THE HIGHER-LAW DOCTRINE.

NORTH AND SOUTH.

A DISCOURSE DELIVERED IN ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, JANUARY 27, 1861.

BY REV. W. G. ELIOT.

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well."—1 Peter ii. 13, 14.

These words were addressed to those who lived under an absolute monarchy, but they are applicable to all regularly constituted governments. The more mild the form of government, the easier, and at the same time the more important does obedience become. In a Republic, where the constituted authorities, for the time being, are in the place of "the king," obedience is equally commanded, and is the most important of all. We appeal, therefore, to the text, and to other Scriptural passages of similar import, as our authority for the leading doctrine of the present discourse.

For the first time, in a ministry of more than twenty-six years, I would call your attention, in this place, to what may, perhaps, be termed a political discussion. Under all ordinary circumstances, such subjects are, in my opinion, better avoided by the pulpit; and, generally speaking, but little good results from their introduction. Perhaps, among the minor causes of the present unhealthy excitement of the public mind, the frequency and violence of such discussions, in the pulpit, may be rightly named. But to every general rule of expediency there are exceptions; and in this time of peculiar trial, when the question in every one's heart is, "Country or no country?" I have felt it to be my duty, as an American citizen and as a minister of Jesus Christ, to address you upon the leading topics of the day. Not that I stand here as a party man; for in such a crisis as this we can have no party but the country, and I desire to stand upon no platform but the Constitution of the country, the Union of the States, and obedience to the laws. To do my small part for the maintenance of these, is my only desire. Nor shall I forget, in any word now to be spoken, that I am the minister of Him whose birth was heralded by angels proclaiming "Peace on earth, good will towards men," and one of whose last commands was, "Put up thy sword into its place; for they that take the sword shall perish by the sword."

The time is one of great difficulty and peril. We are passing through a fiery ordeal, which is trying every man's patriotism, of what sort it is; and in not a few instances, that which has seemed to be gold, is proving to be no better than brass or stubble. All over the land, the question of disunion is freely discussed—a word which we ought not to hear without shuddering; and in our own State a Convention of the people has been called, to consider what part we shall take in that which many persons regard as the inevitable "disruption."

Perhaps, in the present state of the public mind, the call has been wisely made, though I do not myself see its necessity. But that such a convention is to be held, for such a purpose, especially if we admit its necessity, is a fact well calculated to excite patriotic fears, and to arouse us to the most diligent performance of our duty. As it looks to me, from the teachings of history, from our knowledge of human nature, and from the angry passions already working, both at the North and South, the questions to be discussed may involve, not only disunion, but social disorganization, civil commotion, civil war, servile war, anarchy, military despotism, national ruin. It may be to decide upon the destruction of the grandest Republic the world has ever seen—upon the continued success or total failure of the great experiment of American freedom.

For the consideration of this question, involving all our interests—individual, social, and national; vitally affecting all enterprises of public good—educational, charitable, philanthropic, and religious—the most important question of the nineteenth century—at the end of two weeks' excito debate, a Convention has been called; and in about two months it will have been determined, under all the chances of excited popular elections, what part this State shall take for good or evil, in its final settlement. Compared with the movement of other States, the action of Missouri has been slow and deliberate; but, in all the records of modern history, was there ever so moments a question, so precipitately considered as this, which Missouri, in common with the other "Border States," is now, with such hot haste, placing in issue? Surely, it is not a healthy condition of the public mind or of political morals, in which the foundations of society can be so easily disturbed. There must be some hidden cause, apart from the immediate occasions of trouble, or such forwardness to invite calamity could not exist. There must be some poison in the blood, destroying its vitality—some insidious disease, which, unperceived, has been long undermining the national health, to account for the sudden and calamitous outbreak. We know that by discrimination and recrimination, by mutual misunderstandings and misrepresentations, the North and South have become embittered against each other, and, no doubt, just grounds of complaint on both sides exist; but, in a healthy state of the public mind, disunion would be the last remedy suggested, instead of being as now almost the first, and some one of the compromises offered (among which the worst is better than dissolution), would be greedily accepted by all.

It seems to me that in none of the great speeches which the crisis has called forth, however statesmanlike, whether threatening or conciliatory, has the radical explanation of our troubles, the true diagnosis of our national disease, been clearly given. We doubt if the American people yet understand their duties and obligations in the present crisis, the real danger to
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you are a citizen of Missouri, and you are heard with a look that plainly asks, "Where in the world is Missouri?" But say you are an American, and in every nook and corner of the most distant land your country is honored, and the protection of her flag is your sufficient shield. It is the Union, therefore, not our separate strength, which has established and now protects our foreign commerce and friendly intercourse with foreign nations, thus maintaining the basis of general welfare.

It is the Union, not the forbearance or wisdom of the separate States, which creates and preserves community of interests among themselves, determining boundaries, regulating internal commerce, and bringing under subjection, if not into perfect harmony, the conflicting interests and feelings that would otherwise keep them in bitter rivalry and contention, perhaps in open war. It is the Union, with its quiet, unperceived, but commanding power, not our local laws, which upholds freedom, the freedom of speech and of the press, and at the same time makes it consistent with the peace and good order of society. And we remark with pain, that wherever the controlling power of the Union fails, and in proportion as it fails, freedom of speech and of the press fails too.

It is the Union, by the same controlling presence, not our local legislation, which secures us in our personal rights and the rights of property. For, in this untamed democracy of ours, where there are so many nationalities and religions, so many conflicting views and interests, and where so many persons claim to be leaders, an irresistible superintending strength is needed as the regulator of all.

It is the judiciary system, not of one State, but of the United States, which secures the equal administration of law, so that by appellate jurisdiction, without unreasonable delay or expense, and without the undue influence of local prejudices and partialities, the settlement of every important case involving the rights of individuals and communities, is referred to the highest tribunals, in a manner, with rare exceptions, to do justice to all. If you would understand the majesty of the Union, go into the Supreme Court of the United States at Washington, where a few aged men, without insignia of office, with no armed police, sit in judgment upon your rights and mine, and exercise an authority before which the thirty millions of people willingly bow—an authority which, until lately, almost none have been found to dispute. What a signal testimony to the moral influence exerted by this great Confederacy of nations is here given—that not only individuals, but the sovereign States themselves, submit their controversies to that peaceful tribunal, in cases where the angriest passions have been aroused, and vast interests are at stake, as in the contest now existing between Illinois and Missouri, about bridging the Mississippi, both parties standing pledged to rest satisfied with the decision, whatever it may be! If the commerce of our great rivers should be interrupted by a seceding State, to what tribunal could the appeal be made? And, remark, the power to which we now yield is moral, not the actual presence of physical force; for the whole standing army of the United States is less than that required to keep the city of Paris in order in time of peace.

One other consideration may be added, especially important at the present time, and to the "Border States." The Union is the grand conservative influence to guard our social institutions from external attack, and give us time to work out whatever needful reforms the interests and duty of the State may hereafter demand.

Twenty-eight years ago, when at Harvard University, I went to Boston to hear one of the early, reasonable speeches of William Lloyd Garrison, on the subject of American slavery. It was at the beginning of his career of hostility to the Union, "the confederacy of iniquity for the oppression of the slave." The destruction of the Union as "the hope of freedom," has been the doctrine of his philanthropy ever since; and now his language is: "Hail the approaching jubilee, ye millions who are wearing the galling chains of slavery, for assuredly the day of your redemption draws nigh, bringing liberty and salvation to the whole land." Taus, shouts of victory for secession, coming from the extreme South, are echoed back by extremists of the North. And do we not see the logical force of their argument? It is applicable to all the Border States, as Clemens, of Virginia, and Etheridge, of Tennessee, and Crittenden, of Kentucky, have so clearly shown, but to Missouri more than all. Separate her from the Union, surround her with hostile free States, and in five years the number of those held to involuntary service would be exceedingly small. As a property, they would not be worth keeping, and the attempts to keep them here would be vain. "But would not the cause of philanthropy be the gainer by this?" some one may ask. We answer, No, not by a process of change so violent and sudden. To the slaves themselves, it would be hardship and suffering; to the masters, and temporarily to the whole State, it would be ruin. I am not the advocate of slavery, and cannot see with their eyes in regard is as is in itself a beneficial and divine institution. Neither history, nor Scripture, nor my own observation, teaches me such a lesson. Whatever may be true in the far Southern States, where cotton and other tropical productions are the staple growth, and whatever arguments may there exist for the continuance of the institution, there is no doubt in my mind that in Missouri we should be morally, religiously, socially, economically, and in every way the gainers by the transfer of the whole African race to some other clime.

But all great social changes, to be beneficial, must be slow. Philanthropic regard to the welfare of the black race, not less than patriotic regard to the advancement of the State, requires us to "hasten gently," to accomplish peacefully whatever Providence ordains to be accomplished by our hands. They who would do in a few years what Divine Providence requires one or more generations to accomplish, should
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 scurf ofa in the system, it sometimes lies concealed, but is ever ready to break out anew with aggravated severity. We have not yet learned, as in a Republic, of all governments, the major law must be maintained. The majority that造福es us, or consents to its being enforced against themselves, whenever occasion demands, or we have anarchy instead of freedom. We have not learned this, 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 South-western 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 sanction 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 overriding 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 arbitration 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 is it 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 abolition of slavery can only delay the consummation we devoutly wish, besides exposing the community to the hazard of an insurrection, perhaps less hurtful to the master than the slave."

These are the words of truth and soberness, of experience and wisdom. What a clear ring 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 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 root 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 doctrine of secession. The main is impatience of legal redress, forwardness to take the law into our own hands, to right our real or sup-
posed wrongs, as individuals and as commu-
nities. 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 legis-
lative 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 her-
self the most conservative of all.

There may be many causes of just com-
plaint against the sister States; there may
be absolute and immediate necessity of addi-
tional constitutional guarantees for protection
of the South; there may be wisdom in de-
manding the passage of compromise measures,
for the final settlement of all sectional dis-
putes. 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 reme-
dies with deliberate faithfulness, before think-
ing of any other, and all just causes of com-
plaint 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 main-
tain the law, to stand by the old flag, to be loyal
to the Union.

Let us take ample time for mature and de-
liberate 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 re-
nouncing 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 conserva-
tive; 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, de-
mand 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 reasona-
ibly 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. Per-
haps no direct collision with the General Gov-
ernment or the neighboring States would im-
mediately 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 conse-
quences of revolution and civil war.

In all that has now been said, I have en-
davored 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 nomi-
inally 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 Alleghanies 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 repositing 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 alle-
giance, 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.