

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—NO. 1.

APRIL, MDCCLXI.

ARTICLE I.

THE PRINCETON REVIEW ON THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY.*

The appearance of the above named article in the Princeton Review, for January, 1861, has excited the profoundest emotions of astonishment and grief in the minds of all in the South, and many at the North, who care for the interests of our beloved Church. The standing and influence of the Biblical Repertory, as well as the character of the article itself, require us to give it our special attention. The chief end that we propose is the vindication of Southern Christians from the, no doubt honestly mistaken, yet most amazing misrepresentations of the writer. Many God-fearing men have gone heart and hand with the political movements of the Southern States, and we desire to show that in so doing they have not proved themselves to be either mad men or dishonest demagogues.

* This article comes to us from a much respected correspondent in one of the border Southern States, and we very willingly admit it to our pages, although, of course, it does not look at the subject from exactly the same point of view occupied by ourselves in these Confederate States.—Eds. So. PRES. REV.

Great and radical changes in the social or political institutions of a people are always the result of corresponding changes in public opinion; "and no revolution in public opinion is the work of an individual, of a single cause, or of a day. When the crisis has arrived, the catastrophe must ensue; but the agents through whom it is apparently accomplished, though they may accelerate, can not originate its occurrence."* There are points in the downward progress of men and nations from which they may retrace their steps. There are also points from which there is no return. There is an unseen line crossing every path, whether of individuals or communities, beyond which, if they go, they are lost. It is, however, contrary to all the facts of history, as well as subversive of the whole science of human life and conduct, to attribute the whole power decisive of the destinies of nations to the happenings of one brief hour. To the recluse, unobservant of the mighty sweep of events through years and centuries, or unaware of their true significance, it may seem very natural to refer the final catastrophe to its immediate antecedents of a few days, or even of an hour; but he who would truly estimate the forces which overthrow the loftiest structures ever reared by human genius and human might, must trace the streams back to their fountains, in distant years, and perhaps in the far past ages. This would be a trivial error, were it not for its influence upon all the efforts made to avert disaster, and upon the judgments of men as to the parties who must bear the responsibility of its occurrence. The article under review affords a very striking instance of the evil influence of this error in both particulars.

Another error, at the very outset, has led the writer into still greater mistakes. He says: "There are occasions when political questions rise into the sphere of morals and religion; when the rule for political action is to be sought,

* Sir W. Hamilton.

not in considerations of State policy, but in the law of God. On such occasions, the distinction between secular and religious journals is obliterated." But the distinction between things religious and things secular exists in the very nature of each, and can, therefore, never be obliterated, nor even forgotten, without injury. The rule of political action is always to be sought in the will of God, and sound reasons of State policy must uniformly be coincident with that will. There is an Atheistic politics. There is, also, a Deistic, as well as a Theistic, politics. The Theistic is the only true political science, because it alone corresponds with existing realities. It does not admit of the total forgetfulness of God at all ordinary times; but, on great occasions, the removal of political questions from their own proper domain to the more elevated sphere of religion. Occasions never do, and never can occur, where political questions rise into the sphere of religion. They always belong to the sphere of ethics.

This very confounding of religion with politics has been the most fruitful source of the evils which have overtaken the nation. It has not been, however, the elevation of politics, but the degradation of religion; and this has uniformly been the result of every attempt to combine the two into one system. Politics and religion move in different orbits. Each has its own definite relation to a common centre. They deal with the same men, and often with the same subject matter, but upon principles and for ends wholly diverse. They can never come into collision without mutual injury. Like two planets, they exert upon each other a beneficial influence, while each fills its own peculiar sphere; and this is not an occasional, but a constant power. It might just as well be said that there are occasions where the harmony and well being of the physical universe require that the Earth should rise to the orbit of Jupiter or Saturn. Nothing but the crush of worlds and dire confusion could result from such a disturbance of the order of

nature. And a like catastrophe has always followed a similar derangement of the relations between politics and religion. Would that the Princeton Review had treated the state of the country from a religious stand-point. There the well known piety of the Editor, and his acknowledged ability as a theologian, might have done most efficient service in calming the minds of the people wherever his wide spread influence extends. He might have done much to restore harmony to our greatly distracted country, or, at least, to avert the civil war which he deprecates as earnestly as we do. At the very worst, he might have done much to preserve the unity and harmony of our beloved Church. This part was not chosen, and the political article now under consideration could hardly fail, as the event has proved, to stimulate passions already too much excited, and to exasperate still more the animosity which has long been growing between two sections of the country.

We are, therefore, constrained to treat this article, in accordance with its real nature, as a discussion of the political questions which now so deeply agitate all parts of this great continent. We repeat, that our main design is to prove that Christian men at the South have not been given up to delusion, nor are they destitute of virtue.

When we think of the Union of the States of North America as it was constituted by our fathers, we can go as far as the farthest in extolling the grand conception. Many stirring and many gentle thoughts cluster around our memories of the olden time, when, shoulder to shoulder, the men of the Northern and Southern colonies fought to achieve their independence as sovereign States. Imperfect as the Union has always been, under it our people have accomplished great and glorious things; and but for the black spirit of discord, which some thirty years ago began its destructive work, it might have realized the wildest dreams of the fathers, or the brightest hopes of the men of later generations. We feel the full force of all the tender

associations connected with our common kindred and common Christianity; and for these, and many other reasons, we do not undertake to estimate the value of the Union in dollars and cents, any more than we would to estimate "the value of a father's blessing or a mother's love." It must be remembered, however, that great questions of political freedom are sometimes necessarily brought to a pecuniary test, as was certainly the case in our contest with the mother country, which resulted in the independence of these States. There is, moreover, a still higher example. Our Lord Himself refers the paramount concerns of religion and the life eternal to the same standard: "One thing thou lackest," etc.—(Mark 10 : 21.) It would not be difficult, therefore, to answer the reproach, even though considerations of dollars and cents were as prominent as they are in fact insignificant, amid the causes which have dismembered this nation. We understand fully the reasons for Union, arising out of the geographical relations of the various sections of this vast country. The courses of its rivers, the direction of the mountain ranges and valleys, as well as the artificial means of intercommunication, all indicate that the States of North America should live together in harmony and the interchange of mutual benefits, if not absolutely under the same political Constitution. But human interests and human passions are greater powers than geographical boundaries. Persistent fanatical hate can raise higher barriers between two peoples, than the Andes on the summits of the Himalayas.

We do not intend to follow the reviewer through his exhibition, in contrast of the reasons which, he says, the politicians have assigned as producing the present state of things. It is not difficult to see which set of opinions meets with the hearty concurrence of the writer. We shall simply content ourselves with saying that we have not so read the history of the country, and especially of the Territory of Kansas. We do not believe that the Republican

party had its origin in the outrages perpetrated in the settlement of that Territory, as he says, by the South, and as we say, by the North. That party which has destroyed our Union has an older date, and a more enduring foundation, than the transient disturbances in Kansas.

We come now to the questions which he rightly regards as of paramount importance.

“What are the grounds on which the cotton-growing States advocate the dissolution of the Union? or what are the reasons why they desire to secede?”

These questions are propounded as though they were identical. They are, however, very different, and we shall, therefore, give them separate answers. To the first, we say, that neither the cotton-growing States, nor any others of the slaveholding States, nor any considerable number of the prominent citizens of either of them, have ever advocated the dissolution of the Union in any such sense as that contemplated by this question. The secession of the Southern States is not the expression of a wish. It is simply the declaration of a fact. It does not mean that they desired the dissolution of the Union. It only shows that, in their deliberate judgment, the Union has been dissolved, not by them, but by the so-called Republican party of the North. Many of the leaders of the secession movement have loved the Union as their own lives. Truer patriots never governed the counsels of any people. If the sacrifice could avail any thing, they would gladly have emulated the conduct of the noble Roman youth, who, clothed in his richest armor, and decked with his most precious jewels, leaped into the yawning gulf of the Forum. Some of these long ago abandoned the hope of preserving the Union against the growing power by which it has at last been destroyed. But a vast multitude of them continued to hope against hope, until the fatal blow was struck. It is well that the Princeton writer did not strike out the comparison between the disunionist and Benedict Arnold, as certain pencil marks

in the pamphlet edition indicated his intention of doing. No Southern man need be offended. Let the guilt of the disunionist be what it may, the South disclaims the responsibility. It is true that some of the political economists of the South have thought, for a long time, that the material interests of their section would be greatly enhanced by separating from the North and forming a Southern Confederacy. They have believed, very sincerely, that they were impoverished by their connection with the Northern States; but these have never been the opinions of a great majority, and they have had but little to do with the secession of the Southern States. The South has always resisted partial sectional legislation, designed to make her tributary to the North, as South Carolina did in 1832, when she constrained, not from the fears, but from the justice of the whole nation, a compromise of the tariff question. But if the whole South had been, as one man, fully persuaded that their continuance in the Federal Union would deprive her of uncounted thousands of dollars, they would never have dissolved the Union so long as the injury was wrought under the operation of the great laws of political economy, without the unwarrantable interference of partial legislation. They are a people who "swear to their own hurt, and change not." They would, therefore, have continued to bear the burden which was laid upon their shoulders, not by the tyranny of men, but by the stable laws of a great natural economy. The insinuation, or rather the bold assertion, therefore, of the Princeton Review, that the leaders of the Southern movement are actuated only by the sordid love of gain, and that they have taken advantage of the excitement of the people on another and very different subject, to precipitate them into unjustifiable revolution for their supposed advantage, can only be excused on the ground of profound ignorance of the whole subject of Southern principles, Southern interests, and Southern men. The arguments of Southern states-

men, to which he refers, have never been intended to stimulate the people, and to furnish the motive, to secession. They were designed to encourage the timid to stand for their rights, by assuring them that they would not be utterly ruined, but might even enjoy greater prosperity out of the Union than they ever had while in it. They were given in answer to such fearful predictions as those of the *Princeton Review*, and to the taunts of the North, when they say, "You had better submit to our rule. We do not intend to make it very oppressive. We will impose the yoke upon you very gradually, and it shall not gall very severely; but if you resist us, and prove stubborn and rebellious, it shall go hard with you. We will whip you back to the yoke. We will subdue you by force, as we do our unruly cattle; but even though you should succeed in breaking away from us, and we should leave you to roam wildly in untamed freedom, you will find no fat pastures—you will surely starve to death." In reply to all such predictions, or threats of evil, the Southern statesman demonstrates that the threat to employ force is nugatory. The South can not be subdued by arms, and her material wealth may even be greater than ever it was before. The South does not look upon disunion as the precursor of inevitable and total ruin; but, even though all the prophecies and threats of ruin should be fulfilled to the very letter, she says, "Let come what God may send of evil." She will never submit to the rule of a dominant section of the country, North, East or West, no matter how mildly they may promise to exercise their despotism.

Whatever benefits are to follow disunion, it is said, are to accrue only to the slaveholders—a small minority of the Southern people, not more than three or four hundred thousand of the whole population. The secession movement is, therefore, characterized as invidious, class legislation. All this sounds as if the writer in the *Princeton Review* had read the celebrated "Helper's Impending Crisis."

We can only say that, if any man who reads that book gives it one particle of his faith—if he does not reject it at once, as false in its statements, false in its arguments and inferences, fiendish in its spirit and in its design—he is himself beyond the reach of argument, and impervious to the force of truth and evidence on the whole subject of which it treats. There is no greater folly than this talk of class legislation for the small minority of slaveholders. The institution of slavery is so interwoven, yea, entwined, with the very texture of the social, political and religious life of the Southern people, that there is no diversity of interest among them. Whether they be rich or poor, white or black, bond or free, their interests are one. The non-slaveholders of the South, agriculturists, mechanics, merchants or professional men, would be the first ruined, and the most completely, by the abolition of slavery; and, for the most part, they have the sense to know it, and to show that they know it by their acts.

Let us proceed to the second question: Why do the cotton-growing States desire to secede? What reasons have induced them to brave all the real difficulties, and all the possible dangers, of secession? Among the reasons assigned by the Princeton writer, only one is true, and that one is stated as it never entered the mind of any Southern man, living or dead, and could not, therefore, be subjectively a motive for their conduct.

The fierce ravings of the Abolitionists have not caused the secession of the Southern States. This has, for many years, been a great annoyance; but it could hardly be called a grievance. The wild outcries of the Abolitionists have excited very various emotions in the breasts of different Southern men. Some have been aroused to anger and scorn; others have been amused; while those who agree, with the Princeton Review, that their language and spirit is execrably wicked, have heard them more in sorrow than in anger. They have felt that the danger to be feared was

for those in whose hearts these fierce fires were burning, and by whose lips such words of blasphemy were uttered. The high-spirited and fiery Southerners, as they are called, have borne for thirty years all that the fanatics could say, and they might very well have endured it a little longer.

The proceedings of the incendiaries sent to the South to entice the slaves to abscond, or to stir them up to revolt and massacre, have not caused the secession of the Southern States. This is undoubtedly a very great grievance, but by no means so formidable as the people of the North generally suppose. It is a great mistake to think that the Southern people feel like "persons who live in a powder magazine, into which others insist upon throwing fire-brands." Their great fault is, that they feel entirely too secure. They know that the blacks are a loyal race, and that they are bound to them by ties of interest and affection. In the African, the affections predominate over the intellect more than in any other great division of the human family; yet many of them have intelligence enough to see that the problem of their condition as slaves in this land, so far removed from the native home of their fathers, can not be solved by any scheme of abolition or emancipation, and that it would be very fearfully complicated by discontent or any violent outbreak on their part. Yet even this gentle, loyal people may be made the dupes of crafty villains. Reckless efforts, long continued, may seduce even them from their allegiance to their truest friends. Therefore, this sending of cruel and fiendish emissaries is a grievous wrong; but this, too, has been suffered for years, and the patience of the South might have held out a little longer.

Here let us pause a moment, to ask the solemn question: If the same assaults had been made upon the social system of the North by the pulpit and the press of the South; and if the same efforts had been made, for a period of thirty years, to excite the poor against the rich, to stir up

the laborer against the capitalist, would the labor of the South have proved so utterly fruitless as have been those of the Abolitionists? We think not.

The nullification of the fugitive slave law, and of the constitutional provision upon which it is founded, by the formal legislation of ten States, and the intense anti-slavery sentiment of the whole North, is surely a good ground of complaint, not so much on account of the actual evil which it works, though even in this respect the South are heavy losers, but because of its significance, as showing how majorities can, by law and against law, subvert the Constitution, which is the only defence of minorities against the worst despotism to which man can subject his fellow man. It is only in this aspect of the case that Northern nullification has any direct bearing upon the secession of the South.

The last reason assigned by the Princeton Review as influencing the cotton-growing States to desire to secede, is "the complaint that the South has lost its equality in the Union, or that they are denied equal rights." This complaint is then examined and dismissed as wholly groundless. This is the part of the Princeton Review article which has caused us the greatest sorrow. We have read these four pages but once, and we are thankful that the exigencies of our argument do not require us ever to turn to them again. We do not care to characterize these utterances as they deserve. We need only to quote the sentences that linger sadly in our memory :

"In the past history of the country the South has been dominant. Although in a minority as to population, it has shaped the whole policy of the country."

"This state of things is passing away. By the inevitable progress of events, the sceptre is changing hands."

"Southern statesmen have predicted that the time must come when the South could no longer control the policy of the country."

"Not to command, however, is, in their estimation, to submit. Not to be masters, in the logic of the extremists, is to be slaves."

"The thing complained of is not the irresponsible power of a majority."

These have been selected from four pages of similar assertions, filled with intense, exultant, defiant sectionalism. We do not intend to review the whole history of the United States, to prove that all this is utterly without foundation. The writer admits that it can not possibly be true, in acknowledging that the South has always been in a minority. In what possible way could a minority, however compact, dominate over a majority? We do not, however, intend to follow the Princeton writer through his honest, no doubt, yet total perversions of the plainest facts of history. We shall simply answer assertions by counter assertions, and we do it without fear of successful contradiction. The South never has been dominant in the government of the country. The South, though always in the minority, have never been a compact minority. All the Southern States have never been united in either of the great national parties which have alternately governed the country. Alas! they are not even now agreed as to the time and mode of resisting Northern domination, though they are united as one man as to the necessity of resistance. There never has been a sectional party organized at the South. Up to this very hour it has never been done. The Princeton writer does not hesitate to say that the party which nominated and supported Mr. Breckinridge was a Southern sectional party; yet, in another place, he admits that it would be wrong to affirm this of Mr. Breckinridge, or his party. We affirm that nothing can be further from the truth. The simple fact that John C. Breckinridge, a Union man, from the most Union-loving of all the States, was the candidate, is of itself the complete refutation of the charge. He was nominated as a national man, and, so far as the so-called Southern extremists supported him, it was on their part an effort, however hopeless, in good faith, to save the Union under the Constitution. We say, again, that up to this very hour there has never been a sectional party organized, or attempted to be organized, in the Southern States.

Whatever influence Southern statesmen have had in shaping the policy of the country, has always been the legitimate effect of their genius, talents, or political sagacity, and always in connection with one or the other of the great national parties. We can not, however, pursue this subject. Alas! for the day when the Princeton Review is found joining in such party cries as would never have been uttered by the more high-minded and honorable of the political leaders.

We are now ready to answer the question: Why have the Southern States seceded from the American Union? It may, however, be as well to premise that it is a very great mistake to suppose that the Southern people are a fiery, excitable race—a nation of hotspurs. They may, perhaps, be more excitable by nature than their Northern neighbors, though we have never seen the proof of the fact. We do know that they are ordinarily men of earnest thought and deep convictions. The views which they now take of public affairs have not been suddenly conceived, nor are they lightly held. They have been the slow growth of years. Indeed, the portentous shadows of these times loomed upon the vision of the great prophetic minds of the revolutionary era, and had assumed distinct shape before the minds of men contemporary with the adoption of the Federal Constitution. The present attitude of the South has not been assumed in a fit of transient resentment, nor are they acting under the morbid influence of disappointed ambition. Whether they are in error or not, the men of the South are acting under an awful sense of their responsibility to God and man, as well as the profoundest convictions of right and duty that ever sunk down into the depths of any human soul. But are they in error? Is their whole course a tissue of mistakes and blunders? This brings us back to the question: Why have the Southern States seceded from the Union?

It is because they are fully convinced that they have lost not only equality, but liberty, in the Union. The true cause of Southern discontent is the deep and solemn conviction that, in the Union and under the forms of the Constitution, they are a "conquered people." These are the very words of one of their leading men.

The South maintains that the following is a self-evident proposition, which needs only to be stated to command the assent of every man who knows the meaning of the terms: Make any question whatever a permanent political issue between geographical sections of a great republic, and the union between those sections is *ipso facto* dissolved. If one of the sections is numerically weaker than the other, there remains for it nothing but resistance or vassalage. The only possible hope of the restoration of the Union is in the recession of the dominant majority tendering the issue. The Princeton writer seems to be aware of the influence of geographical considerations upon the political and social interests of men. It is passing strange that he did not see the dissolution of the Union in the very formation of the great sectional party which has at length given its death blow. We assert, with perfect confidence, that the judgment of impartial history will confirm our views, that the separation of the American States was begun when the so-called Republican party was organized as a sectional party, and that it was consummated when that party triumphed over the combined Union men of its own section, in the election of Abraham Lincoln to be President of the United States. The Northern Republicans are the real disunionists. The dissolution of the Federal Union was accomplished by them, and by them alone. They have subverted the Constitution in its most essential principles. The South has only declared that they will never submit to the usurpation.

It is thought to be a perfect answer to all this, to say that the Republican party triumphed under the forms of

the Constitution, and that the election of Mr. Lincoln was strictly legal. What do men care for the casket, after it has been rifled of its priceless jewel? The empty coffer of the Constitution, from which liberty and equality have been extracted, can serve only for the coffin of freedom. What does the fond wife care for the form and features of her husband, if the body, once so dear, has become the possession of a demon, which may, at any moment, use her husband's hands and teeth to tear and rend her? She would feel such keen sorrow as men at the South now feel for the ruin of our Government; but she could not lie down in peace and security by the side of the once loved form, now become the abode of a fierce and malignant spirit. Neither can the South hope for safety under the mere forms of a Constitution, however grand and noble, when a great dominant majority have infused into it the fanatical spirit of Abolitionism, or the more comely, but no less cruel, spirit of sectionalism.

We shall inquire, presently, how far the Republican party is to be regarded as an Abolition or anti-slavery party. Whether it be distinctively such or not, we believe that Abolitionism has mounted it, as the old man of the sea upon the shoulders of Sinbad, and it can not be shaken off. Whether the great dominant majority of the North be abolitionized or not, there can be no question that it is a sectional party, claiming to govern, not only the minority of its own section, by laws operating equally upon themselves and the minority, which is essential to the very idea of free government; but also challenging the right to rule over the whole people of another section of the land, by laws affecting the interests of that section alone, and having no sort of bearing upon the law-makers themselves, except to promote their wealth at the expense of the subject States. In this point of view, it makes no kind of difference on what subject the issue is joined, or whether there is any issue made up between them, other than that of power on the one side,

and subjection on the other. It is, therefore, evident from the very nature of the case, that under the permanent domination of a sectional party, the South are a permanently subdued people. This may be made perfectly clear by an illustration, supposing the subjugation of another section of the Republic. Suppose that an effective majority in all the other States should organize themselves into a great political party, inimical to the manufacturing interests of New England. They obtain possession of the Government of the United States, by regular election, under the prescribed constitutional forms. They soon obtain all the offices of Government—legislative, executive and judicial—and proceed to enact laws forbidding New England mechanics to carry their mills and machinery, or their handicraft tools, to any territory of the United States, or any where beyond the limits of the six States. They then employ all the patronage and power of the Government, under the forms of law, to repress and, finally, to extinguish the manufactories in New England. Suppose that the history of the origin and progress of this party was such as to render it certain that its power would be permanent. What, under such circumstances, would New England do? Would she say: Freedom to move—the very life of the Yankee nation—is lost. The sources of our wealth are dried up. Our country is utterly ruined; but it has all been done under the forms of the Constitution, and we must cheerfully submit; we must give up our manufactures, and turn our industry into other channels? Would the sons of the men who threw the tea into Boston harbor reason thus? Would the children of those whose blood flowed at Lexington and Concord submit to such tyranny? No—they would never submit. We do not believe that they would endure half as long as the South has borne inconceivably greater wrongs and perils. The case supposed is evidently exactly parallel with the issue actually made between the great dominant party at the North and all of the slave-

holding States. We have only to substitute slavery for manufactures, and the Southern for the New England States, to show that the correspondence is perfect. If there is any difference, it can only be found in an assumed distinction between slavery and manufactures. We have no space to enter upon the discussion of the many questions here suggested. It is referred to, only because it leads to the inquiry: How far is the great dominant Northern party to be regarded as an Abolition or anti-slavery party? We think that we are as fully competent to answer this question as the Princeton writer, or any other Northern man. We have had much more imperative reasons for studying the history of the origin and progress of abolitionism, and we think that we can state the results of our observation so as to defy contradiction.

There are, first, the Abolitionists proper, relatively not very numerous, but absolutely a very large body of intensely earnest men and women, embracing a considerable variety of opinion, from the extreme views of Garrison and Phillips, down through the Beechers and Albert Barnes, to the mildest form of the doctrine. These are all agreed that slaveholding is a sin of the deepest dye. They all feel bound in conscience to bear testimony against it, and, by some means, to cause it to cease from the earth. Some of them would employ fire and sword, and even the coward murderer's weapon, poison. Others content themselves with railing and fierce denunciation. They all believe that they are under solemn personal obligations to labor for the extinction of slavery from this land, and from the whole earth.

The second class feel what the Princeton reviewer calls "a moral disapprobation of the system of slavery." The formula in which they sum up their views is: "Slavery is a great political, social and moral evil." What they mean by moral evil, as distinguished from sin, we know not. We give them, however, the benefit of the distinction. It

is not a sin, but a moral evil, to be discountenanced, repressed, and gradually, but as quickly as possible, abolished. There are various opinions among this class of persons, as to the nature and extent of the moral evil of slavery. Some of them can hardly be distinguished from the genuine Abolitionists, while others shade off gently into the next class. There is, however, among this great body of Northern men, one broad, well marked distinction, which is very pertinent to our present discussion. There are many whose moral disapprobation, like that of the Quakers in the South, does not demand an expression in outward word or action. Others, and, we think, by far the largest part, think that it is their solemn duty to prevent the extension of the great moral evil, and, by all lawful means, to labor for its extinction. These are the men who have swelled up the fearful majorities of the great sectional party.

There is a third class, who think that slavery is a social and political evil, analagous to despotic government, in the State. They contend, very earnestly, that it is not a sin, and, therefore, no bar to Christian fellowship in the Churches. They regard slaveholders as men who ought to be pitied, rather than condemned—as unfortunate, but not criminal. It ought to be said, here, that some of the “moral disapprobation” men, however, inconsistently take the same view as to Christian fellowship with slaveholders. Multitudes of this third class feel bound, not in conscience, but as wise and prudent men, to prevent the extension of slavery beyond its present limits, for the advantage of the white race.

There is a fourth class at the North, who look at the whole subject of slavery with the eyes of Southern men.

If these statements are even approximately correct, then it appears that the Republican party is composed of all who feel that they have any duty to perform with respect to the repression or extinction of slavery, either on religious,

moral, social, or political grounds. There are, therefore, two spirits, so blended that they can hardly be distinguished even by the analysis of thought, which constitute the life and soul of the great political party which has subverted the Constitution and dissolved the Union of the American States. They are abolitionism and sectionalism. The dominant party is manifestly a sectional party, and slavery is the subject upon which it has joined issue with the South, and upon which it has finally and fatally triumphed.

In political union with such a party, and under its uncontrollable domination, the Southern man feels that he is subjugated. He is the citizen of a conquered province—conquered in and under, through and by the forms of the Constitution, but in defiance of its essential spirit, and in spite of the solemn prophetic warnings of the great Washington. Under such rule the Southern man sees clearly, not only that he can never be a dominant power in the country, as he never has been, but that he can never again have any part in the Government. He can have no effective voice in making the laws which he and his children are to obey. No Southern man, nor his descendant to the remotest generation, except by being a renegade to his own section, can ever again aspire to the office of President of the United States, or Vice President. He can never again occupy a seat on the bench of the Supreme Court, nor hold a place in the Cabinet. Never more can he represent his Government at the Court of any foreign Power. In the halls of Congress he can do nothing but utter unavailing remonstrances, or make a factious, but helpless and hopeless, opposition to the designs of his oppressors. He can fill the offices of the Customs in his own State, or occupy the place of village Postmaster, but it will be upon the same condition of inevitable degradation which attended the Jewish Publican under the Roman domination. Under these circumstances, he feels that he can have no security for life or property, except in the forbearance of his rulers, or in his

own right arm. He sees that he is for ever shut up in his present home; that he can never emigrate to any other part of this vast unoccupied continent, unless he will consent to sacrifice his worldly wealth, and sunder domestic ties which wind around his heart with a tenderness and power not dreamed of by those who dismiss their domestic *help* with less regret than they sell a horse or part with a favorite dog. It is in no caviling spirit that he asks: How long will the Constitution retain its present form, to remind the oppressor of his wrong, and to recall the memory of those days when, for the maintenance of that Constitution as the fortress of his liberties, the Southern man poured out his blood, like water, upon every battle field where the armies of the Republic met a common foe? The Southern man sees that all this happens to him at once, under the Constitution as already subverted by the dominant sectional majority. All this was upon him, or in immediate prospect, on the very day that the fatal tidings thrilled along the magnetic wires, all over the land, that Abraham Lincoln had been elected by an overwhelming sectional majority, as a Northern, sectional, anti-slavery President of the United States.

There is but one other point that we need examine to complete the answer, under the first head, to the question: Why the Southern States desire to secede?

It is the deliberate conviction of the great majority of Southern statesmen, that the conflict of opinion in the Union is over. The last battle has been fought, and the combined forces of abolitionism and sectionalism have triumphed, finally and fatally triumphed, over the Constitution, over the principles of the fathers, over the rights and liberties of the South, and over the hopes of mankind. Southern men have watched, with intense solicitude, the rising from the abyss, first, of the spirit of abolitionism, and then of the spirit of sectionalism. They have seen them expand separately, and then coalesce. They have

anxiously watched their embodiment, and have beheld them, with unspeakable horror and grief, looming up into a gigantic living organism in the self-styled Republican party. They have seen the rapid growth of this giant in four short years, between the defeat of Fremont and the amazing success of Lincoln; and now they behold it, with one huge hand repressing national men and parties at the North, while the other is stretched out to subjugate and crush the South. So far as the Southern man can judge, this giant is destined to a long and vigorous life. The causes which have led to the origin, growth and final success of the great sectional party, are not merely constant in their operation; they act with accelerated force. Viewed in this aspect, the pervading and growing anti-slavery sentiment of the North becomes terribly significant. If other evidence were wanting of the prevalence of the sectional feeling, we have it sadly enough in this article of the Princeton Review—the very last place where we would have expected to find it. In this point of view, the denunciations of the Abolitionists; the John Brown invasion, and his canonization as saint and martyr; the activity of the under-ground railroad; the sending of incendiary emissaries to the South; the nullification of the fugitive slave law; the violent rescue of apprehended fugitives by mobs of free negroes and white clergymen; the rupture of the Democratic party, and, still more, the division of the great Methodist, Baptist, and New School Presbyterian denominations—together with a thousand minor manifestations of the anti-slavery and sectional spirits—have a profound and fearful meaning. The South believes that no power can exorcise these twin spirits of abolitionism and sectionalism but the mighty power of God. No power on earth can stem this flood. The conscience, the pride, the fanaticism, the sense of duty, the prejudice, the envy, jealousy and resentment of supposed Southern assumption, as well as the hatred of various persons and various classes against

the South, all have contributed to swell this ever-rising tide, which has, at last, in the triumph of the Republican party, overwhelmed the rights and liberties of the Southern States, and threatens to sweep away into indiscriminate ruin their whole social fabric. Is there any hope that this tide will recede? Does the history of the world present an instance where men who have, for years, with mingled prayers and curses, toiled for the possession of power, have, when the sceptre was within their grasp, voluntarily laid it down? What hope can the South cherish that the great sectional majority will not be permanent? She sees that Territory after Territory is ready to wheel into the line of this great host, while the fiat has gone forth that never again shall a slaveholding State be admitted to the Confederacy; and that the States where slavery now exists shall be surrounded by a cordon of free States, and, like a girdled tree, shall die.

The reply to all this is, that the Constitution is the safeguard of minorities. It may, perhaps, protect the rights of minorities, in the proper sense of that term; but, in the nature of the case, it can afford no security to a subjugated section of the country. It must be apparent to the dullest comprehension, that there is a radical and essential difference between the attempt of a majority to oppress the minority, when the two parties are intermingled in all the various relations of life, and an effort to subdue and tyrannize over a great geographical division of the land. If the majority should control all the departments of Government, the judicial, as well as legislative and executive, constitutional protection would amount to very little in either case, but it would be utterly nugatory with respect to the weaker geographical section. Besides, it has been loudly proclaimed that there is a higher law than the Constitution, which controls the consciences of the dominant majority to set at naught the stipulations of that solemn compact. We freely admit that there is a higher law than any earthly con-

stitution, but it is not registered in the moral instincts of fallen man. It is found only in the revealed will of God; but, find it where we may, it can never authorize men to swear to support a Constitution, and then to disregard its compacts, or, by false interpretations, to abrogate its plainest provisions. It never gave any man a warrant to add the baseness of fraud to the guilt of perjury. Such a law would have furnished a conclusive reason for not entering into the covenant, or it might now justify the Northern States in seceding from the Union, to which the South would most cordially yield her assent. When, therefore, the South is told that the Constitution is her security against the tyranny of the majority, they point to the nullification of the fugitive slave law; they listen to the wild outcry against the decisions of the Supreme Court, and, above all, to the solemnly declared purpose of the dominant party to reverse the judgment of that Court, and, by legislative enactment, to wrest from them the whole common territory of the nation. Who will stay the hand of this great party, when, clothed with the ermine and wielding the sword, it holds the Southern States as victims in its grasp?

It is said that the only use that will be made of power by the dominant section, will be to restrain the evil of slavery from spreading, by preventing its extension beyond its present limits. This, it is contended, is a very righteous course, of which the South has no right to complain; because, forsooth, "slavery is not natural or national, but a local institution, the creature of municipal law." If this were not so, it is argued that the slaveholder would have the right to reside with his slaves in England, or France, or any other State, in defiance of public sentiment and the laws of the land. This seems to be regarded as a *reductio ad absurdum*; and this is the reasoning by which the tyrannical majority think to justify the spoliation of the South of those lands for which they paid their money and shed their blood. If put to the proof, they would find it very

difficult to show the absurdity of the claim of the slaveholder to reside in England or France. If right prevailed over might, and, with respect to the true interests of the African race, mercy triumphed over judgment, it might well be that the Southern gentleman would be allowed to dwell securely, with his domestic circle of whites and blacks, within hearing of the eloquence of Exeter Hall. The Southern States, however, have made no such claim. They have never demanded such a privilege, as due either by right or courtesy. The South has always contended earnestly for the right of sovereign States to determine all such questions for themselves. Massachusetts or New York have the right, in their sovereign capacity, not by an *ex post facto*, but by a prospective law, to declare that, within their borders, there shall be no more property in horses or cattle, in sheep or swine, as well as in the services of the African slave, or in the services of any man by contract of hiring. If it be said that property in the beasts of the field is a natural right, by direct grant from their great Creator, we reply, that a right of property in the service of man, whether by hiring, by purchase, or hereditary descent, is, also, by the direct and positive permission of the Sovereign Lord. Though the conditions of the grant differ, according to the nature of the subject, the right is no clearer in the one case than in the other. As this right of property in any subject is simply by permission, and not by command, it may, perhaps, be true that earthly sovereignties, within their own jurisdiction, may modify its exercise, or abolish it altogether, for reasons of mere policy; but in no case can any right of property, in any subject whatever, be the creature of municipal law. If this were the only title of the Southern man to the services of his slave, he would have no right at all. If it could be made clear to Southern men that their right to hold their slaves had no other foundation than the laws which they themselves have made, there are thousands upon thousands who would at once abandon

all claim to their services. This favorite dogma of the Republicans, and also of multitudes of others at the North, is more erroneous than that of the Abolitionists. The only fault of their reasoning is, that the minor premise is false; but this statement, that slavery is only the creature of municipal law, involves the same false premise, with a fallacy besides. No honest man at the South would hold any property upon any such terms. The Southern-Christian will thank no man for absolving him from sin in holding slaves, when he is told that the standard of absolution is not the law of God, but the municipal law of his own enacting. If he holds his slaves by no other right than the might of human law, or the might of arms, he will not hold them at all. It would be interesting to discuss the right of human sovereignties to abolish the right of property without the consent of the individual holder, except for public purposes and with due compensation made; but, for all the purposes of this argument, it is admitted.

There is nothing in the nature of slavery to restrain its movements, any more than the possession of flocks and herds. So, when the patriarch Abraham emigrated to the new territory which God had given, he took with him not only his cattle, but his servants, born in his house and bought with his money. If, therefore, there is nothing in the nature of slavery to restrain him, the Southern man demands: What sovereignty under heaven prevents him from emigrating, as Abraham did, with all his household and all his wealth, to the land which the Lord has given him, as tenant in common with his Northern and Western neighbors? What power undertakes to deprive him of his just proportion of the land, for the acquisition of which he contributed not only his money, but the lives of his sons? Thinking thus, there is no logic, however specious, which can convince the South that the doctrine of "Free Soil" is any thing else than the doctrine of robbery. Both in what it grants and in what it denies, it is the old

principle, as old as Nimrod, that "might makes right." The great dominant majority have the might, and they have solemnly declared that they will make it right. When the Southern man complains that he is thus deprived of his equal rights of property in the Territories, he is answered by the puerile fallacy, that he can move into the common Territories with all the property that any Northern man can carry with him. Suppose that the dominant majority should declare, that no Southern man should settle in any of the Territories with more than two coats, or more than fifty dollars in his pocket. Why should they not? There would be more reason and right in it, than to forbid him to take with him all the members of his family. Suppose that he should have no more sense than to complain, would not his mouth be for ever stopped by the answer, You have all the rights that your Northern neighbor has; he is the possessor of only one coat, and has no money at all; you have, therefore, more rights than he has, and are more than his equal, by the full sum of fifty dollars? If the dominant majority was with the South, and the law should be enacted prohibiting the establishment of any sort of manufactories throughout the whole public domain, how would the sturdy New Englander look when told by the South, We do you no wrong, you are equal in all respects to us, we have no manufactures, and we do not desire to have any, so you have all the rights that we have? Would he, with a quiet smile, respond: You are right, and I must go back to Lowell, or Worcester, where alone I can pursue my avocations? No! He would say as the South says, Out upon such logic, and out upon such political morality! That honest, and even truly pious men can reason thus, can only be accounted for on supposition of an intense "moral disapprobation of slavery," deep down in their hearts, depriving it of all the incidents which pertain to every other human interest.

It thus becomes as clear as the sun at mid-day, that the great dominant sectional party was organized, either upon deep convictions of the immorality of slavery—upon the basis of the higher law of their own moral instincts, regardless of the covenanted rights of the South—or else it is a great robber-party, banded together with the intent to despoil their brethren of their share of the joint property, by the strong hand. Were we to emulate the charity of the Princeton Review, we might say that the latter was the motive of the leaders, and that they had taken advantage of the conscientious convictions of the multitude to secure the rich spoil. But no, we will not follow the example. We believe that the “moral disapprobation” of slavery, however wickedly erroneous, is, for the most part, honest; we believe that anti-slavery is the spirit, the soul and vital breath of the great sectional party, which has subverted the Constitution and dissolved the Union of the North American States. We believe that this “moral disapprobation” is increasing at the North, and that it is seeking more and more to find its expression in political action. We see it pervading the logic, the ethics, and the politics of the Princeton Review, and going far to neutralize its religious opinion that slavery is not sinful.

We come now to the second and last reason why the Southern States desire to secede. It is that the issue made up between the great Northern majority, and the Southern States, now in a hopeless minority, relates chiefly to the subject of slavery, a social institution existing at the South, and not existing at all at the North. In order to the full comprehension of this point, of transcendent magnitude and importance, it would be necessary to study, minutely and comprehensively, the history of the origin and progress of African slavery in North America. Then we must examine, carefully, the nature of the institution, and its vital relation to all the interests of the States in which it now exists. We have space only for a very brief, but we hope

that it will prove a satisfactory, glance at either of these topics.

The slavery of the African race in North America had its origin in what men call an accident; its beginnings were very small, and, humanly speaking, fortuitous. In the year 1620, a Dutch vessel, driven by stress of weather, entered the Capes of Virginia, having on board twenty heathen Africans, who were sold as slaves to the Virginia colonists. Within the next twenty years slaves were found in Massachusetts and Connecticut, and soon after in most of the British colonies on this continent. Very soon it became apparent that the African laborer could not be made serviceable, under the rigorous climate of the Northern colonies, and that the tendency of the system was, by a great law of nature, towards the more genial skies and balmy breezes of the South. This gave rise to very grave apprehensions in the minds of Southern men. The rapid natural increase of the blacks under the fostering wing of Christian civilization; the influx from the North, where their labor was not remunerative; as well as the direct importations from Africa, seemed to threaten that the white race would soon be overwhelmed by a countless horde of heathen negroes. These things excited the fears of the far-seeing statesmen of those days, and they made strenuous efforts to arrest the tide, which threatened to engulf all the dearest interests of the white colonists. The Southern colonies enacted laws to prevent the importation of slaves from the coast of Africa, and many very anxious thoughts were expended on the question, how they should dispose of those who were already in the country. All were agreed that the prospect was very gloomy, and that some thing must be done. The colonial laws prohibiting the African slave trade were annulled by the authority of the British crown, and this is one of the most prominent grievances assigned in the Declaration of Independence as the reason for the secession of the colonies from the British

empire. The importation of slaves, through the agency of British merchants and the people of the Northern maritime colonies, in which New England took the lead, was continued until after the acknowledgement of the independence of the United States. For a time the apprehensions of the South appeared to slumber, but as the numbers of the slaves continued to increase, they were again aroused, and by the earnest efforts of Southern men, against all the influence of those engaged in the traffic, the slave trade was finally abolished. The Northern States afterwards gradually abolished slavery. They were enabled to accomplish this, because the South afforded a market for those who were unwilling to sacrifice their money invested in slaves, and the scheme of abolition was carried out without difficulty, because the number upon whom the ordinance of emancipation took effect was too insignificant to render them a formidable element in the social state; while, scattered through the rural districts, the freed negroes could do but little harm, and caused, therefore, but little uneasiness. The natural tendency, however, of this class is to congregate in towns and cities, and they have since become a very troublesome element of crime and pauperism, causing much anxiety to the municipal authorities of Northern cities. After the line was distinctly drawn between the States employing hired labor and those in which slavery continued to exist, the still rapid natural increase of the slaves seemed to portend that their numbers would soon greatly exceed the possibility of their profitable employment, and even go beyond the productiveness of the soil, so that starvation stared them in the face. By natural causes slavery was confined to certain definite limits, just as the Free Soil party would confine it now. The prospect before the Virginia planter was gloomy enough, and his experience is too recent to make the South willing to repeat the experiment. The danger was, not that slavery would die of inanition, but that the lack of bread would,

as it always has, among all people, produce destructive convulsions, ruinous alike to the black and white races; the peril would have been much greater if they had had any other race to deal with. The fears of the slaveholders were greatly exaggerated, and we must confess that they were enhanced by an underlying moral disapprobation of the system of slavery, and an undefined dread that they were exposing themselves to the judgment of God.*

It was under these circumstances, and in view of these dangers, which were real, but not near so great as they appeared to them, that all those utterances of condemnation, and expressions of fear of the system of slavery, fell from the lips and pens of Southern men, which the Abolitionists of our day have quoted so dishonestly, yet with such telling effect upon the minds of the Northern people.

It was during this period that the various religious bodies made their deliverances on the subject of slavery, and among them the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church adopted, in 1818, a series of resolutions looking very earnestly toward the gradual emancipation of the slaves. These resolutions were drawn up by Southern men, who were themselves slaveholders, and they were passed by the votes of Southern ministers and elders. With reference to other denominations, a rigid adherence to the modes of thought and feeling of those days has led to the disruption of the Churches; while the Old School

* There is some apparent discrepancy between some of the statements in the preceding historical sketch and some that appeared in the concluding article of the last number of this journal, in reference to the abolition of the slave-trade. The disagreement, however, is not real, for with reference to the States of South Carolina and Georgia, that distinguished writer and ourselves are speaking of different times. Moreover, we have, for the most part, had Virginia in our mind. The only points we wish to make are: First, the experience of some of the slaveholding States as to the confining of slavery; and secondly, the true historical and ecclesiastical status of the action of 1818, by our General Assembly.

Presbyterian Church, commonly regarded as so tenacious of the past, and even reproached as a fossil Church, and her doctrines derided as fossil Christianity, has had the wisdom given her to understand the progress of events, and to keep fully abreast of the age. The action of 1818 still stands upon her records, not as the law, but the history of the subject; and Southern Presbyterians are well content that it should so stand. It is, for them, the incontestible evidence that their fathers did, in good faith, and in the exercise of all the wisdom and philanthropy that God had given them, make an earnest and persistent effort to solve the problem of African slavery in America by some feasible and safe method of emancipation. In this they were joined, with all their force of talents, genius and virtue, by both Christian and infidel statesmen. Their combined power could accomplish nothing. The older men of that day continued to dream of emancipation as long as they lived. They all seized upon the scheme of African colonization, as opening a door of hope. Some were very sanguine; all were willing to give it a fair trial. It was, at last, made perfectly manifest, not only by their utter inability to discover the way, but by the fearful failure of the experiment, on a small scale, in the British West Indies, that the problem of slavery could not be solved by any scheme of abolition, emancipation or colonization. The two first could only complicate it, while the last was utterly insufficient. Still, the slaves continued to multiply, and the danger of over population grew apace.

When hope began to depart, and the evils of shutting up slavery within narrow limits began in some measure to be realized, the providence of God opened the door of safety, by the operation of causes originating at points distant from each other by the whole length of the continent and the width of the broad Atlantic. The invention of the cotton-gin in Connecticut, and the spinning-jenny in Britain, almost simultaneously with the opening for set-

tlement of the vast region of the South suited to the production of cotton, were the instruments by which the safety-valve of the huge machinery was raised. These things came just when Southern Christians and statesmen were at their wit's end. The hope of relief from emancipation had faded away, and all were dreading a terrible explosion from the pent-up elements of unknown power confined within limits too strait for them. From that day to this, amazing progress and prosperity have blessed the Southern States, threatened only by the foolish and wicked meddling of men, like silly boys, who know nothing of the nature and powers of the vast machinery which they so recklessly handle, the explosion of which would as surely cause their destruction as that of the men to whom God, in His providence, has committed its guidance and control. The South has great reason to be thankful that the great enginery that propels the bark which contains her social fortunes is so hard to disarrange, else ruin might have ensued long ago. We have before intimated our belief that one-half as much reckless and wicked interference with the social machinery of the North would, in much less time than thirty years, have produced an explosion, scattering it to the four winds of heaven. Its fragments could only be cemented again by the blood of untold thousands of people, and under the iron sceptre of a single despot.

The lesson which the South has learned from this whole history is, never to consent that her social system should be confined and restrained by any other limits than such as the God of nature interposes; and, above all, not to submit to the imposition of such restraints by another section of the country, whose fortunes are not embarked in the same vessel, whose motives can only be a spurious, fanatical philanthropy, or the lust of power; and whose domination, from the nature of the case, can be nothing but a fearful

and hateful tyranny—the tyranny, not of one man, but of a many-headed monster.

We come now to the nature of the subject on which the great dominant party have joined issue with the Southern States. Slavery has been very variously defined by different writers on the law of Nature and of Nations. Justinian defines it as “a constitution of the law of nations by which a man is made subject to another, contrary to nature.” In the sense in which nature is here used, all human governments, and the more complex laws of the social systems of men, are constitutions of the law of nations contrary to nature. According to Grotius, “slavery is an obligation to serve another for life, in consideration of diet and other common necessaries.” Rutherford makes it “an obligation to be directed by another in all one’s actions;” and Montesquieu says it is “the establishment of a right which gives one man such power over another as renders him absolute master over his life and fortune.” These definitions are all framed with reference to the system of slavery as it existed in the Roman Empire, and it is not a little remarkable that the mildest in its conception of the subject is that of Justinian, to whom alone, of them all, the system was a matter of personal observation and experience. They are none of them applicable to slavery as it exists in America. We shall endeavor to give a succinct description, rather than a formal definition, of the system as actually existing at the South.

Slavery, then, is a constitution of the law of nature and of nations, by which, under certain providential conditions, one man has a right to incorporate into his family institution, and to hold under his rule, as the head of the house, a class of persons of a different, and, in all the attributes which fit men for self-government, an inferior race; and to exact from them, while in health and vigor, service and labor suited to their strength and capacity. In return for this service, he is to exercise over them a just and equal

authority, restraining them, by appropriate rewards and disciplinary inflictions, from idleness, vice and immorality. He is to protect them from wrong and outrage on the part of others; to nourish them in helpless infancy and feeble old age; to treat them with kindness, and to feel towards them the regard to which they are entitled as the servants of his house and the subjects of his family-government. He is to afford them the means and opportunity of becoming acquainted with the Gospel of God's grace, in its purity and power, and to guard them, both by precept and authority, against the errors and heresies which would destroy their souls, or make them turbulent members of his family.

The providential conditions, mentioned in the description, may be various. With reference to slavery in America, they are the historical events which we have briefly detailed. Now, it is true that very few slaveholders fulfil all the duties arising out of their relation as masters. Neither do the slaves perform their obligations so fully as they ought. We frankly confess that there are occasional instances of caprice and cruelty. The same things must, also, be said of all the relative social duties which men owe in the various relations of life.

The conclusion to which we come, from this very imperfect exhibition of the history and nature of slavery in the South, is, that it is emphatically a domestic institution. The relation of master and servant is a family relation. Questions relating to slavery are almost all social questions. The great problem which the system of slavery presents for solution to the Christian, the philanthropist and statesman, is preëminently a social problem. As a vital social interest, it has very few points of contact with politics, even in States where it is recognized by the laws; and it touches the general politics of the United States only at the two points specifically mentioned in the Constitution. The Federal Government has, therefore, no more right to abolish slavery, by direct or indirect legislation,

either in the States or Territories, than it has to divorce, by general law, every husband and wife in New York or Pennsylvania. From the very nature of social institutions, the Congress of the United States has no more right to forbid a Southern man to settle in the common Territories with his slaves, as part of his household, than it has to enact that a Southern man shall not go thither with his children. The ground upon which we maintain this is not that the relation of parent and child is, as to all of its incidents, the same as that of master and servant. We only contend that they are both lawful social relations; and, therefore, it would be just as proper to make one the subject of political strife and political domination as the other. The territorial question, therefore, upon which the issue is specifically joined, is, not merely what property the Southern man shall or shall not take with him to the common heritage of the nation? but, What members of his household shall he be compelled to leave behind? From the nature of the case, as well as by the laws of the States where slavery exists, servants are both persons and property.

As a social institution, moreover, slavery has very close affinities with religion. The social and the religious life of man have ever been inseparably blended, while, even under the old Jewish Theocracy, they were related in a comparatively slight degree with the political constitution of the nation. Social questions, therefore, involve the conscience almost as much as those which relate to religion. And this furnishes an imperative reason why the subject of slavery should never have been drawn into the vortex of political strife. Above all other questions, this ought never to have been made the issue between two sections of the nation. It would have been exceedingly dangerous, even if slavery had existed in every State of the Union; but, in the actual state of things, it might easily have been foreseen, as the event has proved, that it would be fatal. We are sorry to say it, but we honestly believe that it would

have been safer for the perpetuity of the Union if the great dominant party had been organized upon a distinctly religious basis. We have neither time nor inclination to pursue the subject here suggested; but the political history of the country, embracing the period between the disappearance of the Whig party and the rise of the Republican, has very profound lessons for the statesmen of all free countries.

Such are the considerations which, in the minds of Southern men, give such terrible significance to the triumph of the sectional party. They feel that, under the government of the dominant sectional majority, they are reduced, not only to political subjection, but to social slavery. The very sanctity of their hearthstone is invaded. So far as the principle is concerned, they can see no difference between the abolition of slavery in the States, and their exclusion as slaveholders, and because they are slaveholders, from the lands to which they have equal title with their Northern neighbors. The right to do the one involves the right to do the other, and it is the certain expectation of the Northern anti-slavery men that, if they restrain the extension of slavery, they will thereby constrain its abolition. In either case, the Federal compact is broken, the Constitution subverted, and the Union dissolved, by that party which, by the mere force of numbers, has seized upon the Government with the boldly avowed purpose of domineering by the very firesides of the Southern people. Since the days of Papal interdicts and the Spanish Inquisition, no nation under heaven has ever quietly submitted to such tyranny. Did the Princeton writer think that the men of the South would submit?

We will now briefly sum up the causes which have driven the Southern States to secession.

First: The triumph of a great sectional party, which, if it be permanent, will for ever exclude the Southern people from all participation in the government of the country,

and from having any voice in making the laws by which they themselves are to be ruled.

Secondly: The certainty which they feel, from the history of the rise and growth of that party, that its power will last; the causes of which are still at work, with accelerated force, and there is no opposing power that can withstand their progress.

Thirdly: The basis upon which that party rests, is hostility, more or less violent, against an institution which exists at the South, and does not exist at all at the North; an institution in which the North has no manner of interest, and for which they sustain no sort of responsibility; an institution guaranteed to the South, by the compact which constituted the Federal Union; an institution which has been thrown upon the South by the inscrutable providence of God, and which, in the course of events, has become so interwoven with the warp and woof of Southern society, that they can not get rid of it, if they would.

Fourthly: This institution of slavery is social, and not political, and, therefore, the last of all subjects for political domination. As a social institution it has very close relations with the religious life of the people, involving grave questions of conscience, for the decision of which they are answerable only to God. This institution, therefore, belongs, not to the outward form of the State, but to its inner life, and, like the vital parts of the human frame, can not endure the delicate touch of the skillful surgeon, much less the rude handling of the ignorant quack.

The subject matter, therefore, concerning which the sectional party has declared its purpose of dominating over the South, is no mere question of political expediency or in expediency; it is no mere question of right and wrong. It is the simple question of existence, both for the master and the slave; it is a matter of liberty or subjugation, of life or death. Submission to the plans and purposes of the Northern majority is death—death with dishonor; resist-

ance may be death, if the Northern rulers should be so far given up as to attempt to subdue the South by force; resistance may be death, but it will be death with glory—the glory of the patriot. If resistance should be successful, the pen of history will inscribe the names of the great Southern statesmen by the side of Hancock and Henry, Adams and Jefferson, while their great captains will rank with Washington and Green, Putnam and Marion. But should the South be finally crushed, under the weight of superior numbers, her general, whose lot it shall be to hold the last citadel, and to fall in the final ruin of his country, may well claim brotherhood with Kosciusko. We trust that she will not fail; we trust that the good and righteous God—who has protected her, lo! these many years, will shield her head in the day of battle, and that He will enable His beloved Church in these Southern lands to fulfil the mission upon which He has sent her, to white and black, to bond and free.

After all that has been said, it is hardly necessary for us to discuss the right of secession. We are constrained, however, to offer a few words on this subject, because the conduct of the Southern people has been stigmatized as treason, and as involving “manifold absurdities, abnormities and evils,” subversive of the laws of God, and destructive of the rights of man. Southern Christians, who have taken part in this great movement for liberty, are called traitors, and denounced as guilty of the highest crime that can be committed against man, and one of the most heinous against the authority of God.

Until this new conflict between liberty and despotism began, we had always thought that the American Revolution had for ever settled the great principle, that government was made for man, not man for government, and, therefore, both as a historical fact and a necessary logical inference, the Union was made by and for the States, not the States by or for the Union. It seems, however, that we were

mistaken; the war of the American Revolution settled nothing. The despotic theory is now held more tenaciously, and exhibited more offensively, by men calling themselves Republicans, than by the ministerial party under Lord North. The great question of self-government is yet to be determined. The only change which eighty-four years of the conflict of opinion has made, is simply the substitution of a tyrannical sectional majority, for a tyrannical King and Parliament. If we had space, it would be very instructive to exhibit, in parallel columns, the absolute identity of the principles of government maintained by the ruling powers of Britain in that day, and by the leaders of the sectional majority of our own times. The only difference that we can see is, that our British masters were content with political domination, while our American rulers would extend their authority over the social life and consciences of the Southern people. If other evidences were wanting that the Republicans of our day have not receded a single step from the positions of Lord North and his fellow-coercionists, it may be found in the preposterous comparison of a State of the American Confederacy, with a county or district of a consolidated empire. This is a favorite illustration of the ruling party, and the Princeton writer can boast of the endorsement of President Lincoln himself, for he rang the changes upon it during his recent triumphant progress to his capital city. Now, even if this comparison were well founded, it would not prove that the people of the so-called Southern counties or districts were traitors, as tried either by the law of God or the principles of the Revolution. They would stand just where our fathers stood, with all the rights that they ever had to resist oppression, whether of monarch, parliament or sectional majority. In that case their resistance might be properly termed revolutionary, and then the lessons of the old war of Independence might well teach the Northern rulers to consent to the peaceful dismemberment of their empire. There is, however, no

sort of analogy between the sovereign States of North America and the counties or provinces of the British Empire ; the former are manifestly organic bodies politic, possessing each its own political life, the latter are simply convenient divisions for municipal purposes. They differ, therefore, in their essential nature, as widely as a living man differs from one of the phrenologist's divisions of the human cranium. This is an existing reality, palpable to the eyes of all observers ; it is a fact founded upon great historical verities, and not the out-growth of subtle political theories.

The wonderful providence of God, which determined the circumstances of the settlement of this continent by European colonists, and which decided the manner and the result of their struggle for independence, settled the question of the nature and condition of these States upon a basis which no constitution could materially alter, and which nothing but an absolute conquest could entirely change. The only possible union between States of such an historical origin must be founded either in compact or conquest. If, then, as all men know was the case, the union of these States was formed by agreement, any attempt, by the majority of the States or people, to change its essential nature from a union by agreement into one of conquest, does of itself break up the Government and resolve it into its constituent elements. The original contracting parties were not individuals or households, but independent, organized States. The right of secession, therefore, as exercised by the Southern States, is nothing more than the declaration that, the essential nature of the Union having been changed from compact to conquest, they will not submit to the usurpation. Who, then, are the traitors ? Surely not the men of the South.

Besides, it is clear that in a Government having such a historical origin, and such an inherent nature, a revolution, wrought, not by the people as an aggregate of individuals, but by the people as organized sovereignties, must be spe-

cifically different from a revolution accomplished under any other system. This manifest difference is expressed by the right of secession, as distinguished from the right of revolution. The chief characteristic of the difference is peace. The right of secession may, therefore, be called the right of peaceful revolution. The circumstances under which this right ought to be exercised, as determined by great moral principles, are the same that, in any other kind of government, would justify an appeal to arms. We have always thought that the one great benefit which our fathers secured for themselves and for us, their children, and which, under God, they were able to secure by the peculiar conditions of their colonial history, was the right, and the possibility, of maintaining their liberties in any future contingency, without the disintegration of society, and without a resort to war and bloodshed.

It is a faint and dim recognition of this great principle, as involved in the essential nature, as well as in the whole history, of the Government, that compels the advocates of "coercion" to resort to the miserable quibble about "enforcing the laws and protecting the public property." So, also, those opponents of coercion who fail to recognize or fear to acknowledge this principle, are reduced to the necessity of special pleading on the tremendous issues that now divide the country. They contend that the laws can only be enforced, or the possession of property recovered, by regular legal process, in execution of the judgment of a Court of competent jurisdiction, and that the military power can only be called in to aid the marshals in the lawful service of judicial writs. All this is true; but it renders the Government a nullity, and stultifies its makers inconceivably more than the doctrine of secession. If the dominant party should send fire and sword to desolate peaceful Southern homes, and slaughter unoffending people, the most horrible feature of the hideous attempt will be that it is done under cover of a mere subterfuge. This

is a terrible example of the fallacy called *ignoratio elenchi*. The thing supposed to be proved is: The laws must be enforced. The real conclusion: A noble people must be subjugated, or at least punished, for daring to assert that freedom is their birthright.

The right of secession, as we have thus briefly defined it, is the right of peaceful and orderly revolution, by the organized States, for adequate cause. The possibility of capricious, unreasonable secession, without the right to coerce by the remaining confederates, and without the possibility of coercion, except under the fallacy and subterfuge which we have now exposed, is one of the dangers incident to a free Government constituted as was ours. The Constitution of the United States was the best system of government for a free people ever devised by man; but, like all human things, it was imperfect. Like its authors, it contained in its own nature the seeds of death. The dangers to which it was exposed were just two—separation and consolidation; the possibility of secession, and the possibility of sectional domination. The danger arising from these two sources was by no means equally great, for secession was a moral impossibility so long as liberty and prosperity were enjoyed in the Union. Secession, therefore, from mere caprice or passion, has always been a possible, but by no means a probable, result. Massachusetts is said to have voted to secede upon the admission of Texas, but she had the good sense not to carry it into execution. If she had fulfilled her passionate threat, it would have done little or no harm. The Union would hardly have been jostled by the recoil. All the movements of the Government could have been easily and safely adjusted to the new state of affairs. The right of secession, therefore, involved only a remote possibility of danger, and that of no great magnitude; while, at the same time, it contained an element of safety, inasmuch as it was an effectual check upon the tendency to centralization and tyranny of the General Government.

On the other hand, the danger of consolidation and sectional domination was always imminent, and, if it should at any time be realized, fatal. This was the danger against which Washington so solemnly warned his countrymen, and all true patriots have feared it ever since the ratification of the Constitution. The right of secession, if it had been generally acknowledged, would either have prevented the attempt, or would have averted mutual slaughter, in a vain effort to maintain sectional authority. But, whether the Government were a Confederacy or a consolidated Empire; whether the States were sovereignties or only counties of one great nation; the successful effort of any one large section to rule over any other smaller section, by the mere power of numbers, must always have proved fatal to the perpetuity of the Government, unless the people had forgotten the deeds and principles of their fathers, and had lost the very memory of freedom.

This danger, so long apprehended, has come at last; in this the point of its greatest weakness, the Constitution has given way. Upon their heads must the guilt of this ruin fall, who, seeing the danger, have, with insatiate lust of power, broken through the only defence of the weak against the strong, at the only place where a breach could have been made, and where, if once made, it is irreparable.

The only alternative left to Southern freemen is, forcible resistance in the Union, or secession. Some of the States have chosen the latter, because they believe it to be the way of peace, others are hesitating between the two; none of them propose to submit. The seceded States declare, with a solemnity befitting the momentous occasion, that it matters not to them how their course is characterized. Call it the right of secession or the wrong of secession—the right of revolution or the wrong of revolution—call it sedition, insurrection, rebellion, treason, or by any other name drawn from the vocabulary of reproach, they never will submit to be governed by any section of the country on any issue

whatever, great or small. Above all things, they never will submit when the subject matter of the sectional domination is in no sense a matter of political concern, as between the North and the South, but a question involving the social life and the consciences of the people of the Southern States.



ARTICLE II.

COLERIDGE.

An attempt was made, some thirty years ago, by Prof. Marsh and others, to introduce the writings of Coleridge, and to give them currency and favor, in this country. A few young ministers were taken with them, and, for a time, were greatly injured by them. Their thoughts were confused; their style became inflated, obfuscated, filled with outlandish words and strangely constructed sentences, and the complaint among intelligent hearers was, that they could not be understood. They seemed conscious of having great thoughts, and of being the subjects of some special illumination, but few could tell in what the illumination consisted, or what benefit it was likely to be to the world. Coleridgeism had its run in those days, and after a little time it measurably ran out. It was not congenial to the taste and habits of the American people, and, consequently, did not prevail. Most of those who were infected by it, especially if they were pious and sensible men, recovered themselves from it, and returned to the plain teachings of the Bible and of common sense.

We then confidently hoped that our danger from this source was over, and that Mr. Coleridge would never again