

*John Marshall*

---

CANADIAN DOMINION TESTED,  
&c. &c.

---

BY  
JOHN GEORGE MARSHALL,  
RETIRED JUDGE, &c.

---

---



THE  
CANADIAN DOMINION

TESTED BY THE EVIDENCE

OF

Scripture and History.

---

BY

JOHN GEORGE MARSHALL,

Retired Judge, &c.

---

HALIFAX, N. S.

PRINTED BY J. B. STRONG, 64 BEDFORD ROW.

1868.



# THE CANADIAN DOMINION TESTED, &c.

- - -

Of the great variety of subjects on which a supernatural influence is exercised, there is, probably none, whereon, in general, there is less correct knowledge, and more incredulity, even among really christian people, than the truth of the constant overruling government of Divine Providence, both as to individuals and nations. From the natural pride and blindness of mankind, as to the character and dispensations of the Deity, they are ever inclined to forget or set aside, that divine interposition; and to assign some real or supposed merely natural causes, as producing the various events of life, whether prosperous or adverse; or whether affecting individuals, families, or nations. If a destructive disease occurs among human beings, or the inferior animals, it is generally mentioned, as proceeding from some atmospheric malarious influence, or other cause, of a merely natural and secondary character. Herein is manifested a want of knowledge, or a disbelief of these plain Scripture declarations:—"Shall there be evil in a City, and the Lord hath not done it?" (AMOS, 3, 6.)—"He that chastiseth the heathen shall not be correct:" (PS. 94. 10.)—"He doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men." (LAM. 3, 33.)—But for their prophet." (HEB. 12. 10.) There are many similar announcements in Scripture, regarding a divine overruling influence and government, exercised in the affairs of nations. The following are express on the point:—"The kingdom is the Lord's, and He is the governor among the nations." (PS. 22, 28.)—"His kingdom ruleth over all." (PS. 103, 19.)—"If they will not obey, I will utterly pluck up and destroy that nation, saith the Lord," (JER. 12, 17.) But yet, in the case of nations, as also in that of individuals,

although such overruling government may at times, permit acts of injustice and oppression to be committed, it affords them no manner of approval; but frequently, as to individuals, and always in the case of nations, sooner or later, temporal retribution and punishment are divinely executed.

It is conducive to the greatest measure of human welfare, that there is such a divine influence and overruling government. Were it not so, there would have been exhibited in every part of our world, constant scenes of oppression, injustice, and cruelty, on one hand; and of degradation, affliction and revengeful feelings and acts on the other, even far beyond that extent of those evils which has actually prevailed. Such divine controlling and influencing government, is worthy of far more and deeper consideration than is generally conceded. If admitted, in terms, it is not, in general, believed to be actually as operative and extensive, as the facts of both scriptural and secular history plainly reveal.

It is my design, in the present Essay, to show, by the testimonies which both these histories afford, that it is not the will of the Divine Ruler, to establish *permanently*, extensive Empires and governments to rule over other nations and countries, but on the contrary, it appears to be His will and design, that each nation, and people, as to civil rule, shall be independent of every other power; and have and enjoy the government of all its own affairs; except in some special instances, in which that infinitely wise and Almighty Ruler, for effecting certain purposes of justice, or mercy, toward mankind, is pleased to establish and uphold, but, only for a time, some powerful Empire, to rule over any certain number of other nations or countries.

In elucidating and maintaining these combined and important propositions, it will be needful to look very far back into the records of national history; even to some of the earliest patriarchal ages. And here, as also in several other parts of this historical examination, recourse must be had to the infallible authority of scripture evidence. In Genesis Ch 10. we read of the general division of the earth, among the immediate descendants of the three Sons of Noah,—Shem, Ham, and Japheth. The portions of the earth divinely divided and assigned to the descendants of each of them,

are particularly mentioned and described ; and it is there said of that division, that it was made to, “ every one, after his tongue, after their families, in their nations.” Although they all originally descended from the one family, there is no word or intimation given as to any Union or Confederation among any of them, regarding political government, or management of public affairs. In the next Chapter, we further find, that the whole of mankind were then, “ of one language, and of one Speech” and that they commenced building a city and tower to reach to the utmost height, lest they should “be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.” This design being contrary to the will and intention of the Divine Ruler, he confounded their language, so that they could not “ understand one another’s speech;” and by this dispensation, they were obliged to desist from their proud and absurd enterprise ; and did become scattered abroad “ upon the face of all the earth,” according to the divine intention. In Deuteronomy 32, 8. it is further written :— “ When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance ; when He separated the Sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people, according to the number of the children of Israel.” A learned commentator, in remarking on this passage, has thus written :— “ The meaning of the passage, seems to be, that when God divided the earth among mankind, he reserved twelve lots, according to the number of the Sons of Jacob, which he was now about to give to their descendants, according to his promise.”

We further find in sacred writ, that when the chosen people of Israel were delivered from Egyptian bondage, although they all had descended from one family stock ; and as contradistinguished from all other people, composed but one nation. yet in making the estimate of the adult male population, it was taken as to each tribe separately, as mentioned in Ch. 1, of the book of Numbers. In Ch. 26. of the same book, are the Divine commands concerning the division of the land of Canaan among the several tribes ; and it was thereby expressly prescribed, that each tribe should have a separate portion, to be ascertained by lot, with precise boundaries, established throughout the divisions. The book of Joshua shows, that after the conquest of the country, the division was actually made, and the boundaries established, according to those Divine

injunctions. By the same authority, each tribe had its own Prince or Chieftain, and judges, and other officers; but all under the supreme government of the Divine Ruler. In making their conquests, only the territories of certain nations, expressly named were divinely given to them; and in Deut. Ch. 2. we read, that they were solemnly and specially commanded not to invade the lands of the adjacent Edomites, Moabites, or Ammonites. Concerning the first mentioned people, the Israelites were told;—"Ye are to pass through the coast of your brethren, the children of Esau, which dwell in Scir; and they shall be afraid of you; take ye good heed unto yourselves, therefore; meddle not with them, for I will not give you of their land, no not so much as a foot breadth, because I have given Mount Scir unto Esau, for a possession." They were further commanded;—"Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with them in battle, for I will not give thee of their land for a possession, because I have given Ar, unto the children of Lot, for a possession." And again, they were commanded; "when thou comest nigh over against the children of Ammon, distress them not, nor meddle with them; for I will not give thee of the land of the Children of Ammon, any possession; because I have given it unto the Children of Lot, for a possession." Yet these three nations were of the kindred of the Israelites, the first named being the descendants of Esau, the brother of Jacob, called Israel; and the two other nations, were the posterity of Lot, the nephew of Abraham, the grandfather of Israel. These relationships may seem to have afforded a reason for the Union or Confederation of all the four nations, into one great Empire, or Republic, or other form of Government; but although, on a first view, it may be thought, that such a Union, or amalgamation, with the divinely chosen, and favoured Israelites, would, both as to religion and secular affairs, have been greatly to the advantage of the three other nations; yet to infinite wisdom it seemed just and right, and best for all of them, to make such arrangements, and give such commands, as to prevent such union, or consolidation, and extension of Civil power and rule.

It is true that the Divine Ruler has in several instances, permitted proud and ambitious Potentates, to conquer and bring



under their dominion, and hold in subjection for certain periods, surrounding or even distant nations. But it is evident, from many facts and express announcements of sacred revelation, that such instances have been permitted to occur, in order to effect some special purposes of the infinitely wise, and Almighty Sovereign. They form but *exceptions* to His general design and arrangement, as already shewn from Scripture, that each nation and people, should have, and independently possess, and retain, a distinct portion of the earth; and having their own separate government, laws and institutions, and the management of all their civil and political affairs; and free from any control, or coercive interference, by any other power. In all the instances mentioned in Scripture, of one Dominion, or power, ruling over various nations and countries, the divine purposes for which they were permitted to possess such rule, are therein *expressly declared*.

The tribes of Israel,—the people divinely chosen to preserve the seed of sacred truth, for the benefit of the whole of mankind—were, as we find in Scripture, delivered from Egyptian bondage and oppression, by the most signal and miraculous displays of Almighty power, in the punishment of their oppressors. By the same Divine Ruler, those tribes were made the instruments of subduing and punishing the guilty nations of Canaan, when their iniquities, as scripturally declared, had “come to the full”; and the Israelites obtained and held their possessions, according to the previous divine promises and appointments. These people, as we further see in their scriptural history, were by numerous express laws and institutions, placed immediately under the divine government and protection; and yet, they also fell into divers idolatries, and other aggravated sins: and consequently, as we further find in that history, they were, in their turn, scourged by the instrumentality of other nations, according as the Lord had, by Moses previously declared and warned them. They were often brought under foreign and oppressive captivity, and by the sword of war, and in other modes, were deeply and justly desolated and afflicted, especially by the Assyrian and Babylonian powers.

There are various opinions, among those who are learned in historical records and events, as to the duration and the extended

dominion of the first great Assyrian kingdom. Rollin, in his 'Ancient History,' says of it, that, "in its earliest period, it only extended between the rivers Euphrates and 'Tigris'; and that "whatever relates to the times of the ancient Assyrians, is attended with great difficulties." We know, however, from Scripture history, that in later ages it became a mighty Power, and was for a considerable period permitted to exercise extensive dominion, and to flourish in magnificence and unrivalled displays of wealth and grandeur in the higher circles of its various populations; though often passing through distressing convulsions and changes, produced by foreign and civil wars and political commotions. In several of the historical and prophetic books of Scripture, we find the inspired predictions, that this haughty and idolatrous nation should be made the Divine instrument to chastise and punish the chosen people of Israel and Judah, and other guilty nations. In Isaiah, ch. 10, 5-6, is written: "O Assyrian! the rod of mine anger and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge to take the spoil and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets." The fulfilment of these predictions is seen in Scripture—2 Kings, ch. 17 and 18—where we read that the King of Assyria took Samaria, the capital of the kingdom of the ten revolted tribes of Israel, imprisoned their king, and entirely subverted and extinguished that monarchy, and carried the inhabitants of the land into captivity, and dispersed them into various parts of the Assyrian dominions. He also subdued and brought under his authority, Damascus and Syria, and many other cities and countries, and carried away numbers of the people as captives. He also took several cities of the kingdom of Judah, and compelled its monarch to pay large sums of money to withdraw his armies. Shortly after, as we further see in the same sacred history, he again invaded that country, besieged Jerusalem the capital, and reduced it to the most distressing privations, until it was relieved, and the country delivered from the chastening affliction, by the divine arm interposing, and suddenly destroying nearly the whole of the Assyrian host; and the proud and haughty monarch, who

had, by his blasphemies, insulted the Majesty of Heaven, was shortly after slain by two of his sons.

We find in scripture history, and prophecy, (2. **KINGS**, ch. 19. — **ISAIAH**, ch. 37.) the previous inspired predictions; that when the Divine Ruler had, by the instrumentality of the Assyrians, executed his judgements on the Israelites, and other guilty nations, He would “punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks;” — “would put a hook in his nose;” — “send a blast upon him,” and remove his yoke from the neck” of those subjugated nations. These inspired predictions were partly fulfilled, by the instantaneous death of myriads of the Assyrian army, and the death of the impious king, as have just been mentioned.

There are sufficiently authentic records, shewing, that the first Assyrian kingdom was subverted by Arbaces, the Governor of Media, then a part of the kingdom. He obtained possession of Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, 747 B. C. and the Dominion was then divided into three parts, each under its own *independent* Sovereign and government. This divisional condition did not continue long; and again the whole Assyrian Dominion came under one monarch, named Esarhaddon. He took Babylon 710. B. C., and formed the second great Assyrian kingdom, which continued until 626, B. C., when Nabopolasser, Governor of Babylon, and Cyaxeres, King of the Medes, took and utterly destroyed the magnificent and renowned Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, as had been prophetically foretold. So complete was that destruction, that for a long course of ages, even the place where it stood remained unknown, and it may seem probable, is not yet certainly ascertained. Authentic Secular History has given information of that conquest and destruction, in satisfactory accordance with the inspired Scripture predictions, already cited. On that destruction of Nineveh, Babylon became the only Capital of the Assyrian, or, as it was thereafter named, the Babylonian Kingdom. From the foregoing historical facts, we see that the second great Assyrian kingdom, which, according to the Divine predictions and appointments, had conquered and ruled with rigour over Israel and several other nations and countries, as a punishment for their

idolatrics and other wickedness, only lasted about one hundred and sixteen years, from 710, to 626 B. C.

The idolatrous Babylonian power commenced its climax of greatness and oppressive dominion, under the renowned Nebuchadnezzar, concerning whom we read such singular and instructive narratives, in the book of the prophet Daniel. This proud and powerful monarch, as we further read in the Scriptures, was next made the divine instrument of subduing and punishing the guilty Jewish people, and several other idolatrous and wicked nations. In the book of Jeremiah, (chs. 25-27,) are the following prophecies:— “Behold I will send and take all the families of the north, saith the Lord; and Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant, and will bring them against this land, and against all these nations round about; and will utterly destroy them, and make them an astonishment and an hissing, and perpetual desolations; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the Lord, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans; and will make it perpetual desolations.” “Many nations, and great kings, shall serve themselves of them also.” The nations and people, so divinely placed under the dominion of Babylon, were; — Judah, Egypt, Edom, Moab, Ammon, and many others mentioned in Jer. ch. 25. As a chief part of the punishment of Judah, the king, princes, and priests, and all others in the higher classes of the nation, were carried away to Babylon; and many of them put to death; and the rest with their descendants, were held in captivity for seventy years, according to the before mentioned prophecy, and others contained in the Scriptures. The ancient history, by Mons. Rollin, already cited, gives substantially the facts, as to the subjection of those nations to the Babylonish authority.

And now must be mentioned, the following most remarkable coincidence of circumstances, forming a noted instance of the divine foreknowledge, and of the fulfilment of prophecy:—Nebuchadnezzar began those conquests, and that captivity of the Jews and the other nations, and the extension of the Babylonian

dominion, in the first year of his reign, 606 B. C. ; and from that date, to the taking of Babylon, and the destruction of that dominion, by Cyrus 538 B. C. are exactly seventy years, at the termination of which period, the Jews and the other nations subdued by Nebuchadnezzar, were restored to liberty by Cyrus, according to the prophecies already mentioned. It is thus seen, that these seventy years of the captivity, composed the identical time of the duration of that extensive dominion of the Babylonish monarchy. Here also is a marked instance, that such extended dominion by one nation over others, is but exceptional to the general divine intention and arrangement, as previously mentioned ; and is only permitted and employed for a limited period, and for effecting certain special purposes of national chastisement, and other infinitely wise designs of the Almighty Ruler.

The next great Power which held dominion over several nations, —but only for brief periods,—was the Medo-Persian, whose extended rule commenced under Cyrus the Persian King, and Darius King of the Medes. The last monarch, with several of his successors, reigned in Babylon, only about 78 years, during which period, several of the subjugated and tributary Nations of the kingdom revolted, and again became independent. That Medo-Persian power was divinely raised up, to accomplish the restoration of the Jews from their captivity. This purpose was prophetically foretold, about 174 years before its fulfilment, as we read in Isaiah Chs. 44 and 45, where even the name of Cyrus is foretold, and of whom it is written:—“ He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure ; even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built ; and to the temple thy foundation shall be laid :” And again, in Ch. 45, 13 ;—“ I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways ; he shall build my City ; and he shall let go my Captives, not for price nor reward saith the Lord of hosts.” We see, in the book of Ezra, that these predictions and promises were literally and accurately fulfilled.

In a comparatively short time after the close of the return of the Jews from their captivity, and the completion of the rebuilding their city and Temple, that great Medo-Persian power was overthrown, and the countries under its dominion were subjugated by Alexan-

der of Macedonia, the insatiable conqueror of nations. His vastly extended conquests and rule, only continued about 10 years, the remaining period of his restless and vain glorious life. None of his posterity succeeded to any part of those conquests, but immediately on his decease, either by drunkenness or poison, when in the thirty third year of his age, four of his chief captains divided the conquered countries among themselves; each of whom established, his own independent monarchy and dominion. Two of those divisions,—Egypt and Syria, with their respective tributary possessions, became the most powerful, and doubtless, their monarchs are the same mentioned in ch. 11 of the book of the prophet Daniel, as “kings of the north and of the south.” In the same ch. is a prophetic intimation of this change in national dominion being also divinely decreed, for it is there declared; — “A mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will; and when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided, towards the four winds of heaven, and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled; for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others, besides those.”

After that division of Alexander's conquests, no very mighty power arose, having the like extended dominion, as had been possessed by the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Medo-Persian monarchies: until the Roman, the most powerful of all, gradually acquired and secured its dominion, and ruling influence, over very many nations and countries near, and afar off. This gigantic and vastly extended power, had reached its greatest height, and become consolidated under Augustus Caesar. In the latter part of his reign, our divine Saviour appeared in the human nature, in Judea, according to the numerous prophecies declared from time to time, through all previous ages. He is, as had been foretold, the Prince of Peace; and he made his appearance, when nearly all the known world was at rest from wars, and reposing in peace under the Roman Authority. This state of national affairs, it would seem, was designed and established by Him who has the hearts and minds of all in his power and can turn them as the rivers of water whithersoever He will in order the more extensively and effectually to facilitate th

progress and establishment of His benign christianity, throughout the various regions of that vast Empire. The Roman government, at that period, and for some time after, as we learn from history, tolerated the religious opinions and modes of worship of the different nations who were brought under its authority ; and permitted each of them, to retain and follow its own religious rites and observances. This liberality, which both before and since, has been so very rare among nations, was divinely made to contribute, in a great degree, to protect and favour the advance of infant Christianity. It is true, that at no long time after its first successful and extended progress, the persecution of it commenced, by Imperial and other Civil authority ; and, with some intermissions, was continued through a long period, and under several reigns ; but it may well be concluded, from the instruction and instances afforded by Scripture, that these persecutions were permitted by the Divine Head of the Churches, as needful chastisements, for their purification from the various heresies and departures from the true faith ; and for the strifes and divisions, as well as other sins and immoralities, which had arisen and prevailed among them. When these divine purposes were in part fulfilled, the first Constantine, through the same overruling Providence, became the sole possessor of the vast Roman dominion ; and exercised that authority, in establishing and facilitating the extension of Christianity throughout the Empire. Although it was subsequently persecuted, and its progress partially suspended, for a season, under the rule of Julian, called the Apostate, who laboured most strenuously, and in various modes, fully to restore idolatry, he was not allowed to succeed in his impious attempt, but was suddenly stricken down in the day of battle. Shortly after, by the first Theodosius, Christianity was again made, and ever after remained, the established religion of the Empire. And now must be mentioned, another most remarkable instance of the truth of the proposition advanced in this Essay, namely,—that it is the general design of the Divine overruling government, that each Nation and Country, shall be independent of all others, as to Civil government, institutions, and laws ; and that in the exceptional instances, where such dominion is obtained and exercised, by any one great Power over others, it is designedly per-

mitted by the Almighty Ruler, to effect some special purpose, regarding the Nations, and the interests of His own Holy religion. The following is the instance referred to, and which is clearly shown from historical records:—In the year of our Lord 395, at the latter end of the reign of the first Theodosius, paganism was legally abolished, and Christianity was established as the religion of the Empire, and only 15 years after, A. D. 410, the great and populous City of Rome,—one of the Imperial Capitals,—after having been three times besieged by the Gothic hosts, under the renowned Alaric, was taken by them, and thoroughly pillaged. Gibbon, the historian of the Roman “Decline and Fall,” and the insidious and determined enemy of Christianity, states, that “the prosperity of the Empire expired with Theodosius.” He has also shown, that from that time onward, in the several sections of that vastly extended dominion, its various national portions and appendages, became broken off, more or less rapidly, by the incursions and conquests of the nations and tribes of Goths, Huns, Vandals, and other barbarians. These, with fierce and mighty hosts, rushed in upon the different portions of the Imperial dominion, and established their own rule, and a mixed but superior possession with the other populations. Shortly before the establishment of Christianity, by Theodosius, the Visigoths had invaded and settled in parts of Thrace, and the Ostragoths in Phrygia and Lydia. The Vandals, Suevi, and Burgundians, a few years after, established themselves in Gaul,—now France,—driving out the Franks, another barbarous people, who had previously, by conquest, obtained a settlement in portions of that Country. About A. D. 428, the Vandals conquered from the Empire, a part of Spain; from whence they early passed over to Africa; and subdued nearly the whole of the Roman territories there; and soon after, the whole of them were lost to the Empire, until the time of the Emperor Justinian, whose renowned General, Belisarius, reconquered it, with some other portions of territory which had been wrested from the Empire. These reconquered portions however, were only retained for brief periods.

In A. D. 446, the fierce and haughty Attila, with his mighty hosts of barbarous Huns, invaded the Eastern Roman Empire, and



overran it, from the Euxine to the Adriatic ; and even approached near to the walls of Constantinople. By a heavy subsidy, and a large territory assigned to him in Thrace, he was induced, for a time, to refrain from any further devastations and conquests. About A. D. 350, Britain was conquered by the Saxons ; and only 5 years after, a second Capture and pillage of Rome took place, by Genseric and his Vandal hosts. In, or about 474, may be dated the extinction of the Western Roman Empire, by the resignation of the Emperor Augustulus ; and Odoacer, the chief of a barbarous tribe called the Scirri, who were confederate with Attila, was made King of Italy.

It thus appears, that the extensive Roman Empire in the west only continued about 80 years after the legal suppression of paganism, and the establishment of Christianity, by the first Theodosius. This, evidently affords another instance, that great Empires, holding various nations under their rule, are only permitted to remain for limited periods, to effect some purposes of justice, or mercy, or other designs of the infinitely wise and Almighty Sovereign.

At that period of the extinction of the Empire in the west, the following were the portions, or divisions of it, possessed by the several barbarous nations and tribes, who overran and settled within it :—The Goths and Visigoths were in parts of Italy, and other regions ;—the Burgundians in Gaul ;—now France ;—the Suevi in Spain ;—the Vandals in Africa ;—and the Ostragoths, and others from the Northern hive, in Italy, under Odoacer, previously mentioned. About A. D. 510, there was a revolution in Gaul ; and the Frank or French monarchy was established by Clovis ; and about 567, nearly the whole of Italy was overrun and conquered by the Lombards.

During these events, the Divine power and goodness were manifested, by this glorious fact, that all of these barbarians, almost immediately after their conquests, and settlement, abandoned their idolatries, and embraced the Christian religion. This is recorded even by Gibbon, who had so often shown himself its determined and numerous opponent.

In returning to narrate further events, relating to the Eastern Roman Empire, mention may be made, that about A. D. 614,

Chosroes the Persian, subdued to his dominion,—Syria, Egypt, and other Provinces of that Empire, in Asia and Europe, from Istria to Thrace. For 10 years, the Persian Camp was in the presence of Constantinople ; and the Empire may be said to have been reduced to the walls of that City, together with a remnant of Greece, Italy, and Africa, and some maritime Cities on the Asiatic Coast. About 840, the immediate successors of Mahomet, by repeated conquests, became possessed of all the Provinces which had been taken from the Eastern Empire, by the Persians. That Empire continued thereafter, but a weak power ; its Provinces and possessions greatly reduced and limited. In or about 1183, during the time of the Crusades, a Latin or western conquest was made, of Constantinople, and the rest of the Eastern Empire ; but that western dominion only remained about 60 years, and the former one was restored ; and with reduced power, and afflicted with many wars and convulsions continued until 1496, when Constantinople was taken by the Turks, and the Eastern Roman Empire was finally extinguished.

In France, its Sovereign, known as Charlemagne, the successor of Clovis, made extensive conquests of nations and territories, in the West, but immediately on his decease, his dominion became separated into many hostile and independent States ; the Sovereignty of which was assumed by the principal and most ambitious chiefs who had been under his sway.

The foregoing events and statements, concerning those two great Eastern and western divisions of the Roman Empire, have been chiefly drawn from Gibbon's celebrated Work on their "Decline and Fall" which, as to secular facts and affairs, is universally admitted to be an impartial and authentic history.

After giving an abstract of the Byzantine history, he says, "the following nations pass before our eyes:—1. Franks, and including the other barbarians who had settled in France, Italy and Germany,—2. Arabs, or Saracens, who had conquered Syria, Egypt, Africa, Persia, and Spain.—3. Bulgarian.—4. Hungarians.—5. Russians.—6. Normans, who possessed Apulia and Sicily.—7. Latin subjects of the Pope, with the nations of the west, engaged in the crusades, who subverted the Greek Monarchy, and established that of the Italian, which continued about 60 years.—8. The Greeks them-

selves, who during that dominion of the Latins, were considered as a foreign nation.—9. Moguls and Tartars, under Zengis and his descendants. By the victories of Timour, the final destruction of the Byzantine Empire was suspended for 50 years.—10. The second dynasty of the Turks, in the eleventh century, by whom Constantinople was taken, and the Eastern Greeco-Roman Empire was finally extinguished in A. D. 1496.”

In this division of 10, by Gibbon,—the enemy and traducer of Christianity—there is the remarkable coincidence, of its being the same number prophetically foretold by the prophet Daniel, (Ch. 7,) nearly one thousand years previously,—would be that of “the horns,” or kingdoms,” which would “arise out of” the fourth, or greatest, of the “four beasts,” or kingdoms, described in his vision; and which evidently meant the Roman Empire. Perhaps a better division than that of Gibbon, is the one in which many learned men agree, and is as follows:—1. The Roman Senate. 2. The Greeks in Ravenna. 3. The Lombards in Lombardy. 4. The Huns in Hungary. 5. The Alemans in Germany. 6. The Franks in France. 7. The Burgundians in Burgundy. 8. The Saracens in Africa and a part of Spain. 9. The Goths in other parts of Spain. 10. The Saxons in Britain.

If we next advert to more modern times, as regards the same subject of great Empires, holding several nations under their sway, we find the same fact of the comparatively brief duration of such comprehensive dominion. The Emperor Charles the Fifth held in subjection, as head sovereign, and ruled over Germany, Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands, or Provinces of Holland and Belgium. But this extended dominion only continued during his reign of about 45 years; and almost immediately after his decease, the dismemberment of that great Empire took place, and Spain, Holland, and Belgium, and other portions of the Empire, again became separate and independent states.

At a later period, the Spanish Monarchy became possessed of dominion over several other countries and territories, but such extended rule of that ambitious and haughty power, like the one last mentioned, was but of limited duration.

The great Napoleon, who like a Sennacherib, or a Xerxes an Alex-

ander, or an Attila, seemed to be aiming at universal sway, or dictating and commanding influence over the nations, only obtained and held his extensive power for a very brief period; and the subdued and indignant nations, encouraged and led on by free and undaunted Britain, overcame the mighty conqueror, and were again established as independent powers.

The territories and appendages over which the present great powers of the earth hold dominion and rule, consist, chiefly, of colonies, except in the unjust and oppressive instances by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, who, divisionally, hold Poland in their tyrannical grasp. The last named of those iniquitous despoilers also holds its unjust dominion over Hungary; and until recently, over parts of indignant and struggling Italy, which have now become rescued from her oppressive rule. When the purposes of the divine overruling authority, in permitting those first-mentioned subjections, shall be accomplished, those tyrannous bonds will also be broken asunder, as in all the instances previously mentioned, and those oppressed nationalities will be restored to their former independence.

It may here be remarked, that seldom or ever has any nation or people *voluntarily*, without any foreign violence or coercive influence, surrendered its institutions and laws, its civil government and management of its public affairs, into the power, and placed itself under the institutions and the authority and rule of another nation or people. In all the instances which have ever been known of such surrender and foreign dominion, the change has been effected by hostile invasion, or violent compulsion in one form or other; or else through the political apostacy and treachery of the legislative or other ruling authorities of the nation or people unwillingly and coercively brought under the foreign subjection and rule. There are with every nation and people, feelings, either of patriotism or pride, or of natural tenacious adherence to established institutions and customs, or apprehensions of injurious results, or some other just feeling or cause which forms and maintains a deep repugnance and aversion to any voluntary surrender and change of civil institutions and government. Such feelings and sentiments, of themselves, have a tendency to show the truth of the proposition here maintained, that it is the divine will that each nation and people shall be independent of every other, as to civil power and rule.

In near relation to the subjects which have thus been treated of, there is one of a political nature, on which I shall now offer some facts and remarks. I allude to the Union or Confederation of different Nations, or States, as regards laws and civil institutions, and public affairs generally. During the several ages of the world, and in its various divisions, there have been many such Confederations; all more or less differing in the terms and conditions on which they were formed. In disagreement with the opinion or dogmatic assertion so often advanced, but misapplied, that such political arrangements always confer power and other public advantages, I here propose, and shall be able, to show, that in the greater number of the chief instances of such Confederations, instead of having, on the whole, been productive of permanent public security, peace, and prosperity, and other general advantages, they have been attended with internal divisions and strifes, oppressions, injustice, and other embarrassing and disastrous consequences. These afflicting results have, in nearly all such instances, led to the weakening of some or all of the members of the Confederation, and finally to their dissolution, under circumstances of convulsion, loss, and other injuries to all the combined States. The earliest of such Confederacies of which we have any tolerable correct historical information, are those which, from time to time, were formed between certain States of ancient Greece.

#### I. STATES OF GREECE.

In the very earliest periods, they were all separate States, politically independent of each other. The first coalition or Confederation among them, of which there is any account, was called the Council of the Amphyctions, from its supposed founder Amphyction. It was formed of deputies from the different countries of Greece, whose business it was to decide all disputes between the States of which the Association was composed; and to concert measures of defence against their common enemies. But experience showed, that it had but little efficacy towards securing either of those good purposes. It did not succeed in preventing frequent wars among the States. On the invasion of Greece by the enormous hosts of Xerxes, the Persian Monarch, the mutual jealousies among the States, especially between the two most powerful,—Athens and

Sparta,—prevented the assembling of a sufficient force at Thermopylæ to oppose the Persian Army, which after the most desperate encounters, only forced the pass, by annihilating the noble Spartan band, who there devoted themselves for its defence. An historian of these events has written, that “the ambitious views and political jealousies among the Confederate Greeks, produced greater evils, than all that they had endured, while struggling under the pressure of the Persian hosts.” Soon after the close of the several Persian invasions, the rivalries and animosities between the Athenians and Spartans became so embittered, that an army of the former, with some of their Grecian Allies, made a sudden attack upon a Spartan force and their allies, and a great battle of two days’ continuance took place between them, which ended by the retreat of the Athenians. A truce for five years was agreed upon between them, and on its conclusion, hostilities between all the same parties were renewed, which ended for a time with a longer truce. Sparta favoured aristocracy, and Athens democracy. Hence their influence was extended, according as one or other of these opposite powers prevailed in the several other States; and as either of the factions gained the ascendancy in any one of such States, it brought that state to the side of Sparta, or of Athens. The constant rivalship between these two leading States was kept in ardent excitement, by the frequent quarrels of the minor commonwealths: and at length gave rise to the fierce and sanguinary Peloponnesian wars, which continued for nearly 30 years, with various and alternate victories and defeats, devastations, and other severe distresses, experienced in greater or lesser degrees by every State. At the close of this long and fierce struggle, Sparta succeeded in humbling Athens, and gained, and for some time retained, the ascendancy and a paramount authority over the whole of Greece. After a time the Theban State became powerful, and confederated with Athens and other Grecian allies, in engaging in a war against Sparta and her allies. After several severe battles had been fought, with varied successes and defeats, a general pacification and arrangement took place, through the mediation of Persia. But Sparta very soon violated the arrangement, and committed hostilities against some of the smaller States, which led to further wars, in which most of the States became involved; during which they became so weakened and reduced, that the entire overthrow of Gr

gian independence, and the subjugation of all the States were effected by Philip and Alexander of Macedon. Looking over the history of those ancient Grecian States, we can find only few and brief periods when there were not either hostile movements or open wars among some of them. Sparta and Athens, the two most powerful, through ambition and jealousy, were continually attacking and desolating each other, and frequently oppressing the smaller States. Several "Sacred wars," as they have been called, occurred between some of the States, through differences as to religion. Yet, as to language, laws, and institutions, habits and manners, the inhabitants of the different States were nearly the same people. During the whole time of those contentions and wars among them, and down to their conquest and subjection by Macedonia, the beforementioned Amphycionie Confederacy existed; but it neither prevented wars between the States, or secured, as intended, equality among them, or a more powerful defence against foreign enemies. That Confederacy was dissolved by the Macedonian Monarchy, immediately on his subjugation of Greece.

In this instance of the Grecian Confederacy, we see a failure as to the truth of the supposed invariable, and often dogmatically asserted maxim, that in political affairs, "Union is Strength."

## 2. DENMARK, SWEDEN, AND NORWAY.

The National Confederacies to be next examined are those which, on several occasions, were entered into between the three Scandinavian nations—Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. In the earliest periods, each was a separate and independent kingdom; but about the year 1030, Denmark conquered Norway, but lost it in a revolt by the Norwegians a few years after. It was reconquered by the Danes in 1387, under their Queen, Margaret, who also conquered Sweden: and after a short time, convoked the States of the three nations at a place called Calmar, in Sweden, where a law called "the Union of Calmar" was passed, including the three nations. The first and irrevocable principle of the Union was, that the three nations should form one kingdom; but it was expressly stipulated, that the Sovereign should govern each according to its own laws and customs, and rights and privileges. There were several other articles of Union, which it is not needful to mention here. In a very

few years, under the son of Margaret, who succeeded her, the Swedes became greatly discontented, because they found that the treatment they received from the sovereign was, on several points, inferior to that which was afforded to the Danes and Norwegians. Their chief complaints were, that they were taxed to carry on a war against the House Towns, in which they had no interest; and because the King sent Danes, as Governors and other officers, into Sweden, who oppressed the people. These and other modes of injustice and oppression, caused the Swedes to go into open revolt, which compelled the King again to convoke a meeting of the deputies of the three nations at Calmar, where the Union was renewed, on the king binding himself to respect and preserve the privileges of the Swedes, and for the future not to entrust any of their strong places to the care of foreigners. He did not however regard his promises and pledges, but soon acted in a most tyrannical manner towards all the three nations: who compelled him to surrender his Crown. Another king was chosen, according to the Union of Calmar, under whom the three Nations continued united for a short period, until his death. Circumstances then rendered it needful for the Estates of the three Countries to elect a King; but the Swedes refused to concur, and chose for their King one of their own countrymen. The Danes and Norwegians united in also electing a king for themselves. Constant disturbances and strifes between the three nations occurred, through a number of years, until 1514, when deputies from each Nation, again met at Calmar, pursuant to the requisition of the Danish King, who designed thereby to bring Sweden under his rule, agreeably to the first Calmar Union; but the Swedish deputies refused to join in electing the King of Denmark and Norway as their Sovereign. On their return from the Assembly, an Administrator of the government of Sweden was chosen by the authorities of the nation. A war soon followed between the Danish King and Sweden; and after severe battles were fought, the Swedes were completely subdued and were united to Denmark. The King treated them as a conquered people, and inflicted upon them the greatest cruelties during several years. At length the celebrated Gustavus Vasa appeared to redress the wrongs of his country; and under his leadership, Sweden revolted, and chose him for her king, and in the war which ensued with Denmark, succeeded in obtaining entire freedom from Danish rule; and



Sweden has ever since continued a separate and independent kingdom. At several times since, wars have taken place between the two nations : but neither has again succeeded in subjugating the other.

Referring to Norway, we find that it was conquered by Denmark in 1030 ; and as already mentioned, was one of the national parties in the tripartite Union of Calmar ; and like the others, under that arrangement, was to retain its own peculiar laws, privileges, and customs. About the year 1536, and after Sweden had broken off from the Union, Norway also revolted from the Danish rule, but was subdued and still retained by Denmark ; but on a second revolt, through oppressive measures, it was again subdued, and its independence entirely destroyed, under a decree of the king of Denmark, which declared, that Norway should no longer be in any respect a separate State, but should ever after remain a part of the kingdom of Denmark. This condition of Norway continued until the year 1815, when the allied Powers who had overcome the great Napoleon, ceded Norway to Sweden : and ever since it has remained a part of that kingdom. From all the foregoing facts, relating to that Calmar Confederation, and the political affairs of the three nations, it will be seen, that at no time, during the 830 years which have elapsed since 1036, has Norway been an independent State ; but having been the weakest of the three Nations, though placed on equality in that confederacy, yet it has always since been subject either to Denmark or Sweden ; and in consequence, has been greatly harrassed and oppressed by wars, and in various other modes. In the instance of these three nations, as here given from history, is also seen a failure of the truth of the asserted invariable maxim, that Union is Strength, and always affords security and other political advantages.

About two years ago, the King of Sweden and Norway issued a joint Commission, for framing a new Union between the two Nations ; and it was recently stated in a London Journal, that the Commissioners have agreed on the terms, and have made a Report, which is to be submitted for the assent of the two legislatures. By the Scheme reported, the two Countries are left in the present state of equality and internal government. Each Nation is to remain a free, indivisible, independent Kingdom ; but both united

under one king; with "mutual equality and parallel position." The existing Council of State, composed of ten Swedes, and three Norwegians, is to be replaced by a Council of an equal Number of each Nation, to whom is to be referred all measures affecting the two Nations, in common; and to all propositions for any change in the Union.—Should the contingency of the choice of a King arise,—a Convention of 80 deputies, chosen by each nation, and formed under a Commission, shall make the election.

### 3. GERMANY.

From the most reliable history it appears that, in the very earliest ages, the German people were composed of several independent tribes, each having its own chieftain and other officers. All the tribes had nearly the same language and customs and habits, and similar laws and regulations as to their general and domestic affairs. About the third christian century different Confederations were formed among the tribes for their common defence against the Romans; but that colossal power, at several periods, by the invasions and force of its trained legions, brought the most of the brave but undisciplined tribes under its subjection, and tributary terms and general government, as a part of the Empire. After a lapse of ages, the mighty potentate called Charlemagne united all Germany under his sceptre: but very soon after his decease, the great Dukes and Counts of Germany parcelled out their hereditary possessions among their feudal barons, and these among their immediate vassals. The Kings and Emperors in Germany were at first elected by the people at large; but subsequently in Diets, composed of the heads of certain great princely families and other high dignitaries.

When the first Napoleon overran Germany, most of the princes of its southern and western divisions separated from the Germanic Constitution and formed themselves into a league, under the protection of Napoleon, and took the title of "the Confederated States of the Rhine." By the Act of Confederation, their common interests were to be discussed and determined in an assembly divided into two colleges of Kings and Princes. The members of the Confederacy were to be independent of foreign

powers; the Emperor Napoleon to be protector of the alliance, and all the Princes, Counts, &c., within the circle of the confederated territory, were to be subject to the alliance. In consequence of this Confederation, the German Emperor, on concluding a peace with Napoleon, absolved all his German States and Provinces of the Empire from the reciprocal duties towards the Empire, and renounced the title of Emperor of Germany, and assumed that of Emperor of Austria.

With the fall of Napoleon a few years after, that Confederation of the Rhine was dismembered, by its several States successively joining the Allied Powers against Napoleon. Immediately after, in 1814, another Germanic Confederation was formed, which the document containing its terms declared was intended to secure the independence and inviolability, and preserve the internal peace of the States named and included therein. The following are some of the principal stipulations of the Confederacy:—"The independence and integrity of the States, connected with the right of examining disputes between the members of the Confederation and foreign States. The mutual protection of the States against each other, or the preservation of the Confederacy. The internal tranquility of the separate States is left to the care of the respective governments; but in case of the resistance of the subjects to their government, the Confederation may assist the latter. The establishment of representative constitutions in all the States belonging to the Confederation. The establishment of a common civil law in Germany." A few years ago, an historian wrote on this Confederation in the following terms, which, from all the facts on the subject, seem sufficiently warranted:—"Germany thus presents again the semblance of a political whole, which, in reality, possesses no strength, even in time of peace, as many instances show. It is only necessary to mention the fruitless decrees of the Germanic Diet, respecting the arbitrary ordinances of the Elector of Hesse-Cassel against the holders of the old dominion: the excesses and follies of the Duke of Brunswick; and the want of any general system for promoting the internal navigation of the country. In time of war its insufficiency must be still more apparent."

In addition to the troubles alluded to in this extract, it might be shown that there have been frequently political agitations and strifes between the States of the Confederation, which, as in so many other instances, have clearly shown that confederations of States or Provinces, even by people of the same language, and of similar institutions and customs, very rarely increase or establish permanent strength and security, or social peace and prosperity. Where those elements or essentials are wanting in any such Confederacy, the political blessings just mentioned are scarcely ever found to result, but, on the contrary, jealousies and strifes very frequently ensue, producing general weakness, diminished prosperity, and various other forms of political evil and unhappiness.

That last German Confederation has very lately been broken and virtually destroyed, chiefly by Prussia, who became its most powerful member, by the superiority of its military force, having compelled the submission of a number of the States, incorporating some of them into its own dominions, and placing others almost entirely under its dictating influence or authority.

#### 4. HOLLAND AND BELGIUM.

During a long course of ages, the Batavian States, or Netherlands, as they were subsequently called, were subject to foreign powers. First to the Romans; next to some of the northern tribes who overran Europe; and later, for a long period, under the absolute rule and cruel oppressions of Spain. This tyranny was at length overcome through the undaunted efforts of the people of the States, under the leadership of the princes of the House of Orange, combined with British aid; and the seven States became, and for a long time continued, the prosperous Republic of Holland. In the early part of the first French Revolution, Belgium was conquered from Austria by the armies of France; and a few years after, Holland was also conquered by the French, under Napoleon, who made his brother, Louis, King of Holland. During the French rule, this last country, like several others, suffered various severe oppressions. In the year 1814, when the Allied Powers overcame Napoleon, Holland and Belgium came under their power, and the British Cabinet accom-

plished its often projected scheme, and Belgium was united with Holland, and the Prince of Orange was made king of both nations, under the title of the King of the Netherlands. This arbitrary and incongruous union continued only sixteen years; and in 1830, a revolution in Belgium took place. It commenced with a meeting in that year at Brussels, principally composed of its citizens. It appears that the people of the Belgian Provinces were never cordially united with Holland and the other Dutch Provinces. The king, with but little success, attempted to unite two millions of Dutch Calvinists—engaged principally in commerce—with four millions of Belgian Catholics—employed in agriculture and manufactures,—whose language, interests, manners, and customs, were widely opposed to the Dutch. They had also, it is said, some just cause of complaint against the king's government. The Belgians therefore rose and threw off a government forced upon them against their will. They declared themselves *independent*; and with some aid from France, after a short struggle with the Dutch, the European powers became mediators between them; and a dissolution of their Union was agreed upon, and Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg was chosen and accepted as King of Belgium. Ever since the final arrangement of the terms of separation, peace has continued between the two nations.

This instance, like several others which history records, proves that Unions or Confederations of States composed of people differing in language, laws, customs, and on other material points, especially when effected by injustice and *compulsion* of any kind, do not confer *strength*, but rather produce *weakness*, and are invariably attended with bitter alienations and strifes, and various other public evils, and preventing or limiting religious, moral, and secular prosperity.

##### 5. SWITZERLAND.

The first Swiss Confederacy was formed in 1303 between three of the Cantons, to obtain their independence and relief from Austria, which power, for a long period, held all the Cantons under its tyrannical rule. From time to time, other Cantons

joined that Confederacy, for the same purpose of gaining independence. About the year 1400, eight Cantons were in the Confederacy, which was called the Helvetic League; by which it was provided that the public affairs were to be regulated in a Diet, composed of an *equal* number of deputies from each Canton. From historical accounts as to the several stipulations which formed the Constitution of the League, it is evident that there was no intention by the Cantons of forming themselves into *one* separate and independent State or Commonwealth. The chief design of the League was, to preserve the public liberties and private rights of the citizens and subjects of the Union against any attacks that might be made upon them from any foreign quarters. The following are the other chief articles of that Helvetic League:—In the time of war with any foreign power, they were to succour and defend each other as brethren, notwithstanding any contests which might have previously existed between them, and regardless of all danger to which that mutual assistance might expose them. They were not to undertake any war that had not been previously proposed and determined upon by unanimous consent in a general Diet. All disputes between any particular Cantons were to be decided by the mediation of the neutral Cantons; and if either of the two contending parties refused to abide by their decision, they were to be compelled by force of arms. Notwithstanding these express stipulations, several civil wars occurred among the Cantons, especially in the later periods of their history, while under that League, chiefly owing to differences in religion. In 1797, an army of the French Directory invaded Switzerland, and the League was abolished by that Directory, which established a government entirely subject to their authority, under the name of the “Helvetic Republic.” A civil war among the Cantons immediately ensued between an *aristocratic* and a *democratic* party, which continued for several years until 1803, when Napoleon established another constitution for Switzerland, called “The Act of Mediation.” At this time there were nineteen Cantons; all their Constitutions more or less democratic; the *equality* of the citizens forming the base of all of them.

In 1815, the Congress of Allied Sovereigns at Vienna estab-

lished the independence of Switzerland, and granted her a new Constitution, adding three Cantons—making the whole number twenty-two. By this Constitution, each Canton has its own distinct internal government, and the general government is vested in a Diet, composed one member from each Canton.

One of the chief characteristics of the Swiss is a love of freedom.

How different is this *free* and *equal* Confederation of the Swiss Cantons from the present Confederation of the British North American Provinces, which, in both houses of the General Parliament and Executive Government, gives such a numerical superiority to the two Canadian Provinces of Quebec and Ontario over the two Maritime Provinces, and takes from the latter nearly all their sources of revenue, as well as Provincial appointments and institutions, public works, and means of separate government.

## 6. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The first Confederation of these States, then only thirteen in number, was formed in the war with Great Britain, for obtaining their independence. In about five years after that object was attained, that Union was found to be so defective, that a Convention was formed, composed of the politically wisest and most competent men, as delegates from the several States, to confer and deliberate on the whole subjects submitted: and to frame a Constitution for all the States. After many months of deep and enlarged deliberation, and mutual conference, and full examination on the various points of the great subject they formed a scheme for such a Constitution. It was finally agreed to by all the States, and the principal articles of it form the basis and main Stipulations and portions of the Confederation, under which these States continued until the commencement of the late dreadful and calamitous civil war between those of them in the Northern, and those in the Southern portions of their immensely extended territory.

With reference to the unfavorable conclusion already intimated, concerning political confederations, intended to be established in this portion of the present Essay, it is not needful to mention even the principal articles of that constitution. It may suffice to say,

that considering the favorable circumstances under which it was formed, as regarded the several States, their unanimity on the subject; and the high character of the men who framed it, as to sincere patriotism, eminent skill, and dispassionate and superior judgment as Statesmen, scarcely ever has there been a political confederacy, which seemed more likely to be of very extended duration; and to ensure national prosperity and public advantages of every description. But alas, as to general peace and harmony, and unanimity of patriotic and other good feelings, what a sad reverse has, as yet, been exhibited in their comparatively brief history. Differences, and keen controversies between the Northern and Southern States very speedily commenced, and became more and more intensified and embittered; chiefly through opposite opinions as to Negro Slavery, and tariffs of duties in trade and commerce. Through these causes, especially the former, open and fierce hostilities between those States of the North and of the South commenced in 1861, and continued upwards of four years, producing an enormous sacrifice of life and property, and every other evil and affliction of Civil war. After prodigies of bravery and endurance on both sides, the combatants of the South, as we all know, were conquered by their opponents of the North; and the reconstruction of the Union has not yet been accomplished, although efforts are being made by the General Government for effecting it.

These States have afforded an additional instance in proof, that political Confederations do but seldom or ever secure protracted continuance and strength and general peace and prosperity, where the institutions and interests, and the habits and manners of the respective populations are materially different.

## 7. GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

It is a notorious and historical fact, which none will now venture to deny, that the present Union between these Countries was accomplished, chiefly through seducing and corrupt means and influences of various descriptions. It is not therefore needful, to give any special or detailed exposure of them here. The Union having been thus effected, it could scarcely, on religious and moral grounds, be supposed, that any political or other good effects



would generally result from it. On the part of a very large majority of the population of Ireland, there has been constant aversion, or even hatred to British rule, producing numerous plots, and conspiracies, and popular agitations against that rule ; and several open rebellions, attended with bloodshed, and various public and private evils and afflictions. Of late years, and at present, that disaffection, and those distressing results have become nearly, if not quite, as alarming and injurious, as at any previous period ; and more extended in their range of operation, having reached these North American Provinces as well as England itself. I have no intention, indeed it would be rather presumptuous, to express an opinion here as to which of the two great conflicting parties,—the Imperial ruling Authorities,—or the disaffected Irish people,—are blameable, or the most to blame, for the causes and occurrence of those various public evils. My design here, in treating thus briefly of this Union, and its distressing and injurious results, is merely to exhibit it, as another instance, that political Unions of Countries, whose respective populations are entirely, or in a large proportion, of different predilections, habits, and customs, and most especially, if of opposite religious sentiments, do not produce or *increase* National or general strength, or power, but on the contrary, distrust, disaffection, and general weakness, with many other public disadvantages and injuries.

In the immediately preceding pages, *seven* instances have been given of Confederations of different Nations, or States, being nearly the whole number of the principal political alliances, or arrangements of that nature, of which we have any satisfactory or reliable information, from the histories of ancient and modern civilised nations. From the facts given, as to the several instances, it will be seen, that in all of them, national agitations, bitter alienations, and Strifes, almost immediately ensued, and continued to prevail ; and also open and destructive wars, more or less frequently ; thereby weakening their means and power of resistance, against foreign invasions and aggressions ; and in several of the instances, ultimating leading to the subjection of most, or the whole of the members of the confederacy, to some foreign nation, and its absolute rule ; thus refuting the assertion, so often dogmatically

advanced, that political Unions always confer strength, and other general advantages.

Now let us see how this maxim, that "Union is strength," applies and is true, as to any increased power of defence against enemies; and as to peace and the general welfare and happiness, in the case of the present Confederation of the four North American Provinces. In all the time previous to its being effected, the Province of Nova Scotia was so universally and thoroughly loyal, and attached to the Imperial rule, and on such good terms on every subject with the whole of Canada, that if it had been invaded from any foreign quarter, or its political safety or welfare had been in danger from internal hostilities, the Militia force of Nova Scotia, to any required extent, would have readily and cheerfully gone forth to its assistance. But if either or both of the Canadian Provinces were now under any such dangerous circumstances, would Nova Scotia furnish such assistance with the like readiness, or afford it at all? Even if compulsion were attempted, it would most probably be unavailable for effecting the purpose. Here, then, would be an additional proof, that political Unions of States do not always produce increased power, but on the contrary, in most instances, weakness, as well as alienations and strife. They often engender even bitter and lasting enmity.

Let it further be supposed, that the Imperial powers entirely relinquished and withdrew their authority and rule from the present Confederation, and declared the Dominion an entirely independent nation, how long would the Confederation last. Not a week would elapse before Nova Scotia, with its limited population, would set the two millions of Quebec and Ontario at defiance, and send off every Canadian Official to the place from whence they came; and Nova Scotia would declare itself an independent State. If the Canadian should endeavour to compel Nova Scotia to remain with them under the paper union, they could not accomplish it. The great distance—and hundreds of miles of it a wilderness, and the Province of New Brunswick intervening, where they would get no aid, together with the large and resolute Nova Scotia opposing force, would completely repel and frustrate the mad and wicked attempt. Now, here again, in this supposed case, would "Union" be

“Strength.” It is altogether improbable that such a case will ever occur, but suppositiously put, it serves to show that compelled Unions do not confer strength, with reference to the prevention or suppression of internal dissensions, or open hostilities, between their members.

To show that this common, but often misapplied saying, that “Union is Strength,” was not, in its origin, meant to apply to nations or States, I will here relate for the information of some, by whom, and how, the saying was first uttered and applied. It was thus:—The wise and affectionate head of a large family, in order the more effectually to instruct and warn his children against any disagreements, or alienations among them, took, in their presence, a bundle of small twigs, and having bound them firmly together, showed the children that scarcely any force could break all the twigs while so united. Then separating them he further showed, that it was quite easy to break each twig, and thus readily destroy the whole of them. This was indeed an impressive and excellent symbol, to inculcate and recommend a close and affectionate union and kindly intercourse among all the members of the family, and for the promotion of their common interests, and general and individual welfare. With this most significant symbol before them, he then gave them the saying, which, after a time, became a common motto, or maxim—“Union is Strength.” It is thus seen, that in its origin, it had no reference whatever to political Unions, or Confederations of any kind; nor can it be applied to them with any propriety, or under any appropriate similitude. In a family, the members of it are bound together by the sympathies and other ties of the same kindred; and by common feelings and interests, as to family reputation, and successful efforts for the advancement of each and all, in worldly emoluments and honors. But those elements and motives for Union, do not exist with separate nations and States. Each has its own distinct predilections, and attachments, and institutions, objects, and interests; and also the special or peculiar customs and habits of its people. The differences on these and various other points, in the case of a Confederation of any two or more of such nations, inevitably give rise to jealousies and contentions, more or less severe, for pre-eminence, superior power,

and political advantages ; producing injuries to all the members of the Union, as seen in the instances which have been given ; and generally terminating in the destruction of the Union, either by civil war, or a foreign enemy.

Any such Union of States may be likened to the case of two families. These, when living in the same street or neighbourhood, or even in adjoining habitations, will be on friendly or peaceable terms ; but put them in the same house, and how soon will they disagree, and become troublesome to each other ; and so alienated, that they will soon be found in separate tenements.

In the present Confederation of the Provinces, Quebec, as to geographical position, is nearly in their centre. Its population is not far from a million, chiefly French, having their own long-established, peculiar, and unchanging laws and institutions, customs and habits—all very dissimilar from those of Nova Scotia, as also from those of the two other Provinces. So great indeed are the differences, that it would seem to be both a natural and moral impossibility to form, as to those points, any real political Union, agreement, or uniformity, between that large French population and the rest of the Dominion population, especially those of the two Maritime Provinces, which latter, in all the foregoing particulars, are nearly the same. There are also considerable differences between the population of Ontario, and of each of the two Maritime Provinces. In the former there is a very much larger proportion either born in the United States or their immediate descendants. Such is the case in the cities of Toronto and Hamilton, and also in many other towns and places in that Province. Consequently, the institutions, customs, and habits of its population are, in a considerable degree, different from those of the Nova Scotia people. Toronto and Hamilton are in the particulars just mentioned, and in what may be called their general complexion, especially the latter city, very much like the cities and towns on the other side of the Lake, or rather like what are sometimes called Yankee towns. But, further, very small portions of the inhabitants of Quebec and Ontario, especially of the latter, are engaged in the fishing occupation ; but a very large proportion of the population of Nova Scotia follow that employment, whose

interests are, on many points, dissimilar from those of the agricultural and manufacturing population of Ontario. Should the proposed purchase of the North Western Territory and Rupert's land be effected, there will be many other and great dissimilarities as to population, institutions, habits, and pursuits. There will be added numerous bands of fur-hunters and trappers of various nations, including Indian tribes, and mixed and rather wild and roving people of very different customs and habits from those of the rest of the population of the Dominion, and most probably of a generally inferior character. Such a Confederation would be similar to one composed of the populations of England, France, Italy, Holland, and some of the wild tribes in the fur regions of Russia. Those regions are not at a greater distance from England than Nova Scotia is from most parts of that North Western Territory and Rupert's land. If Columbia and Vancouver's Island, on the Pacific coast, are to be added, as seems to be intended, the whole Dominion will comprise a greater extent of territory than is comprehended within all the nations of Europe, from Great Britain to the northern bounds of Russia. To say nothing of appropriate laws and equitable considerations, as well as public arrangements and conveniences as to governments and the administration of political affairs, in such a combination, or rather conglomeration, of people and things, the absurdity of it is so great as to ensure its condemnation by every unprejudiced and sensible person.

Several of the Confederations which have been herein mentioned, were formed chiefly for affording a greater power of resistance and protection against foreign aggressions and attacks, and in all of them, but the two last-mentioned—those of the United States and Great Britain and Ireland—each of the Confederated States retained its own separate and independent government, laws, and institutions, and rights and privileges, and entire management of all its internal civil affairs. Compared with that condition of those last-mentioned States, how stringent and be-reaving are the provisions and enactments of the present British North American Confederation, as regards these two Maritime Provinces. By the Act on the subject, nearly every existing

source of revenue and all public works and buildings have been taken from them. They are deprived of the choice or power as to the appointment to judiciary offices. They are placed under great inequalities as to representatives in both of the Houses of the Dominion Parliament and in the Executive Government. They are deprived of the power of making any laws or regulations as to trade or commerce of any kind, or agriculture, or immigration, postal service, marriage and divorce, banks and banking, ferries between the Provinces or between the Imperial or foreign nations, or as to canals, steamboats, dredges and public vessels, rivers and lakes, improvements, marine hospitals, and even such small public institutions and affairs as local penitentiaries, census, beacons and buoys, saving banks, inland fisheries in lakes and rivers, and, of course, the appointment of officers to attend to their regulation; with several other small public matters, which surely might most appropriately have been left to each Provincial Legislature and Government. Not even a room in a public building can be occupied by a Provincial Legislature, or for any Provincial office, but by the special *permission* and *assignment* of the Dominion Government.

It may fairly be concluded, that all these bereaving and humiliating enactments have been purposely made, the better to assist towards speedily or ultimately effecting the unjust and absurd design of abolishing all the Provincial legislatures and governments, and bringing under one parliament and government the whole of the British North American possessions, from the island of Newfoundland to the Pacific Ocean—a distance of nearly four thousand miles; more than a thousand miles greater than the distance between Great Britain and the continent of America. A more politically absurd and distracting measure was never imagined. A part of that design is now attempted to be accomplished by the purchase of the possessions of the Hudson's Bay Company.

From several circumstances it appears to be a further design of the Dominion government to equip, arm and pay very large Militia forces, and have them under training for greatly increased periods, yearly, throughout the Dominion; and doubtless, also, a

considerable naval force on the Canadian Lakes, and to erect several extensive fortifications in Quebec and Ontario. The accomplishment of these purposes will require enormous public expenditures.

There seems also to be almost a certainty that an immense sum will shortly be advanced by the Dominion to relieve the embarrassments and to repair the lines and other property of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which are entirely within the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. The expenditures and advances for all the foregoing objects will so greatly increase the general taxation as to render the burden of it most oppressive, and altogether intolerable, especially to the two Maritime Provinces, which do not require any such expenditures, and will not receive from them any benefit whatever.

That single and vast dominion, which has been mentioned as intended to be formed, would answer very well for a few speculative and ambitious politicians; but how would it do for the millions of the people, many of whom would be obliged to travel 1500 or 2000 miles to the Parliament or seat of Government to make their applications for their redress of grievances, or for any other purposes? But such matters, and other affairs of the people generally, are of very little importance with the class called professed politicians and statesmen. With reference to the subject of that further extended Dominion, it is well for Nova Scotia that it is now undergoing, and will yet undergo, such further injurious effects of a political Confederation forced upon its people, that it will be long indeed, or never, that there will appear within its borders another band of political apostates to their country's rights and interests, who will have the power to accomplish that further bereaving and unrighteous design, just mentioned, of abolishing the local legislatures and governments, and having only the one parliament and government for the whole Dominion. Viewing all the facts and reasons on the whole subject, in relation to the rights and interests of this Province, it may well be hoped and expected that our local parliament will, in its present session, make such a constitutional and earnest representation to the Imperial Parliament and Government as will, before long, lead to a

separation of Nova Scotia from a Confederation so repulsive, and even hateful, to the vast body of its people, and so injurious as regards its peace and loyalty, its interests and happiness.

In now drawing to a conclusion, I feel well warranted in confidently asserting that the facts which have been given, and the arguments employed under the several propositions advanced, have quite sufficiently verified and maintained them. As to the first proposition—that of the Divine overruling government of the world,—none who believe in Revealed Truth will doubt or deny it. The next, and, indeed, the chief proposition—that of the Divine will and intention that each nation and country shall possess its own territories and laws, institutions, civil rights and customs, free of the dominion or dictating power or influence of any other nation or country—has also been sufficiently shown by the numerous historical facts, *scriptural* and *secular*, which have been advanced. This truth has also been shown, that where there have been exceptions to that general divine intention, they have been *permitted* for the purpose of executing some national chastisement, or other divine arrangements. The further proposition has also been proved that Unions or Confederacies of nations have, in nearly every instance, been attended with internal political agitations and contentions; often civil wars, general political weakness, and ultimately the destruction of the Confederacy, either by internal wars or foreign conquest and dominion. Lastly, that Nova Scotia has *coercively* and *unjustly* been deprived of her Constitution and all her most important sources of revenue and civil rights and privileges; and further humiliated and injured, through her weak, or rather *powerless representation* in both branches of the Dominion Parliament, and in the Executive Government, as has so recently been shown. These, with some other injurious facts and events as to taxation, and on other subjects, which have lately taken place; and others nearly and darkly *portending*, are too generally known to our people to require any further facts and arguments to establish the melancholy truth, that by this Confederation Nova Scotia is deeply injured, and very far removed from the state of internal tranquility, secular prosperity, and general welfare previously enjoyed.



From this most unhappy political condition there is no way of escape or deliverance, and no other mode of preventing further and greater evils and afflictions to our people than by an entire separation from a compelled Union, which they view as not only injurious to their interest, but as *humiliating* and *oppressive*, and consequently *odious*.

It is not difficult to discover the chief motive and the policy which induced the Imperial powers to desire and effect this Confederation. They have an anxious and constant dread of these American Provinces, by some means or other, becoming a part of the bordering United States. It is this doleful apprehension, and not any desire to promote the commercial or other interests of the Provinces which has also led them so imperatively to provide for the immediate construction of the Intercolonial Railway, to serve for the conveyance of troops and the munitions of war in the event of hostilities with those States, and the Canadian Provinces being invaded by their military and naval forces. As a matter of prudent policy, there is nothing to censure in making all needful arrangements for being well prepared to meet and overcome such a threatened or impending evil, provided the means employed for making such preparation are consistent with a due regard to justice and righteousness towards all affected by such precautionary measures. But, on this point, there has been a very serious and injurious failure, as well as a mistaken and disastrous political policy in bringing Nova Scotia into the Confederation in the *compulsory* manner in which it has been done. By this imprudent and unjust procedure, instead of any additional strength being obtained for resisting any such hostilities by the adjacent States, there is a very general and deplorable diminution of the best and most available means for such resistance. That compulsory policy towards this Province by the Imperial powers has been extremely imprudent, is now dangerously perplexing, and also ominous of many further evil results, and is such as greatly to impair and weaken confidence in their constitutional and equitable rule, and in their justice, honor and magnanimity generally towards the Colonies of the Empire.

