

And, on the other hand, if Governments, we repeat, take up the work of arbitration in such cases,—Governments such as those of Russia, Sweden, Prussia, Austria, France, Sardinia, Naples, Spain, and Portugal,—and such are the existing elements for an Arbitration Court,—it is easy to divine how the peace of the world would be preserved : it would be preserved by the putting down of what would be termed *rebellion* in Hungary, and *revolution* in Rome.

Often did Chalmers quote the emphatic word, “first *pure*, then *peaceable*.” And very emphatic words they are, and singularly pregnant with meaning. They reveal why it is that Peace Societies, in the present state of the world, can produce no *direct* results. The nations and the Governments must realize the purity ere they can rationally expect the peace. Peace under certain limitations is no doubt a duty. “If it be possible, as much as lieth in you,” says the Apostle, “live peaceably with all men.” But the qualifications of the text are very important ones,—“*if it be possible*,” and “*as much as lieth in you*,”—so important, that they make a state of peace to be not so much a duty to be accomplished as a gift to be received. “When a man’s ways please the Lord,” said the wise king, “He maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him.” Nor can Peace Associations alter this state of matters. They cannot by any scheme of arbitration convert the gift simply into a duty, seeing that if they take the existing Governments as the elements of their Arbitration Courts, their plan involves of necessity merely the creation of a new Holy Alliance ; and if, on the contrary, they propose first remodelling and reforming the nations, so as to qualify their Governments for arbitrating justly, they change their nature, and become Revolution Societies,—of course, another name for *war* societies. But, though we can thus promise ourselves no *direct* results from the Peace Societies of the times, their *indirect* results may be very im-