹ This Article was delivered as an oration before the Porter Rhetorical Society, in the Theological Seminary at Andover, at its anniversary in August, 1862. The introduction and the conclusion have been omitted. In other respects it is now printed in the form in which it was then delivered.

² Thucyd. II. 35-46.