

THE

Reformed Presbyterian.

WHOLE NUMBER, }
Vol. XXV.—No. 4. }

APRIL, 1861.

NEW SERIES,
Vol. VII.—No. 4. }

ORIGINAL.

COMPROMISE—RECONSTRUCTION—COERCION.

POLITICIANS are in a fever of anxiety to invent something that will please the South, and secure her return to the Union. Such is their haste in their efforts, that they have forgotten principles, party and pledges. Some are evidently inclined to consider the seceding States as innocent sufferers at the hands of the North, and that amends should be made as soon as possible. To reach this, compromises are framed and reconstruction is talked of—conventions are held and others proposed. No good is likely to come of these. The Constitution itself is a compromise, as wisely devised and as liberal to the South as could be at the time of its adoption, or as can be yet obtained, and it has failed. So have those that have been founded on it. That of 1820 was a yield, after a long and exciting struggle, of the North to the clamors of the South. Again in 1850 it gave in to slavery, and the country settled down in the expectation of repose, but was again aroused by the renewed clamors for rights; and the repeal of the compromise of 1820 was obtained. The atrocities of Kansas followed, and there slavery met its first defeat. Beginning to fall, it has happened, as in the case of Haman before Mordecai, that one disaster followed another. It lost the election of 1860—the first it ever lost. From the first till now, the South has had its way, and shaped men and things as it liked. But the sceptre is wrested from its grasp, and another hand, and of nobler humanity, is to take the sway. There is no apprehension that the South will be an immediate sufferer by the change—there is no threat to pay it back in its own coin, or to call it to account for malfesance. Nothing of the kind. There are pledges of adherence to past compromises, and of steadfastness to the Constitution. But the South is indignant; and yet, while it

declares irreconciliation, and revels in robbery and bravado, some of the leaders of the North are on their knees to the raving mad-caps, and racking their brains to invent compromises that will placate and reconcile! She spurns them, turns away, and while they follow offering pledges, she refuses to listen.

What will all their pledges do? Republicans may back down; those who hurraed for Lincoln and Hamlin may slink into obscurity, or go a-begging to her offended majesty, and whine as much as they choose; she will be pleased with the humiliation, and encouraged—that is all. The entire proceedings of the North and of the government have been of this sort. The President's Fast was a humiliation of the North for the deed of November 6th. The conciliatory speeches of its leading men in Congress and out of it, the talk and doings relative to liberty bills, pledges to the Union, and the fugitive slave law, are of the same sort—the South all the while asserting that the North must be a mere rump of the Republic if she shall have anything more to do with it.

Attempts at compromise have done nothing—peace conventions the same. All they can do is perhaps to recommend the Crittenden amendment. If so, and the Border States compromise be adopted and acted on by the incoming administration, what then? Will the leading secession States be content to forego all that has been done to establish a Southern Confederacy, and their bright visions of glory under King Cotton! Have they not gone too far to turn a somersault into their former peaceable position? Have they done nothing that would require the government to call them to judicial account, or hinder their return to loyal and official position? Supposing they have not, and were all back and right as heretofore, there would be really nothing to insure concord and harmonious co-operation—for compromises have been as nothing. At most it would be only an agreement between freedom and despotism, which the past too evidently shows cannot long exist. Freedom is by nature irrepressible; despotism is as naturally determined to repress—and this antagonism must eventuate in open conflict. Compromise may prevent it for a time, but the struggle *must* come, it *has* come, and compromise will in vain attempt to stave it off. The attempt is ungenerous. Our children would, by the success of such an effort, be required to do that from which their fathers shrink. It would be unwise. The present is as propitious as any time we can expect, and as brave and devoted hearts as the future is likely to produce, are deeply concerned. Let the difficulty be settled *now*. Shall freedom or despotism rule?

The Republican administration ought to decide. How? By reconstruction or compromise? Not compromise: that, as it has been, can be only a miserable failure. Reconstruct? *Yes*, and *no*. *Yes*—if in national convention the position of the original framers of the Constitution be assumed, and it will give us an instrument recognizing the Creator of heaven and earth as the God of the nation, and recognize our Saviour Jesus Christ and the Holy Scriptures as worthy of homage and obedience; if traffic in mankind is

excluded, and the Sabbath sanctified. But *no, forever no*—if it be a reaffirmation of the retrograding of the original constructors on these points. “Our fathers swung back on the extreme opposite” (of the religion of the old country) “of ignoring God as the Ruler of the nations,” said Rev. Dr. Vinton, of Trinity church, New York. “We have forgotten God, and set up in his stead the goddess of Liberty—lost sight of the fact that human powers are ordained of God—and set up insatiate Mammon to divide the honors with the goddess of Liberty,” said Rev. Dr. Gallaudet, of the same city. *No, forever no*—if it be the extension of slave territory, the suppression of free suffrage, the non-interference with oppression, the perpetuation of slavery. We have reconstruction and compromise before us. We abhor compromise, and have little expectation of a desirable reconstruction. It is probable, however, that one of them will be adopted, and compromise is most likely. Its adoption, however, is not so near as the inauguration of the President elect. Whatever are his opinions and wishes, he must then swear to the Constitution *as it is*, and to execute the laws of which six States are in open violation. When inducted into office, he cannot do otherwise than require of them obedience—he must demand the surrender of United States property. If they continue to be refractory, what then? “Coerce?” Faugh! That word is a cunning manufacture, a subtle appeal to soft hearts for sympathy for the wolf, because the lamb is unwilling he should eat him. Yes, “coerce,” if you please to call it such. For what other purpose does the magistrate bear the sword, than to insure obedience? And is it to be drawn only against foreign foes, while those of his own household may set him at defiance and kick him out of doors? To maintain authority is not coercion—to enter Southern ports is not aggression. When United States troops enter the territories of seceders they are still on their own soil. They claim their own when they claim the forts, arsenals and magazines in the South; and if any interfere with their occupancy and use of them, do with them as was done with John Brown and his confederates. But if the insurrectionists are not so easily caught as were those simple men, and it is found that gas won’t do, give them bullets; and when they cry “coercion,” add “a little more grape;” and when “these men of buckram” have enough, they will say so—and not till then will attempts at compromise or reconstruction be of use.

J. W. SHAW.

CONFORMITY TO CHRIST THE EVIDENCE OF DWELLING IN HIM.

Continued from page 81.

“He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.”
1 John 2: 6.

THE Lord Jesus sustains a variety of relations to his people, and fills a variety of offices, all of which are interesting and necessary to their salvation. He is the great apostle and high-priest of our