
LONDON PEACE CONVENTION

Source: *The Advocate of Peace (1837-1845)*, Vol. 5, No. 9 (SEPTEMBER, 1843), pp. 97-107

Published by: {sage}

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27888504>

Accessed: 16-08-2024 08:03 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Advocate of Peace (1837-1845)*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

SEPTEMBER, 1843.

LONDON PEACE CONVENTION.

One of the most important peace movements of our age is the General Convention held in London this year. We had no account of it before our last number was made up, and have as yet, no regular authentic statements of it from our London friends; but supposing it will now be the most interesting subject that we can offer, we occupy the greatest portion of the present number with such accounts as we can gather from the papers sent us by the London Committee. In the first place we give an extract from a letter from our Corresponding Secretary—a delegate of the American Peace Society to the Convention—received by the Caledonia, dated London, June 30.

“Our General Peace Convention began its session on the 22nd inst. in Freemasons’ Hall, continued three days there, and closed on the 26th with a public meeting in Exeter Hall. The exact number of delegates actually present I do not know; but I believe it was some 300. The attendance, quite to my surprise and gratification, was as good as at the great Anti-Slavery Convention which immediately preceded it. A number of members of Parliament attended as much as their parliamentary duties would allow; and we were honored through all our meetings with the presence of the Marquis de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, President of the Society of Christian Morals, Paris, and others from France, Switzerland, and some other parts of the continent. I think we had fourteen representatives from America, and I found after the Convention closed, that there were others from our side of the Atlantic who wished very much the honor of a seat with us; one proof of the estimation in which the movement was held here. I will not now enter upon any detail of what the Convention have done. Its elements were of course heterogeneous and liable to collision and miscarriage; but our proceedings, with one transient exception near the commencement, were remarkably harmonious. The kindest and best feelings pervaded the Convention to its close; nor was there on any important point, a divided vote.

“Each session was opened with prayer; and seldom have I seen in any similar meeting, demonstrations equally strong of a religious feeling. We did not, as we could not in so short a time, accomplish all we desired; but the progress and results of the Convention so far exceeded the expectations of its most sanguine friends, that we were quite willing to leave some points of interest and importance to a second Convention for which we made provision by a final vote like that passed at the first Anti-Slavery Convention in this city.”

VOL. V.—No. 9.—MONTHLY.

9

We next copy from the London Nonconformist, of June 28th.

“Dr. JOHN LEE, in proposing Mr. C. Hindley, M. P., as the President of the Convention, said he felt bound to present his thanks to the Committee and the Secretary who had conducted the Convention so successfully to its present position. In 1841, it appeared that a Convention of the friends of peace was held in Boston, in the United States of America. Upon that occasion it was thought that the period had arrived when it was necessary to hold a Convention of the friends of peace all over the world. Mr. Joseph Sturge, one of the most devoted friends of the Convention, was present at the meeting in America, and communicated the opinion of their friends there to the London Peace Society, and after mature deliberation, it was determined to hold a Convention of the friends of universal peace in London in 1842. That Convention was held, and it was then determined to hold a general Convention of the friends of peace all over the world. Owing to the labors of the Committee appointed upon that occasion to make the preliminary arrangements, they were then assembled to carry out their objects. He had the pleasure of announcing to the meeting that they recognized deputies from America, from Brussels, Mons, Paris, and various other places. They had received the most satisfactory and encouraging communications from several parts of the continent. In the absence of Judge Jay, the Committee resolved to nominate Mr. Charles Hindley, M. P., as President of that Convention.

“Mr. A. WALKER, of the Oberlin Institute, Ohio, briefly seconded the motion, which was unanimously adopted.

“Mr. HINDLEY, M. P., having taken the chair, said he hoped the time was rapidly approaching when the foolish, wicked, and anti-Christian character of war would be made thoroughly manifest to all mankind—when the swords should be turned into ploughshares, and the spears into pruning-hooks. It appeared to him that great improvement must take place throughout the world before their objects were carried out; therefore, in attempting to promote the principles of peace, they were not bound to say that differences would not arise amongst nations, but to show how much better and easier it would be to settle all disputes without setting nations to murdering and destroying each other. Differences there would be, of course, between nations, but justice could be done by referring the matter with respect to which those differences might arise, to the decision of other and independent powers. As they had met for a practical object, he would suggest that the observations of the delegates should likewise be of as practical a nature as possible.

“The Rev. J. JEFFERSON, the Secretary, read a brief statement showing the circumstances which had given rise to the assemblage of the Convention, and the objects contemplated by it. He also read letters from several delegates, explanatory of the causes which prevented their being present at that meeting. There were 300 delegates, including seventeen from America, six from France, and many from other parts of the continent of Europe. The Secretary then proceeded to read the rules for conducting the business of the Convention.

“Mr. R. J. ROUS, late a lieutenant of the royal navy, proposed an amendment to the principle on which the Convention was formed, affirming that war, whether offensive or defensive, was inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity; but, after a very lengthened discussion, it was negatived.

“Le Marquis de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, J. Brotherton, M. P., John Tappan, of Boston, Joseph Sturge, Amasa Walker and Dr. Cock, of New York, Dr. Bowring, M. P., Dr. Lee, Rev. G. C. Beckwith, of Boston, United States, M. Edmund Verrue, of Brussels, George M. Gibbs, of Paris, M. Eugene Doxar, of Lausanne, were appointed Vice Presidents of the Convention. M. M. Hierson, of Brussels, M. M. Pletian, and M. M. De Ferol, of Paris, were also present after the appointment of five Secretaries, who were to act also as a committee to arrange the business of the Convention.

“The Rev. JOHN BURNETT, of Camberwell, read a paper on the essential sinfulness of war, and its direct opposition to the spirit and precepts of Christianity, the prosperity of nations and the true interests of mankind. It was listened to with great attention, and elicited frequent demonstrations of approval.

“The Rev. JAMES HARGREAVES proposed, ‘That the paper now read be referred to a committee to consider its contents, and to report as to the course to be adopted upon it by the Convention.’

“The reverend gentleman said, he was one of the oldest advocates of the doctrines of the Peace Society, having embraced the principle upon which it was founded from the study of the contents of divine revelation, long before the existence of any society, and when he was considered mad for attempting to speak in condemnation of war. War, he maintained, was essentially, and not accidentally sinful; it was sinful under all circumstances.

“The Rev. G. C. BECKWITH seconded the resolution.

“Mr. WILLIAM FORSTER directed the attention of the Convention to the despatch of Major-general Napier, dated 24th of March, giving an account of his operations in Scinde, in which he describes the cavalry as pursuing and cutting down the retreating and fugitive enemy for several miles. He hoped the Convention would not separate, without passing some resolution expressive of its sentiments on the subject of the Indian war; and that the time was not far distant when there would be found men in the houses of Parliament possessing Christian principle and moral courage to hold up their hands in opposition to votes of thanks for such atrocities.

“Captain GEORGE PILKINGTON and ARNOLD BUFFUM, of Cincinnati, spoke to the resolution, which was put and carried.

“The Secretary then read letters from several persons approving of the objects contemplated by the Convention, and apologizing for their unavoidable absence.

“The Convention adjourned till four o’clock.

“The delegates assembled at four o’clock, Charles Hindley, Esq., M. P., in the chair.

“The Rev. JOHN JEFFERSON, the Secretary, read the minutes of the morning sitting, which were confirmed; and also documents from the friends of peace at Geneva, at Paris, at Stockholm, at Toronto, Canada, the United States, and other parts of the world, of an exceedingly interesting nature, and bearing upon the object which the Convention had met to promote.

“SHARMAN CRAWFORD, Esq., M. P., was received with loud cheers. He said he felt it his duty to attend the Convention, to express his adhesion to its declaration that war was inconsistent with Christianity. A resolution to that effect had been placed in his hand, and he cordially concurred in the sentiments it expressed, that no wars in which this country had ever been engaged were more hostile to the liberties of the people than the wars carried on in China, Affghanistan, or Scinde. Every man who was a lover of liberty, and had a disposition to be kind to his fellow-creatures, should have deprecated them, and he believed that every man who suffered death on these occasions might justly bring a charge of murder against us. No power of compulsion ought ever to be employed against the independent and inherent rights of mankind. He should wish to see the influence of England extended over the world by acting out the principles of our blessed Redeemer, for the promotion of peace on earth and good will towards men. With these views, he begged to submit the following resolution:—

“That the recent wars in China, Affghanistan, and now on the Ameers of Scinde, are, in the opinion of this Convention, gross violations of all equitable Christian principles, and directly calculated to prejudice the reception of evangelical truth in the heathen nations, as well as to depreciate the character and influence of the British people throughout the whole civilized world.”

“The Rev. W. Brock, of Norwich, in seconding the resolution, commented upon the establishment of naval and military schools for teaching the art of war, and adverted to the circumstance of the British government having recently negotiated for and encouraged the invention of implements for the more rapid destruction of human life. He hoped that another state of things would for the future exist, and he was sure that whatever advance might be made towards the abolition of war would be traceable to the exertions of the Peace Convention.

“A discussion having arisen with respect to the responsibility which devolved upon the government in carrying on the recent wars, an amendment was proposed to the effect that the resolution should specify the relative responsibility of the people and the government. The Rev. E. Miall and several others supported the amendment sustaining the distinction which was drawn between the power which should be represented and the acts of those who should represent.

“A slight alteration, in conformity with the amendment, having been made in the original resolution, it was unanimously adopted.

“The report of the Committee on the paper read by the Rev. John Burnett was brought up. It recommended that the document should be published, with the author's name attached, but that it should be on his responsibility. A vote of thanks for preparing the paper, which was very highly approved of, was then unanimously passed to Mr. Burnett.

“Mr. J. Allen, of Liskeard, read a paper on statistics, showing the various amounts of the revenues of the several countries of Europe, the expenses of maintaining their military and naval forces, and the immense destruction of human life caused by war and its engines of death.

“At half-past seven o'clock P. M. the proceedings of the Convention were adjourned.

“On Friday Mr. Brotherton, M. P., one of the Vice-Presidents, took the chair and delivered a short address, of which the following is an extract:—

“One principle should ever be kept steadily in view—namely, never to approve of or applaud war or warriors—those merciless destroyers of mankind; but to give every honor to those who bestowed services upon their country by cultivating the arts, sciences, and manufactures. He did not believe that God, who gave man life, ever designed or intended that it should be taken away by his fellow-man. By the infliction of capital punishments a very gross anomaly was caused. If one man killed another, it was said he was guilty of murder; but, unfortunately, people were found to be so foolish as to say that a human sovereign could set aside divine dispensations. No human law could be just which was opposed to the divine law. If France and England were to unite in disbanding their armies, and proclaim to the world their determination to submit all their disputes to the arbitration of other powerful nations, they would produce a very great and salutary effect throughout the world. He believed that the moral power of England was much stronger and more influential than her physical power; that moral principles were stronger than even the power of armies; and that such principles would, in opposition to the most powerful despots, make their way and ultimately triumph.”

“Dr. Bowring, M. P., said that a most agreeable task had devolved upon him, by introducing to the meeting a very distinguished person—the Marquis de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt. He bore a very illustrious name—a name which had been illustrious for generations; he occupied, most worthily, a distinguished rank in society, while, personally, he was connected with every thing that was benevolent, great, and beneficent in his native land.

“The Marquis de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt then addressed the meeting at considerable length, in the French language. He said he felt

bound first to express how highly honored he deemed himself in being permitted to take a part in the conference on a question so exalted and noble as that of permanent and universal peace. The Société de la Morale Chrétienne had, for the last twenty years, gained the good opinion of the public by defending all the doctrines of Christian love and humanity, and had continually been, in effect, a French society of peace; his father, the late Duke de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, had been its first President; to him succeeded M. le Duc de Broglie, M. Guizot, M. Benjamin Constant, and he (the speaker), unworthy as he was, had followed them in that office. He proceeded to describe the work performed by that Society—

“The Société de la Morale Chrétienne had unceasingly elicited noble thoughts; it had proclaimed, with as much zeal as success, religious liberty and the necessity of religious convictions; descending into the social condition, it had obtained the abolition of lotteries, and he had the honor of being its organ in the Chamber of Deputies, and of proposing the law which closed the gambling houses in France. At the present moment, that Society was unremittingly pursuing the emancipation of slaves, the abolition of capital punishment, the suppression of torture in prison, and the admission into their laws of every measure calculated to serve the interests of morality amongst the masses, temperance in individuals, and religious education amongst the people. It was the only society in France which had openly declared itself to be a Peace Society—the only one which had unceasingly given open expression to its horror of war—the only one which had opposed itself, without limit, as well to duelling and revolts as against conquests; and, fully maintaining its independence, it united itself to its ancient President, to whom diplomatic trusts were at present confided, in order that it might maintain, in conjunction with him, the policy of moderation and peace.

“He thought he could not better evince his gratitude to them for permitting him to take a part in that congress, than by bringing before them official and authentic documents relative to the state of the question in his own country. It was a tribute which he felt due to that assembly, who kindly permitted him to address them in his own language, as if it were a bond of their sympathies to associate the languages in the same manner as they were in that room blending the generous sentiments of the two nations.

“In 1840, on the first announcement of a war which was still far distant, they had seen the population turning from their usual occupations—commerce and industry brought to an unsteady and timid stand, and crowds of idlers in their towns exciting day by day increased disorder—the songs of war re-echoed in their theatres—the evening cry was, ‘Citizens, to arms!’ and the friends of peace lost all security. Meanwhile the government made preparations for undertaking and maintaining a general war; an army of 900,000 men was raised, the memories of the Empire were summed up, the Capital was covered with fortresses, as if to give rise on all sides to thoughts of war, the national honor was appealed to without any motive, and the speedy occurrence of battles and conquests was proclaimed in order to flatter popular ambition. The agitation which resulted from this produced a great increase of crime. In 1839 there were only 5,621 accusations brought before the courts of assize, in 1840 they increased to 6,004, while in 1841, under a peace policy, they diminished to 5,528. In 1839, 7,858 persons were charged with crime; in 1840, 8,226; while in 1841, there were only 7,462. In 1839 the number of convictions was 5,063; it increased in 1840 to 5,476; and in 1841 it decreased to 5,016. If the calculations only referred to greater crimes, it would be found, that in 1839 there were 1949 persons condemned to death, hard labor, or solitary confinement; but in 1840 their number was 2,324, while in 1841 they were 2,033. It was proved that in France, on the first announcement of war, crimes increased seven per cent.; and that

directly after peace was confirmed there was a decrease of eight per cent. on crime generally, and of twelve per cent. on aggravated offences. The speaker then proceeded to show, by a number of statistical accounts, that warlike rumors had diminished the lodgments in savings' banks, and caused an increase of the withdrawal of deposits. In September, 1840, in the midst of warlike preparations, the receipts at savings' banks were only 1,700,000*f.*, and the repayments 4,000,000*f.* In the month of October the receipts were about the same amount, while the repayments exceeded 6,000,000*f.*; but at the end of that month, on the accession of a peace minister, confidence directly revived; and in January, 1840, the lodgments exceeded 4,400,000*f.*, and the repayments had sunk to 1,900,000*f.* The same results were seen in the public funds, which, in 1840, directly after that war was announced, fell from 119*f.* to 111*f.* 50*c.* Since that, peace had become more firmly established, and the funds had daily increased until they had reached their present unusual height of 122*f.*"

"On motion of Dr. LEE, seconded by Mr. WALKER, of the Oberlin Institution, Ohio, a vote of thanks was passed to the Marquis de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, for his acceptance of the office of Vice-President of the Convention, and for the admirable sentiments he had then expressed in its support.

"The noble *Marquis* returned thanks in his native language, and expressed the gratification he felt at being the object of so flattering a compliment as that paid him by the meeting.

"It was intimated to the meeting that Mr. Rous and Mr. Pilkington wished to withdraw from the Convention.

"Mr. H. T. J. MACNAMARA, barrister, author of the Prize Essay on Peace, read a paper upon the best practical means of carrying out the principles upon which the Convention was founded. It also noticed particularly, and eulogized the suggestions laid before the public by Judge Jay and the late Mr. Ladd.

"The Rev. T. PYNE, M. A., incumbent of Thames Ditton, Surrey, moved that a committee be appointed to consider the paper, and report to the Convention in the course of the evening the best means of carrying out the important suggestions it contained. The resolution having been seconded by Mr. G. M. Gibbs, delegate from Paris, was, after a short discussion, adopted.

"Mr. L. TAPPAN, of New York, rose to propose the next resolution, to the effect that the maintenance of peace with China, by which, and under Providence, the blessings of Christianity might gradually be extended to one third of the population of the globe, was earnestly to be desired, but that it was the deliberate opinion of the Convention that the contraband traffic in opium carried on by British subjects, being a subject of extreme irritation to the government and people of that Empire, threatened again to renew the horrors which characterized the recent war, and that it was the bounden duty of the delegates individually and collectively to exert themselves for the suppression of that great evil.

"The Rev. C. STOVEL seconded the resolution.

"Mr. JOSEPH SAMMS, of Barnard Castle; Mr. ANDREWS, a delegate from Texas; the Rev. JOSHUA LEAVITT, of Boston; Dr. COCK, of New York, and several other delegates having supported the resolution, it was adopted.—Adjourned.

"Mr. HINDLEY, M. P., having taken the chair at four o'clock, the Rev. Dr. J. P. SMITH read a paper, in the form of an address to Christian ministers, teachers in colleges and schools, and the professors of Christianity generally; to be adapted also to the members of literary and scientific institutions.

"A committee was then appointed for the purpose of considering Dr. Smith's address and reporting thereon.

"Lord R. GROSVENOR, M. P., who was received with demonstrations of applause, said he felt great difficulty in addressing the meeting on that

occasion, as he had to speak in the presence of many who were superior to him in the investigation of the means by which the objects of the Convention might be attained, and likewise his superiors in learning and piety; but it was not fit that he should shrink from the performance of the duty of boldly expressing his opinion on the subject that had brought them together. He was one of those who thought that war was abhorrent from the principles of that gospel in which they said they had faith, and in which they professed their belief. Whatever course might be pursued, they should endeavor to conciliate those who differed from them. It should be recollected, that those who were now fighting their battles did so in obedience to the command of higher powers and under the sanction of public opinion. He trusted, then, that their feelings would be spared. After eulogizing the conduct of the foreign delegates, who had traveled so vast a distance to evince the sincerity of their sentiments, the noble Lord proposed a vote of thanks to Dr. Pye Smith, for the admirable paper which he had submitted for the consideration of the Convention.

"The resolution was seconded, and unanimously adopted.

"The Convention was subsequently addressed by several delegates, amongst whom were Mr. J. T. PRICE; Mr. W. FORSTER; Mr. WRIGHT, of Philadelphia; Mr. O'NEILL; Mr. WEBB, of Dublin, &c.; but their observations were principally directed to unimportant resolutions, some of which were deferred or withdrawn.

"The Rev. Mr. BECKWITH read a paper, written by Mr. J. P. Blanchard, general agent of the American Peace Society, entitled 'An Article on the Preparations for War.' The Convention then adjourned to Saturday.

"On re-assembling at ten o'clock, Mr. LEWIS TAPPAN, of New York, was called to the chair.

"The Rev. JOHN JEFFERSON brought up the report of the committee appointed to consider the address to Christian ministers submitted to the Convention by Dr. J. P. Smith.

"On the motion of the Rev. J. HARGREAVES, seconded by Mr. R. JOWITT, of Leeds, the address was adopted.

"Mr. JOSEPH STURGE brought up the following address to the governments of the civilized world, which, on the motion of Mr. JOHN ALLEN, of Liskeard, seconded by Mr. JOHN SCOBLE, was unanimously adopted:—

"For rational beings, possessing immortal souls, to be systematically trained to kill each other, is in itself so utterly opposed, not only to the Christian religion but to the dictates of humanity, that nothing but the natural depravity of the human heart, the form of education, and long familiarity with war, can account for the general prevalence of this monstrous system. Under a deep sense of the enormous evils which mankind have so long and so extensively suffered from the wars which have desolated the earth, this Convention is more especially impressed with the great responsibility of those who are in a position to direct the councils of nations, and appeals to them to adopt the most effectual measures to prevent the continuance of this terrible scourge of the race.

"The Convention is of opinion that one of the greatest securities against the recurrence of international warfare would be the recognition of the principle of arbitration, and the introduction of a clause into treaties between nations, binding themselves to refer all differences that may arise to the adjudication of one or more friendly powers, and it earnestly recommends the adoption of this practice.

"The Convention, in a spirit of Christian love, respectfully urges upon those who are invested with the highest authority, the promotion of 'Peace on earth, and good will to man,' and would also express its conviction that such a course would be especially blessed by Him 'by whom kings reign, and princes decree justice.'"

"A vote of thanks was then passed to H. T. J. Macnamara, for his valuable paper on the best practical means of carrying out the principles of peace; and the document was recorded as part of the proceedings of the Convention.

"A very long and desultory discussion ensued with regard to the most practical means of attaining the objects of the Convention. Ultimately, however, a resolution was adopted on the motion of the Rev. Mr. BECKWITH, seconded by Mr. E. CARROLL, of Cork, to the effect that while recommending the plan of Judge Jay, which proposed that nations should enter into treaty stipulations to refer their differences to the 'arbitration' of a friendly power, as the most available means for the prevention of war, the Convention still thought—as the peace societies had from their origin—a congress of nations to settle and perfect the code of international law, and a high court of nations to interpret and apply that law, for the settlement of all national disputes, should be constantly kept in view by the friends of peace, and urged upon governments as the best practical mode of settling peacefully and satisfactorily all international disputes.

"The Rev. JOSHUA LEAVITT, of Boston, United States, was opposed to the congress of nations. Such a measure would throw great power into few hands, and thereby endanger civil and religious liberty.

"On the motion of Mr. J. SAMMS, seconded by Mr. J. BARCLAY, a resolution was passed, calling upon the friends of peace throughout the world to adopt such measures as they may conceive best adapted for the general diffusion of the principles of peace among all classes of the community, but especially among the masses of the people, as being the only efficient mode of producing that amount of public opinion in their favor which will insure the permanent prevention of war in every country.

"Mr. JOSEPH STURGE proposed the following resolution:—

"That this Convention regard the mutual dependence of nations upon each other, arising out of an unrestricted interchange of their legitimate productions, as one of the best securities for peace."

"The Marquis DE LA ROCHEFOUCAULD LIANCOURT seconded the resolution. The mutual dependence of nations, he said, upon each other, arising out of an unrestricted interchange of their legitimate productions, should be estimated as one of the best securities for peace. He regretted his inability to address the Convention in English. He cordially supported the resolution, and trusted that the unrestricted interchange of the productions of all countries would be adopted both in England and France. He was extremely grateful for the kind reception the Convention had given him, and would return to his own country with the most gratifying recollections of the part he had been permitted to take in their proceedings, and their kind approval of his slight co-operation with them. Since his arrival in London he had been frequently asked by persons who knew he was connected with the *Société de la Morale Chrétienne*, what description of books were published by that Society; he begged in reply to state what they were. The Marquis having communicated the various publications issued by the Society, requested the acceptance, by the Convention, of ten volumes of those works.

"The resolution was then put and carried, and a resolution of thanks to the Marquis de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, was carried with applause.

"Mr. FOSTER, of Norwich, proposed resolutions condemnatory of the practice of educating youth in military schools, and disapproving of the manufacture of offensive and defensive weapons.

"The Rev. J. SHERMAN seconded the resolutions, which, after considerable discussion, were carried unanimously.

"Mr. WEBB, of Dublin, proposed the following resolution:—

"That since intemperance is in various ways one of the principal causes of the violation of peace, this Convention earnestly presses upon all classes the necessity of promoting, to the extent of their power and influence, the principles and practice of temperance."

"The resolution was carried unanimously.

“Mr. THOMAS BEGGS, of Nottingham, moved, and Mr. ARTHUR O’NEIL seconded, the following resolution:—

“That this Convention, having solemnly avowed its conviction of the essential sinfulness of war, would earnestly invite the attention of their fellow-citizens to the consideration of the question, how far they are justified in continuing their support, pecuniary or otherwise, to warlike establishments.”

“Mr. SHARMAN CRAWFORD, M. P., Mr. JOSEPH STURGE, and several other delegates, urged the mover to withdraw the resolution, as it might appear in some remote way to call upon the people to resist the payment of taxes. The resolution was then withdrawn.

“The Rev. G. C. BECKWITH brought up the concluding report.

“Mr. J. PRICE expressed his gratification at the result of the Convention’s proceedings. He confessed he did not think the public mind was so well prepared for their proceedings as he found it to be, and he had, therefore, peculiar pleasure in proposing the following resolution:—

“That the Peace Society of London be authorized by this Convention to announce to the world the time and place for holding a second Convention, when it shall be satisfied as to the right time and place, after communicating with its corresponding associations in Europe and America.”

“The Marquis DE LA ROCHEFOUCAULD LIANCOURT, in seconding the resolution, said he hoped the ‘peace cause’ would progress in many other countries in Europe, and that some of them might put in their claims to have the future meetings held there. He assured the Convention that he would at all times do every thing in his power to extend the cause of peace in France, and to forward their views and objects to the utmost of his power.

“Mr. CANNINGS FULLER, as an American, said he had experienced great gratification in attending that meeting, and that if the next were held in his country, he could assure them that they should have a cordial reception.

“Votes of thanks were then passed to the London Peace Society and the President, and the proceedings terminated.”

“THE PUBLIC MEETING.—A public meeting of the friends of universal peace was held on Monday, at Exeter Hall. Amongst those on the platform were the Marquis de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, William Ewart, Esq., M. P., Dr. Bowring, M. P., Joseph Hume, Esq., M. P., Charles Hindley, Esq., M. P., J. S. Buckingham, Esq., James Simpson, Esq., Edinburgh; William Chambers, Esq., Edinburgh; Joseph Sturge, Esq.; A. Walker, Ohio; Lewis Tappan, New York; John Tappan, Esq., Boston; M. M. Beaume, Paris; Rev. Amos A. Phelps, Boston; Dr. Ritchie, Edinburgh; Dr. Cox; Rev. Messrs. John Burnett, Camberwell; James Hargreaves, Charles Stovel, Owen Clark, J. W. Pennington; Arnold Buffum, Esq., &c.

“CHARLES HINDLEY, Esq., M. P., President of the London Peace Society, was called to the chair. He observed that they were assembled at the concluding meeting of the Peace Convention, which had been engaged for three days in considering the best means of averting the calamities of war. The object of that Society was the welfare of the human race. Their opinion was, that war was against the interest of mankind. While they were aware that disputes would continue to arise amongst nations, they believed that there was a much more rational and Christian way of settling them than by appealing to arms, by which hundreds of thousands of lives might be lost. He rejoiced that the feeling was not confined to England alone; they had amongst them gentlemen from America, from France, and from Switzerland. He was not disappointed that the hall was not so crowded as he had seen it on other occasions, because he felt that they were in advance of public opinion upon this subject. He hoped he would see the time when so humble an individual as himself would not be called upon to preside over their meetings, but that even the Duke of Wellington himself would be found

presiding. He respected the noble Duke, not as the hero of Waterloo, but as the statesman who used his influence to preserve peace and prevent war; and he rejoiced to find another great warrior in France imbued with the same feeling. He would call upon all governments of the earth to re-echo their sentiments, and declare that wars shall exist no more, and that swords shall be turned into ploughshares and spears into pruning-hooks.

"The Marquis DE LA ROCHEFOUCAULD LIANCOURT came forward to propose the following resolution, and was received with great applause:—

"That this meeting, regarding the whole scope of the New Testament, and the awful ravages of war among the nations of the earth, is confirmed in the strong conviction, that war is inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, and the true interests of mankind."

"He said that, during the last year, 24 works in Italian, German, English, and French, on the question of peace, had been addressed to 'La Societé de la Morale Chretienne;' let it be hoped that a still greater number would be presented in this year, and that they might thus peacefully influence public opinion, in order to lead the sincere convictions of all Christians to respect the life of man which God had given him, and which God alone had the right to take from him.

"The Rev. G. C. BECKWITH, Corresponding Secretary of the American Peace Society, seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

"Mr. WILLIAM STORR FRY proposed the following resolution, which was seconded by Dr. RITCHIE, of Edinburgh, and carried:—

"That while this meeting disclaim any intention to use any unconstitutional interference with the powers that be, it cannot refrain from expressing its abhorrence of the late cruel and unprovoked war in the East, and especially laments the permitted traffic in opium, which it regards as not only unjustifiable in itself, but calculated to obstruct legitimate commerce, and to provoke a renewal of hostilities."

"The Rev. CHARLES STOVEL proposed a resolution, calling upon all Christians to co-operate in diffusing the principles of peace, which was seconded by the Rev. J. PENNINGTON.

"Mr. HUME, M. P., in supporting the resolution, alluded to the national expenses which were incurred by military operations, and by the maintenance of war establishments; he however feared that the time had not yet arrived when the differences between nations could be settled by arbitration, as the Convention had recommended. It was some evidence of the progress of peace principles, that Parliament had last year for the first time passed a vote of thanks to the successful negotiator of peace, that honor having been hitherto reserved for those only who had effected their objects by force of arms.

"Mr. A. WALKER, of Ohio, proposed a resolution, stating that Christian women had as deep an interest as any other portion of society in the progress of peace, and owed to the cause of peace the same aid which they had with so much zeal and success rendered to kindred enterprises of benevolence and reform.

"Mr. J. S. BUCKINGHAM, in seconding the motion, referred generally to the various disadvantages of war, which, he observed, while it was destructive of property, obstructed the civilization of countries, and the more universal cultivation of the arts.

"Mr. STURGE proposed, and Mr. LEWIS TAPPAN, of New York, seconded the next resolution, approving of the principle of 'arbitration,' as the best means of amicably settling international differences.

"The Rev. JOHN BURNETT, of Camberwell, proposed, and ARNOLD BUFFUM, of Ohio, seconded, the following resolution, which was carried with great cheering, after which the meeting was dissolved:—

"That this meeting unequivocally avows its attachment to civil order and good government; it is, nevertheless, constrained to declare its serious alarm at the preparations which are being made for the preservation of tranquillity in Ireland by the employment of military force and recommends to the friends of peace throughout the world to adopt all peaceful and constitutional measures, by memorials, petitions, &c., in order to avert so fearful a calamity."

PEACE CONVENTION—DEPUTATION TO SIR ROBERT PEEL, BART.—A deputation consisting of the following gentlemen waited on Sir Robert Peel, by appointment, on Saturday, July 1st, to present to him an “Address to the governments of the civilized world,” agreed to in the recent sittings of the Peace Convention in this metropolis:—the Marquis de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, member of the French Chamber of Deputies; Lewis Tappan, Esq., of New York, a Director of the American Peace Society; Monsieur Verrue, of Brussels, Secretary to the Brussels Peace Society; Monsieur de Lalung de Ferol; Samuel Gurney, Esq., Treasurer of the London Peace Society, John Lee, Esq., LL. D., chairman of the committee; Henry T. J. Macnamara, Esq., of the Inner Temple; and the Rev. John Jefferson, one of the Secretaries of the London Peace Society. The deputation was introduced by John Bowring, Esq., LL. D., M. P., who briefly stated the object of the deputation, to present an address from the Peace Convention, urging the introduction of a clause in all international treaties, binding the parties to refer all disputes that may arise to the arbitration of one or more friendly powers. The address was read by the Secretary, and very courteously received by the Prime Minister, who promised to place it before the other members of her Majesty’s Government, and stated that the principle of arbitration has been frequently and successfully acted upon during the last twenty years. Sir Robert also said, that immediately upon the present differences arising between Buenos Ayres and Monte Video, the British and French Governments put in strong remonstrances, and offered their friendly mediation. Mr. Tappan called the attention of Sir Robert to the particular point of introducing a binding clause into treaties; and Mr. Gurney spoke of the importance of governments acting upon Christian principle.

London Patriot.

WARLIKE CONDITION OF CHRISTENDOM.

Let us trace some of the consequences of the martial spirit, which in former times reigned in every heart, and which even now, though weakened, retains its dominion. Look to England; the supposed prosperity of this nation is believed to be the result of her military spirit. She has been almost continually, from the Norman conquest down to the present time, in conflict with some other nation. Her military posts raise themselves up in defiance all over the broad surface of the earth; her floating batteries trouble the waters of the whole world. Her military spirit has gone north and south, and east and west, for conquest. The blood of her sons has moistened every soil, the bones of her children have whitened every land. Has not the same spirit which fired the blood of the northern savage, when he overran the island now the “mistress of the ocean,” continued to manifest itself through generation after generation to the present day? Is it not the *love of conquest*, seeking good for itself by the destruction of others, which has thus acquired and retained dominion over the remotest parts of the earth? Unlovely as is this trait of character, pirate-like, robber-like as it is, opposed directly to the self-sacrificing spirit of Christianity, till of late few have been so bold as to question it.

We allude not invidiously to England; we have selected her for an example, because it is easier to see the mist which hangs over others, than that in which we are ourselves enveloped. The same red stream flows in our veins, and this Anglo-Saxon blood is pre-eminent in the annals of warfare. We vaunt ourselves that we are as skilful in shedding blood, and as ready and willing to encounter a foe on the field of battle, as the most warlike. Our homes in this land are mainly by conquest; we fought side by side with England as her colonies; the birth-throe of our nation was in the field of blood; the martial spirit was revived in our last contest with England; and even now there are many among us ready to “let slip the dogs of war” for a narrow strip of waste land on our eastern borders.