carefully take heed, lest, claiming to be philanthropists, they be found fighting against God. But, as we cannot rely upon their moderation, we have so much the more reason to rest contented under the protecting shield of the Union, which alone can save us from the results of ill-advised and calamitous haste.

We repeat, therefore, that it is the Union which has made us what we are, and it is to this alone that we must look for continued prosperity and peace. I do not ask you to consider the terrible alternative, for to familiarize oneself with thoughts of evil is not wise. Rather let me say, that the future promise of the Union, if preserved, is still greater than the results already attained and the benefits already conferred. Nor is there any other State or city with deeper interests at stake in the present controversy than our own, whether we consider the evils to be feared or the advantages to be gained. And now, having received so much, owning our whole prosperity to the Union, of which we are a part, shall we, in the first hour of evil, do the work of ingratitude and treason? Admitting that we are suffering wrong at the hands of the Government, though it is against anticipated evils that the outcry is chiefly raised, but admitting all the wrong and injustice that can possibly be charged, shall we thanklessly receive so great good, and refuse to bear the incidental evil? Like those who followed the Master for the loaves and fishes, shall we, in the time of trial, be unfaithful? Or dare we utter the imprecation, "The blood be upon us and on our children?"

We doubt if there be one open and avowed disunionist in the State of Missouri; but if there be any, we would remind him of the Scripture words, "Whosoever shall fall upon this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder."

My present argument, however, does not rest upon the amount of advantages received in the Union, or of evil threatened by its disruption. Loyalty does not depend on selfish calculations of interest, but upon duty and right. We would as soon calculate the market value of honor, virtue, and truth, as of patriotism. Then, indeed, would every individual and State have "a price," to be bought and sold by demagogues. Not what we would like to have, but what as loyal citizens we ought to do, is the first thing to be considered in a juncture like this. He was but a miserable statesman, in the latest seceding State, who said, "At any and all events, we must consider, first and foremost, what will be for the welfare and interest of Louisiana; this takes precedence of all other questions." It strikes me that the neglected questions of loyalty to the Union, of reciprocal relations with other States, of allegiance and honor and honesty, might well have claimed earlier and longer consideration, in a State whose territory was bought with the treasure, and whose capital city was defended by the army of the nation. Can we thus take the law into our own hands, whenever it does not suit us? Can we thus throw off allegiance, because it ceases to be pleasant or profitable? Is democracy, popular freedom, another name for mob law? Is the right to complain the right to "secede," rebel, revolutionize?

The deliberate answer given by some is in the affirmative. A year ago, the present Governor of Massachusetts, since elected by a majority of one hundred thousand votes, advocating resistance to some unpopular law, said that the enforcement of law belongs to a despotic, not a republican form of government. "The people never can be taught to enforce their own laws. A free people will resent the claim of any enforcement against themselves. The people are free, not slaves." That is, if the majority of people for the time being, in any community, as St. Louis or Boston, think a law oppressive, they may rise in their assumed majesty, not by legal process and in lawfully constituted ways, but by the strong hand, to resist and nullify! What more has South Carolina done? What other justification would her Governor demand? Under this ruling, what right should she have to complain, if cannon were placed at Vicksburg or New-Orleans, to control the navigation of the Mississippi? Our rights would be at the mercy of the fluctuating majority of every community and State.

Yes, this is the disease, the social sin, the national weakness. Like scurvy in the system, it sometimes lies concealed, but is ever ready to break out anew with aggravated severity. We have not yet learned that, in a Republic, of all governments, the majority law must be maintained. The majority that exceeds it, or consent to its being enforced, against themselves, whenever occasion demands, or we have anarchy instead of freedom. We have not learned that, nor did our fathers before us learn it. The disease is not new, but inherited. We are accustomed to praise the olden times, but history tells us that they were little better than our own.

Under Washington's Administration, in Pennsylvania, the Whisky Rebellion broke out, to resist the tax on spirits, and required an armed force of seventeen thousand men to subdue it. Under Jefferson, the purchase of Louisiana excited the violent opposition of the North, and threats of a separate Government were freely made; and subsequently a Southwestern conspiracy, with Burr at its head, assumed formidable strength. During the late war, in New-England discontent prevailed to such a degree, that nullification of the United States laws was threatened. Governors conferred together; the Hartford Convention was called; Commissioners were sent to Congress with formal complaint; and, if we may give credit to John Q. Adams, nothing but the timely intervention of peace, by the treaty of Ghent, prevented a New-England monarchy from being formed. And here make note of one thing, that not one of the Hartford Convention politicians ever afterwards succeeded in gaining the confidence of the people of the United States. In General Jackson's time, South Carolina attempted to nullify the tariff law; but, although the excitement was almost as great through the South as it now is, she abandoned the scheme for "a more convenient season." When Missouri was admitted, when Texas was annexed, when war with Mexico was declared, threats of disunion were freely made.
The Kansas troubles were all the fruit of illegal action on the one side and the other, both parties taking law into their own hands. Besides these and many other flagrant instances of lawlessness, there has been exercised in all the newly-settled States and Territories a systematic, popular, unwritten law, by bands of regulators and vigilance committees; for which there is, perhaps, sufficient excuse, where the laws cannot be more regularly enforced. But not only under such circumstances of extenuation has "lynch law" or mob law prevailed. In older communities, also, and in many parts of the land, from St. Louis to Boston, too frequent appeal has been made to popular violence.

At this day, we are reading that the latter city, and the cities of New-York and Philadelphia, are not exempt from lawless outbreaks; and those who denounced "enforcement of law among a free people," are now finding, that especially among a free people, and to keep them free, the laws must be enforced. Thus the long catalogue of wrong becomes longer, from day to day, until of late the action of religion has been invoked, and resistance to constituted authorities has been and is defended, under the captivating name of the "higher-law doctrine," just as disloyalty and revolution find an attractive form in the doctrine of secession.

The higher-law doctrine! It is, as commonly received, the most dangerous of all popular delusions—defended in the pulpit, with boldness almost blasphemous, while brought to sanction popular tumults, and to apologize for the armed invasion of States—the more dangerous, because it can always bring to its aid the conscientious feelings of those for whose benefit applied, and their wishes and interests and prejudices and enmities and sectional jealousies are all made to assume the sacredness of duty. Resistance to law is defended as the "appeal from Cesar to God," and the apostolic words, "We ought to obey God rather than men," is the complacent watch-word of those who are hurried away by their own violent impulses, or are made the tools of self-seeking political leaders.

We do not deny, no sane man can deny that there is a true doctrine of higher law overruling all; and it is by this law (which is allegiance to God) that obedience to the "constituted authorities" is required, making it a religious not less than a social duty.

We further admit that, under rare circumstances, this higher law may stand in direct conflict with the "authorities that be," and peremptorily set them aside at whatever cost. But let us not be deceived by words. To the State or community, this is nothing but the right of revolution; to the individual, it is the call to martyrdom. In both cases it is the last appeal, when all other methods have been tried in vain. The community which makes the appeal must do so with sword in hand, prepared for the dread arbitrament of war. The individual who makes it must peacefully "take up the cross," as the martyrs have always done, to offer up himself and all that he has upon what he believes to be the altar of duty. For violent resistance of law by individuals is not only a crime against the State, but a sin against God. So defined and applied, the higher-law doctrine is true and safe. It will be rarely resorted to, and never except with good reason. It becomes the safeguard of society, not a disturbing cause. The true philanthropist never seeks his ends, however good, by violation or resistance of law. To do evil that good may come, is no part of his creed.

How refreshing it is to hear the words of wisdom from one who is at the same time statesman and philanthropist! In November last, Lord Brougham was invited (we marvel at the coolness and assurance of those who sent the invitation) to attend the "John Brown Meeting" in Boston. A part of his answer is as follows, to which I ask your most diligent attention:

"I consider the application is made to me as conceiving me to represent the anti-slavery body in this country; and I believe that I speak their sentiments, as well as my own, in expressing the widest difference of opinion with you upon the merits of those who promoted the Harper's Ferry expedition, and for the fate of those who suffered for their conduct in it. No one will doubt my earnest desire to see slavery extinguished; but that desire can only be gratified by lawful means, a strict regard to the right of property, or what the law declares property, and a constant repugnance to the shedding of blood. No man can be considered a martyr, unless he obey the law; but is a witness to the truth; and he does not bear this testimony who seeks even a lawful object by illegal means. Any other course taken for the abolition of slavery can only delay the consummation we devoutly wish, besides exposing the community to the hazard of an insurrection, perhaps more hurtful to the master than the slave."

These are the words of truth and soberness, of experience and wisdom. What a clear ringing of common-sense they have—allegiance to God, joined to reverence for law—the combination without which philanthropy is knight-errantry, and self-sacrifice itself becomes fanaticism!

If the general views now presented are correct, it is not difficult to see what is the radical cause of all our troubles as a nation, and the needful remedy. Would to God it were as easily applied! The evil is not local or temporary; it infects the whole people. At the present time it is chiefly disturbing the extreme South, being the loser; and the North, being the winner, is full of indignation. Let the words of censure be more gently spoken. Let them remember the Latin proverb, "Mutato nomine, de te fabula narratur." "Why so indignant? Change the name, and it is your own history." I doubt if, in principle, there is a fear of difference; and the breaking out of what the North might think an unjust war with Europe, requiring an embargo upon her ports, or other measures oppressive to her commerce, would, not improbably, make North and South change places as to the modern value of secession. The root is impiety of legal redress, forwardness to take the law into our own hands, to right our real or sup-
posed wrongs, as individuals and as communities. Whether you call it lynch law, or the higher law, or ordinances of secession, it all comes under the same head, and leads to the same result. The fault is universal; but I think it may be truly said that, in their legislative action, the "Middle States" have almost uniformly been the most conservative.

"In medio tutissimus;" which, being freely interpreted, may be taken to mean, "The Middle States are the safest," in which case, Missouri, situated in the centre of the Union, should dispute with Pennsylvania the honor of being the "Keystone State," by proving herself the most conservative of all.

There may be many causes of just complaint against the sister States; there may be absolute and immediate necessity of additional constitutional guarantees for protection of the South; there may be wisdom in demanding the passage of compromise measures, for the final settlement of all sectional disputes. But there is no wisdom in illegal and unconstitutional methods of redress; there is no necessity of dissolving the Union, or even of talking about it. Let there be universal determination to try the provided legal remedies with deliberate faithfulness, before thinking of any other, and all just causes of complaint will soon disappear. There is enough strength left in the Union, and enough justice to right all our wrongs. At all events, it is our duty, it is required by our allegiance "to God and our native land," to make the full trial. As citizens of the United States, we have a first duty to perform—to obey and maintain the law, to stand by the old flag, to be loyal to the Union.

Let us take ample time for mature and deliberate action. In was not in weeks or months of angry discussion, but after years of patient negotiation and loyal effort, that the American colonies came to the point of renouncing allegiance to the mother country; and almost until the last they kept open the way of return. Shall the American States do less? Do we owe less to the American Union than the colonies did to George III.?

To the State of Missouri, whatever the other States may do, the words of practical wisdom are very plain. Be loyal; be conservative; be deliberate in all your counsels and all your actions. Exhaust all constitutional remedies, before so much as considering any other. In the Union, and under the law, demand that, and only that, which is just and right. Consider maturely, and count the cost, before taking the leap in the dark, for the worst condition possible for us in the Union, may be better than the best we can reasonably expect out of it; and if the time ever comes, which God forbid! for the severance of the sacred bands of alliance between us and our sister States, let us not deceive ourselves by calling it "peaceable secession." It may seem to be so in its first movement. Perhaps no direct collision with the General Government or the neighboring States would immediately occur, nor is it probable that measures of coercion would be rashly used. But a few months or years would certainly develop the act in its true character, in the fearful consequences of revolution and civil war.

In all that has now been said, I have endeavored to abstain from the language of angry debate. It would be sinful, in this place, to say one word to increase the bitterness of fraternal strife. "The fruits of righteousness are sown in peace, of them that make peace. But where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work."

Upon the States which have already nominally seceded we pass no judgment, although we look with amazement upon the precipitancy of their action. We would leave them, so far as practicable, to the peaceful working out of the problem which they have, at their own hazard, undertaken to solve. Perhaps some mode of adjustment may yet be found, and let it be our part, if we have the opportunity, to smooth the pathway of return. But whether their action be final or not, our duty as a people and as a State continues the same.

A few days ago, an American eagle, in his long journey, perhaps from the Alleghenies to the Rocky Mountains, when passing over this city, stooped from his lofty flight, to rest his wings upon the spire of this church—the living emblem of our national freedom reposing upon the eternal symbol of our Christian faith, the cross of Christ. We accept it as a favorable omen. Let it suggest to us our two-fold allegiance, that it may, if possible, be brought into one. As Americans and as Christians, "be faithful unto death," that for our country and for ourselves we may obtain the crown of immortal life.