

## *The Lonely Non-Resistant: Adin Ballou's Opposition to Violent Abolitionism in Antebellum America*

**Bryce Hal Taylor, Doctoral Candidate, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Germany**

---

### **ABSTRACT**

This project uses the historically neglected nineteenth-century New England preacher Adin Ballou to open an intimate window into abolitionism's failure to liberate the slave using non-violent methods attributed to Jesus Christ before the Civil War in the United States. I will highlight, through Ballou, New England abolitionism's gradual acceptance of freeing the slave by force after thirty years of using moral suasion as its foundational liberation principle. The antislavery societies in New England nearly collapsed amidst the theological battle over Christ's declaration to "resist not evil."

My findings, acquired in multiple libraries in New England, indicate that Ballou was one of the leaders of the branch of abolitionists who remained fixed in their belief against using the coercive powers of "godless governments" to emancipate the slaves. Ballou's biblical exegesis left no flexibility in regard to Christ's admonition of peace and forgiveness despite Ballou's other fluid interpretations of other supposedly foundational Christian doctrines. One sees in Ballou the larger struggle among abolitionists to find providential acceptance of using violent means to attain righteous goals. Ballou's story evinces the triumphs and failings associated with democratizing Christianity in the United States. Abolitionists' theological struggle with violent abolitionism was a bi-product of disestablishing the church and state relationship in the New Republic and opening the press to lay ministers. With virtually every preacher fusing common sense into biblical exegesis, abolitionists naturally experienced differences on the proper method to free the slave. During arguably the most tumultuous period in the United States' history, Ballou chose autonomy rather than union with abolitionists' who adopted the principle, "Peacefully if we can, forcibly if we must," to rid the United States of its vilest atrocity.

### **INTRODUCTION**

In 1904, the famed Russian writer Leo Tolstoy was asked a question by the co-founder of Cornell University Andrew Dickson White. "Who, in the whole range of American literature, [Tolstoy] thought the foremost?" Tolstoy, who admired Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nathaniel Hawthorne, William Lloyd Garrison, and Theodore Parker, astonished White with his answer. "Adin Ballou" replied the Russian.

"Indeed," reflected White "did the eternal salvation of all our eighty millions depend upon some one of them guessing the person he named, we should all go to perdition together. That greatest of American writers was – Adin Ballou!"

Tolstoy was astounded by the United States' complacency with Ballou's writings and argued in *The Kingdom of God is Within You* that the public in their complacency was disturbed by Ballou's musings and seemed determined to build a "tacit but steadfast conspiracy of

silence”<sup>1</sup> around them. American religious historians have complained that “Few figures in the history of American radicalism have been more seriously neglected than Adin Ballou.”<sup>2</sup>

This in part led me to New England to scour the archives of numerous libraries, such as the Boston Public Library, where I found countless tracts, newspapers, books, and letters authored by Ballou. With each new document it became evident that Ballou illuminated the perplexity and originality of becoming a Christian in the religiously chaotic nineteenth-century New England world. Thanks to the disestablishment of the church and state partnership, and the Second Great Awakening from roughly 1790-1830, passionate and emotionally driven parishioners opened a new era of religious experimentation and denominationalism. This explosion of experiential religion coupled with the revolution of communication and print, caused lay rebels to breathe life into a Christianity that previously was thought to only be understood by the educated clergy.<sup>3</sup> Ballou became part of the first generation of Americans who experimented with the disestablishment of religion and the press. As shown by my research, he was one of the initial pioneers of religious freedom who sampled, tested, and participated in this new age of religious thought, practice, and print culture before, during, and after the establishment of his utopian community called Hopedale in 1841.

Even though Ballou described himself at the end of his life in 1890 as a “failure” whose hopes “were too urgent and sanguine” and would die “overshadowed with disappointment and grief,”<sup>4</sup> he opens an intimate window into a number of issues plaguing the United States during the antebellum period. The focus of this study is to use Ballou’s lens to explain the difficulty of espousing abolitionism in New England, to identify the primary doctrinal struggle with espousing violent means to free the slave among abolitionists, and to highlight the decline of non-violence after the Civil War. By using Ballou, one can “walk at a human pace”<sup>5</sup> through the “time of greatest religious . . . originality in American history”<sup>6</sup> and recognize that freeing the slave by force of arms required not only providential approval, but acceptance from

---

<sup>1</sup> Leo Tolstoy, *The Kingdom of God is Within You*. Translated by Constance Garnett. (New York: Watchmaker Publishing, 1951), 17.

<sup>2</sup> William O. Reichert, “The Philosophical Anarchism of Adin Ballou,” *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (August, 1964): 357.

<sup>3</sup> Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1989), 225-26.

<sup>4</sup> Adin Ballou, *Autobiography of Adin Ballou* (Lowell, Mass.: The Vox Populi Press – Thompson & Hill, 1896), Preface.

<sup>5</sup> Robert H. Wiebe, *The Opening of American Society: From the Adoption of the Constitution to the Eve of Disunion* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984), xii.

<sup>6</sup> Gordon S. Wood, “Evangelical America and Early Mormonism,” *New York History* 61 (New York: New York State Historical Association, 1980), 362.

abolitionism's spiritual hierarchy.

Perhaps at no other time in the United States' history were the calls for peace attributed to Jesus Christ more problematic than during the build up to the Civil War. Although Anabaptist groups such as the Mennonites opposed the Revolutionary War in the late eighteenth century, their Christian doctrinal protests largely remained within their communities due to their insistence on non-participation in human governments. Calvinist traditions, such as the Congregationalists, maintained defensive war tenets combining both Old Testament and New Testament exegesis, but Calvinism's eighteenth-century religious dominance in New England waned at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Clergymen were viewed with disdain and preachers began interpreting the Bible for themselves, thereby upsetting traditional norms in regard to war. Unlike Anabaptists, the majority of the newly converted public remained inside of the United States and sought to reform its institutions. In Massachusetts, two renowned Unitarian ministers, William Ellery Channing, and Noah Worcester organized the first Peace Society in 1815. Through their efforts, the larger American Peace Society was formed in 1828 with numerous branches. The American Peace Society provoked the discussion of the evils associated with war and specifically international wars. Soon, however, their complaints did little to shift the focus to the plight of the slave within their borders, and the most noted abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, espoused radical non-resistance in his antislavery crusade splitting with the American Peace Society and forming with Ballou and other abolitionists the New England Non-Resistance Society in 1838.<sup>7</sup> For Garrisonians, Christ's admonition to "resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also,"<sup>8</sup> led them to declare all forms of coercive practices by individuals and governments sinful, and slavery maintained the most grievous of atrocities supported by both northerners and southerners. However, by proclaiming non-resistance in all forms incompatible with Christianity, non-resistant abolitionists struggled to understand how God would free the slaves without force.

Through 1830-1840, the vast majority of abolitionists continued proclaiming non-resistance and moral suasion as the only providentially sanctioned method to free the slave. However, slavery expanded into new territories acquired by the United States. Notwithstanding their attempts to convince the populace and other abolitionists that God would free the slave if

---

<sup>7</sup> Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1972), 222, 645.

<sup>8</sup> Matt. 5:39 KJV

they maintained non-violent protest, the 1850s all but convinced the majority of abolitionists that the slaves needed more than sermons, perhaps it was time to free them by any means necessary. As Ballou witnessed many of his fellow abolitionists' justify the use of arms to free the slave, he departed from the movement, preferring to remain attached to his own interpretation of Christ's peace teachings, rather than join his fellow radical non-resistants who adopted the phrase, "I am a NonResistant, but not a fool."<sup>9</sup> Through Ballou, one recognizes the primary doctrinal dilemma among abolitionist leaders leading up to the Civil War, and the struggle to understand God's will on how best to free the slave.

### ESPOUSING ABOLITIONISM

As Christianity spread throughout the United States during the first half of the nineteenth century, not only were religious leaders concerned with the human soul, but many believed that the soul of the United States was on the brink of damnation due to its continued practice of chattel slavery. The praise once given the colonies' revolution against Great Britain was fading for religionists who preached a gospel of freedom. In this enlightened age of individual rights, how could the United States turn a blind eye on the fate of the Negro in a country whose Declaration of Independence proclaims,

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness?"<sup>10</sup>

Becoming an abolitionist in New England required a complete reversal of cultural norms in the United States. Prior to the emancipation of slaves in 1865 with the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, New England clergymen struggled with understanding God's justification of slavery in the Old Testament and the continued practice in the southern states. Jonathan Edwards, the famed eighteenth-century American theologian and slave owner, similar to George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, believed slavery was a necessary evil and served some form of good in the "natural order" God decreed. It appears Edwards' response to slave owning was similar to the conventional understanding that owning slaves was accepted by God, so long as the slave owner treated his or her slaves humanely. And, although many preachers and citizens in New England were not slave owners, most held this view in response to the slave question in nineteenth-century New England.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Thomas Wentworth Higginson in Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment – Phases of American Social History to 1860* (Case Press, 2007), 424.

<sup>10</sup> Declaration of Independence, 1776.

<sup>11</sup> Kenneth P. Minkema, "Jonathan Edwards on Slavery and the Slave Trade," *The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 54, no. 4* (October, 1997): 825. 823-834 for bib.

However, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, antislavery societies appeared in New England preaching a New Testament brand of Christianity to a populace mired in Old Testament exegesis on the slave question. Calls for immediate emancipation came from the pulpits of Baptists, Methodists, Universalists, Unitarians, and non-denominational lay preachers. An Abolitionist was the term used to describe those who recognized the North's involvement in slavery and called for immediate emancipation. The abolitionists were not well received by the larger New England public who pecuniarily benefited from the slave system and cleverly labelled abolitionists "radicals" who were attempting to upset the natural order God decreed in certain passages of the Bible and break apart the New Republic. The populace largely desired to sit comfortably in their pews without discussing the United States' vilest transgression. To align with abolitionism in the North had cultural, political, familial, and financial consequences.

Initially, Ballou remained aloof to the radical abolitionists until the autumn of 1833. The large majority of New Englanders viewed the abolitionists with contempt and Ballou's preaching to his Universalist parish in Mendon Massachusetts was vacant of antislavery rhetoric. However, on 9 September, 1833, Ballou entertained Arnold Buffum, who spoke to Ballou's congregation. In fragmentary memoranda kept by Ballou during 1832-1833, he writes,

"Not a ripple of antislavery has yet reached Mendon. But friend Buffum thought it was high time to stir the waters, and he was not a man to be put off. So the appointment was made."<sup>12</sup>

The listeners were not moved enough to join the radical reformer, and Ballou continued preaching comfortable Universalist tenets.

Ballou's complacency with addressing the slave question was due in part to his political affiliation and nationalism. He was born a Democrat and later justified his lack of earlier involvement in abolitionism to a

"thick veil of reverent patriotism" that "shut out the vision of many things I afterward came to see. I was brought up to idolize my country, its Constitution and laws, as a rich and sacred patrimony, earned and consecrated by the heroic blood of Revolutionary sires . . . . The national union was sacred to me,"

therefore joining abolitionists was rebelling against his country. For over three years after the meeting with Buffum in 1833, Ballou refrained from expressing his struggle with

---

<sup>12</sup> Adin Ballou, "Fragmentary Memoranda" quoted in *Autobiography*, 228. The location of this fragmentary memoranda has not been located.

biblically and sensibly justifying slavery.<sup>13</sup>

However, abolitionism was on the rise, and Ballou's initial distaste of the "agitators" turned to reverence after a time of "solid, earnest thinking." By 1837, Ballou no longer could remain silent in regard to the evil of slavery. He concluded that it was what "John Wesley had characterized it, 'The sum of all villainies'; that what I had regarded as its abuses were its natural fruits; and that from its inception to its consummation it was utterly wicked."

The above proclamation was against Ballou's "temporal interest, ambition, and comfort" because abolitionists were seen as a source of discord in virtually every political, denominational, and social circle. Eventually, Ballou's conscience could not remain passive, and on Independence Day in 1837, Ballou preached his final sermon to his Mendon parish.<sup>14</sup>

On the Fourth of July in 1837, Ballou was invited to give the keynote address at the First Congregational Meeting House in Mendon, Massachusetts. Immediately the audience recognized he did not intend to primarily focus on the usual providential history of the United States and its founding. A few lines into the sermon, Ballou pleads with the audience to listen with "your understandings, your reason, and your consciences" rather than with "your passions." His address emphasized that the United States was founded on the principle of liberty, and it was

"not a creature of man; it is not a form of words on parchment; it is not the uncertain sound of a trumpet; it is not the echo of a mob; it is not a gaudy idol, carved and gilded by human craftsmen, to be glorified and shouted at by a vicious multitude; but it is an original gift of God."<sup>15</sup>

For Ballou, there was a louse infecting the United States and its once providential institutions. That particular "death-worm now rioting near the heart of our liberties is SLAVERY," affirmed Ballou. He continued by quoting from Thomas Jefferson, Samuel Adams, William Pinckney (famous lawyer and revolutionary), William Eaton (famous revolutionary), and from three opponents of slavery in Virginia, South Carolina, and Kentucky. Each quotation was laced with millennial implications for the United States if it did not extinguish the practice. For example, Ballou used these words from Jefferson.

"I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever . . . . When the measure of their [slaves] tears shall be full . . . doubtless a God of justice will awaken to their distress, and by diffusing a light and liberality among

---

<sup>13</sup> Ballou, *Autobiography*, 51

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*, 278.

<sup>15</sup> Adin Ballou, *A discourse on the Subject of American Slavery, Delivered in the First Congregational Meeting House, In Mendon, Mass., July 4, 1837* (Boston, MA: Isaac Knapp & Cornhill, 1837), 4, 6.



their oppressors, or, at length by his exterminating thunder, manifest his attention to things of this world, and that they are not left to the guidance of blind fatality.”<sup>16</sup>

If the United States did not open its collective eyes and ears to the cries of liberation from the slave, God would punish those who perpetrated the villainous practice and release the slaves by any means necessary.

After a lengthy biblical argument against slavery, it was evident Ballou no longer could hide his abolitionism. This particular Fourth of July did not bring him to a providential reflection on the Republic’s founding, but an abhorrence for what professed “Christians,” including himself, did with the liberty given them. In conclusion, Ballou “humbly” asked a series of questions imploring his audience to reflect on their standing as both citizens of the United States and citizens of God’s house.

“How is it possible for any man to be a good and faithful minister of Jesus Christ . . . and yet feel that he has nothing to do with the question of slavery? Are you for justice, mercy, liberty, happiness – or are you for injustice, cruelty, oppression and misery?”

If American citizens truly desired to reverence the Revolutionaries, abolishing slavery was the mark of a patriot and more importantly a Christian. As a minister of the Gospel, Ballou concludes

“friends, I am ready to sign a quit claim to all the offices, honors, and emoluments of civil government; but I never will relinquish the right vested in me by Jehovah, to bear my testimony to that I deem truth, nor the authority given me by Jesus Christ, to proclaim the gospel.”<sup>17</sup>

Ballou’s sense of divine authority gave him the right not only to proclaim the Gospel but address political issues. By joining the abolitionists, Ballou understood there would be repercussions.

Outraged by his remarks, some of Ballou’s flock renounced him immediately. Initially he gave up his pastorate due to the primary financial contributor who was unwilling to continue paying him for his ministry. Ballou also owed an unknown sum of money to his beneficiary and received a note requesting a “forthwith” payment of Ballou’s financial obligations “or procure a satisfactory endorser therefor.”<sup>18</sup> He likely saw this as a threat with the potential of jail time. Although imprisonment for debt was on the decline in Massachusetts for over a century, debtors’ prison was not abolished until 1857 involving cases of personal animus.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Thomas Jefferson in *Ibid*, 21.

<sup>17</sup> Ballou, *A discourse on the subject of American Slavery*, 84-85.

<sup>18</sup> Unknown author letter to Adin Ballou, in Ballou, *Autobiography*, 282.

<sup>19</sup> Peter J. Coleman, *Debtors and Creditors in America: Insolvency, Imprisonment for Debt, and Bankruptcy, 1607-1900* (Madison, WI: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1974), 45.

Quickly, Ballou rallied members of his congregation who he hoped would “help” him “in the emergency where I found myself.” The debts were paid and within a month Ballou recognized most of his flock continued their support of him, “though some preferred that I should have kept silent on the subject of slavery.”<sup>20</sup> Ballou’s Fourth of July sermon was requested to be published, and his *Discourse on the Subject of American Slavery* was widely circulated in the United States and found an audience in England. He immediately received recognition as an abolitionist and straightaway formed an antislavery society in Mendon, as an auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society in Philadelphia.

Ballou found himself heavily involved in the antislavery reform movements from 1837 until roughly the eve of the Civil War in 1861. His home became a “public hostelry” where “all kinds of reformers” came to discuss the “various schemes proposed for . . . bettering the condition of mankind.”<sup>21</sup> He also left Mendon for speaking engagements throughout New England. For example, on 24 September, 1838 he gave a lecture with noted abolitionists William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips in Lynn, Massachusetts.<sup>22</sup> Ballou’s *Independent Messenger* and *Practical Christian* newspapers, dedicated entire columns to promote abolitionism and renounce slavery. In one particular column entitled “Genius of Reform,” Ballou questions a “Br. D” to prove the merits of the pro-union arguments on the slavery question.

“Is not the duty of every man in Church and State to use all righteous means whatsoever, to exert his entire influence – in favor of the abolition of slavery? . . . . In what future age will Christians be under greater obligations to use their influence to this end than now?”<sup>23</sup> asks Ballou.

Garrison’s newspaper the *Liberator* frequently published sections of *The Practical Christian* that were dedicated to “Non-Resistance, Abolition, Temperance, [and] Moral Reform.”<sup>24</sup> Garrison and Ballou used their printing presses to spread abolitionism to the broader New England public. The *Liberator* from its first volume in 1831 until its last in 1865, called for immediate “Universal Emancipation.” Every issue was headed with “OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD-OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE MANKIND,” and was filled with antislavery columns by numerous reformers from the United States and England. The *Liberator*

---

<sup>20</sup> Ballou, *Autobiography*, 283.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid*, 296-297.

<sup>22</sup> “Anti-Slavery Lectures in Lynn” *Liberator* (1831-1865); September 28, 1838; 8, 39; American Periodicals, 155. Andover-Harvard Theological Library.

<sup>23</sup> Adin Ballou, “Genius of Reform” *Independent Messenger*, vol. 3 (1837). Special Collections Bancroft Memorial Library, Hopedale, Massachusetts.

<sup>24</sup> “Notice of the *Liberator*,” *The Practical Christian*, vol. 1 (1840). Special Collections Bancroft Memorial Library, Hopedale, Massachusetts.



and the *Practical Christian* were pillars of antislavery rhetoric adhering to Garrison's proclamation,

“On this subject [slavery] . . . I will be as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice . . . I will not equivocate – I will not excuse – I will not retreat a single inch – AND I WILL BE HEARD.”<sup>25</sup>

By roughly the spring of 1845, Ballou quickly became a powerful voice in abolitionism. He was called upon to give lectures and write on slavery throughout New England and for antislavery publishers. In August, 1845, abolitionists celebrated the ten-year anniversary of the Emancipation of the British West Indies. From 1833-1835, Britain's “Slavery Abolition Act” effectively spread throughout the British Empire, and Ballou along with other abolitionists celebrated the event.<sup>26</sup> On 1 August, the American Anti-Slavery Society announced that a collection of speakers would give addresses throughout New England, including Ralph Waldo Emerson, Theodore Parker, Wendell Phillips, and Ballou.<sup>27</sup> The Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society, asked him to write something for its book *Liberty Chimes* published in 1845. His piece titled “The American Union” articulates the need of United States citizens to reflect on their role with the continuation of slavery. “Nearly three millions of human beings, whose birth-right was freedom, clank the chains of slavery,” and Americans' joined “hand in hand” and shouted to the “onward progress of the most intolerable wrong and outrage” in human history, wrote Ballou.<sup>28</sup> *Liberty Chimes* in the same volume published writings from Phillips and a letter from John Brown.<sup>29</sup>

The abolitionist cause continued to move forward and attempted to seek political power in Massachusetts. Ballou was nominated as a candidate for the Senate in Massachusetts and became a Free Mason. The antislavery society tried to replace the Whig governor and senators of the Bay state as a protest against the Whigs and Democrats who both compromised on slavery. In a letter to “Friend Quincy,” likely Josiah Quincy Jr., who was serving as Boston's mayor, an unknown author, probably Garrison, informed Quincy that the antislavery movement in Massachusetts desired to have a third-party on the ballot for the Governor and Senatorial elections. For governor, they nominated William Lloyd Garrison, with Francis Jackson as his

---

<sup>25</sup> William Lloyd Garrison, “To the Public,” *The Liberator*, vol. 1, no. 1 (January, 1, 1831).

<sup>26</sup> Seymour Drescher, *Abolition: A History of Slavery and Antislavery* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 322-23.

<sup>27</sup> “Notices: The First of August” *Prisoner's Friend: A Monthly Magazine Devoted to Criminal Reform, Philosophy, Science, Literature* . . . July 30, 1845; 1, American Periodicals, 71. Andover-Harvard Theological Library.

<sup>28</sup> Adin Ballou, “The American Union” *Liberty Chimes* (Providence, RI: Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society, 1845), 27, 29.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid*, 20-24, 111-113.

Lieutenant Governor. The Senators were “Adin Ballou, of Milford; John M. Fisk, of Brookfield; Stephen S. Foster, of Worcester; Effingham S. Capron; of Uxbridge; [and] Jt Everett, of Princeton.”<sup>30</sup>

Obviously, the abolitionists understood the unlikelihood of obtaining office against the powerful Whig and Democrat parties. The abolitionists’ candidates were arguably nothing more than protest candidates determined to spread the message of abolition to a wider audience. By the mid-1840s, Ballou full heartily espoused abolitionism and sought for immediate emancipation. For Ballou and other abolitionists, the next question was not if or when the slaves should be freed, but how.

### MORAL SUASION VS. INSURRECTION

From the outside, the antislavery movements appeared to be harmonious and were able to push doctrinal differences aside to rid the nation of slavery. However, the antislavery movements, similar to religious denominations, held differences in religious and political opinions and constantly debated the subject on the best solution to liberate the slave. Some called for a constitutional amendment, others thought to return slaves to their native country was the best solution; there were some who desired to use the United States Treasury to purchase the slaves, and others argued to abolish the practice by arming the slaves. In 1844, an Anti-Slavery Convention was held in Milford, Massachusetts to discuss the above issues troubling abolitionists. Ballou brought the meeting to order, and seven noted abolitionists including Wendell Phillips participated in a discussion to a “full” house. The participants lambasted Henry Clay for his Missouri Compromise,<sup>31</sup> and vilified the former President of the United States, stating, “That in Martin Van Buren we see the willing tool of the slavocracy.” The most radical resolution made in this meeting was their belief that the

“Constitution of the U. States, in founding the system of national representation on a basis of slaves . . . is a covenant with death and an agreement with hell, and ought to be immediately annulled.”<sup>32</sup>

Ballou and Phillips represented a radical branch of abolitionists who, along with

---

<sup>30</sup> “Curiosities of Voting.: The Letter. For Governor. For Lieut, Governor. For Senators,” *Liberator* (1831-1865); Nov. 26, 1847; 17, 48; American Periodicals, 190. Andover-Harvard Theological Library.

<sup>31</sup> The Missouri Compromise was a United States federal statute that regulated slavery in the country’s western territories by prohibiting the practice in the Louisiana Territory but allowed it in the Missouri territory. This opened the future admission of slavery in the Kansas and Nebraska Territories. See Robert Pierce Forbes, *The Missouri Compromise and Its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America* (Raleigh, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

<sup>32</sup> “Anti-Slavery Convention,” *The Liberator* (1831-1865); Mar 1, 1844; 14, 9; American Periodicals, 35. Andover-Harvard Theological Library.

Garrison, believed the Constitution, due to its proslavery character, ought to be disobeyed and abolished. Garrison, notably made similar claims in 1832 calling the Constitution

“the most bloody and heaven-daring arrangement ever made by men for the continuance and protection of a system [slavery] of the most atrocious villainy ever exhibited on earth.”<sup>33</sup>

His vehemence for the Republic’s charter was displayed during an Independence Day rally sponsored by the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in 1854 where he burned a copy of the Constitution to the sound of applause from many abolitionists.<sup>34</sup> Ballou, Phillips, and Garrison in 1844 recognized the structural designs of the Constitution were unable to free the slaves disagreeing with the American Colonization Society’s belief in deportation, and the broader abolition movement who believed amending the Constitution was the best option.

The solution to free the slave presented by Ballou and Garrison during the 1840s was to continue promulgating and expanding abolitionism via moral suasion. Ballou and Garrison used passages from the New Testament attributed to Christ, including Matthew 5:39, Mark 14:32-72, Luke 9:51-56, and others to argue that by taking up the sword themselves, arming the slaves, or using constitutional methods to liberate the slaves, the United States would be in danger of fulfilling Christ’s teaching that “for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.”<sup>35</sup> Ballou and Garrison knew that the abolitionists were largely a group of radicals committed to a strict biblical rendering of Christ’s controversial non-violent teachings, and by linking Christ’s anti-violence and anti-government instructions together, they sought to persuade other abolitionists to view the United States’ Constitution with contempt, and any attempt to validate it by emendation was accepting coercive methods as the means whereby to liberate the enslaved population instead of the formula given by Christ.<sup>36</sup> Ballou and Garrison believed,

“That no abolitionist can throw a vote for any candidate for office, under the United States Constitution, without being utterly recreant to his principles, and a traitor to the slave’s cause.”<sup>37</sup>

Many abolitionists did not agree with Ballou and Garrisons’ defaming of the Constitution and using its structural designs to free the slave. The differences in opinion on

---

<sup>33</sup> William Lloyd Garrison, “The Great Crisis!” *The Liberator* vol. II, no. 52 (December 29, 1832).

<sup>34</sup> Paul Finkleman, “Garrison’s Constitution: The Covenant with Death and How it was Made,” *Prologue: A Quarterly Publication of the National Archives and Records Administration* (Winter, 2000): 231-245.

<sup>35</sup> Matthew 26:52, The King James Version of the Holy Bible.

<sup>36</sup> Finkleman, “Garrison’s Constitution,” 231-40.

<sup>37</sup> “Annexation of Texas” *Liberator* (1831-1865); March, 8, 1844; 14, 01; American Periodicals, 39. Andover-Harvard Theological Library.

how to liberate the slaves came to their apex during an American Anti-Slavery Society meeting held in New York in July 1844, attended by hundreds of abolitionists. Ballou, and Garrison, Charles Dennison (a noted Boston abolitionist and reformed Baptist minister), Charles Burleigh (Then President of the American Anti-Slavery Society), and Abby Kelly (famous Women's Rights activist and abolitionist), were given time to explain their views on the subject. Ballou delivered a speech against using any "other means of advancing their objects but that of moral power." Dennison next took the stand and proceeded to lambast Ballou's proposals. The notes were taken during the meeting highlight the discord among abolitionists:

He [Dennison] regarded the views propounded by Mr. Ballou as day-visions from Hopedale. – (*Loud hisses and cheers.*) For himself, he felt satisfied that the friends of Abolition must take society as it is, and reform the existing evils by the means which God had placed at their disposal. Slavery was a great evil, and had grown up with the institutions of the country – it was interwoven with the very texture of political power, and political action alone must remove it. – (*Loud hisses and cheers.*) Yes, political action alone can remove it. We must carry our principles to the ballot box, and there enter protest. – (*Loud hisses and cheers.*) He [Dennison] believed that it was morally impossible to reform this world by moral suasion alone. The tares must grow up with the wheat until the day of harvest arrives. He would entreat, persuade, advise: and when all failed, he would resort to political power to break what he could not bend. (*Hisses and cheers.*) . . . After a long review of the several branches of moral influences enumerated by Ballou, he concluded (*amid a storm of the most violent hisses and wild uproar,*) with these words: "Who then, shall we follow, the Lord Jesus Christ, or Adin Ballou, of Hopedale?" The scene which followed baffled all description – it exceeded any exhibition of feeling we have ever witnessed in a political assemblage.<sup>38</sup>

Tensions continued to heighten during the meeting when the President of the American Anti-Slavery Society, Charles Burleigh, took over the platform and spoke for several minutes denouncing Dennison. Frustrated by his attempt to liken the "American ballot-box" with the "religion of Jesus Christ," Burleigh argued that only

"a wolf in sheep's clothing would have dared to do this. (a violent opposition from the friends of Garrison and Dennison),"

and boldly declared,

---

<sup>38</sup> "Confusion Among the Abolitionists," *African Repository and Colonial Journal* (1825-1849); July 1844; 20, 7; American Periodicals, 208. Andover-Harvard Theological Library

“In the name of every slave mother, he [Dennison was] a Benedict Arnold. (*Increased confusion, shouts, ‘No.’ ‘Yes.’*)”

Burleigh in the midst of cheers and hisses, relinquished the pulpit back to Dennison, who was frustrated that Burleigh labeled him a “hypocrite” and “apostate.” Dennison, however, continued the uproar by acknowledging the opinions of Garrison in regard to slavery, but “he did not adopt his wild, visionary theological opinions.” Frustrated by Burleigh’s veiled attack, Garrison rose from his seat shouting:

“Once there was a Benedict Arnold. (Hisses, louder than before, and great excitement.) “You are cowards!” (Another storm of hisses.) “Yes, I call you dastards!” (Continued confusion.) A voice “Judge not!” Garrison in a tremendous passion – “I say that whoever spoke then is a coward and dastard!” (Of the scene at this moment, it is impossible to give any description.) Garrison continuing – “I say, there was once a Benedict Arnold.” (Hisses). (Mr. Dennison jumping on the seat, shouted out at the top of his voice, ‘I think you are the Benedict Arnold!’”<sup>39</sup>

The uproar in the meeting “was tremendous” and several “ladies” and men shouted at the top of their lungs to allow the speakers to be heard without interruption. Eventually, Abby Kelly spoke and according to the scribe, was the only one who was heard “without any other expression, but that of approbation.” She asked everyone to be charitable toward Dennison and welcome him back. The meeting ended with the rowdy abolitionists singing “Come join the Abolition Cause.”<sup>40</sup> There were no formal policies adopted on how to free the slave, and the debate continued.

As the 1840s came to an end, slaves continued to be held in captivity. The abolitionist cause moved into the 1850s, seemingly without hope that the slaves would be freed. For more than twenty years, the belief that moral suasion, as advocated by Garrison and Ballou, would rid the United States of its national sin was beginning to appear inadequate. In November 1851, the Rhode Island Anti-Slavery Society held its sixteenth annual conference. Invitations for speakers were sent to “Frederick Douglas [a renowned fugitive slave], Samuel R. Ward, Charles L. Remond, Theodore Parker, Charles C. Burleigh, and our highly esteemed non-resistant brother, Adin Ballou.” Of those invited to speak, only three concurred, Douglas, Redmond, and Burleigh. Ballou wrote a letter stating he had “other engagements” that prevented him from attending.<sup>41</sup>

At the meeting, Douglass spoke during the morning session about his fond memories

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> “Rhode Island A.S. Society” *Liberator*, vol. 21, no. 46 (November 14, 1851): 187. Andover-Harvard Theological Library.

during the early days of the movement with Garrison, Abby Kelley, and others. During his speech, an anonymous “colored man” rose and advocated “killing all who attempted to re-enslave a fugitive,”<sup>42</sup> in reference to the Fugitive Slave Act that required citizens of the North to return runaway slaves to their masters in the south. Many abolitionists nicknamed this law the “Bloodhound Law” in protest.<sup>43</sup> Quickly, the meeting turned as Remond (A leading black abolitionist in Boston who frequently toured with Garrison), arose and discussed the subject of “self-defense.” He believed it was time for abolitionists to encourage “colored people” to use “all the physical power and means they could command to strike down the executors of the Fugitive Slave Law.” Remond understood his calls for self-defense likely would cause an uproar due to his friendship with Garrison. However, he attempted to appease the non-violence majority explaining non-resistants would not be expected to participate in the “shedding of human blood.” Theodore Parker’s belief was also represented at the meeting, even though he was not in attendance. SWW (name unknown) read a portion of one of Parker’s speeches that said, “I am no-non-resistant, but I am glad that the leading antislavery men are so.” Douglass, frustrated by the mutual exclusiveness, charged Parker and those attending the meeting with “inconsistency, and endeavored to show there was none in the language used.”<sup>44</sup>

The evening session continued the discussion of violent opposition to slavery when Remond and Douglass justified the killing of slave owner Edward Gorsuch during the Christiana Fugitive Affair in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, where four fugitive slaves, along with local townspeople, resisted the captors by force killing Gorsuch in the process. Douglass continued his remarks by promoting the killing of all slaveholders. He referenced the Revolutionary War engagements at Lexington and Bunker Hill, and used the revered revolutionary Patrick Henry, to explain the just war of the slave. Burleigh finished the conference by refuting both Douglass and Remond and asserted,

“The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds. Let us be faithful, abhor all compromise with evil, and in due time we shall reap, if we faint not.”

According to the scribe at the meeting, Burleigh’s words received “continued applause – more than on both the previous days.”<sup>45</sup> Even though Ballou and Garrison’s position on non-

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> Allan Nevins, *Ordeal of the Union: Fruits of Manifest Destiny, 1847-1852* (New York, NY: Collier Books, 1992), 367.

<sup>44</sup> “Rhode Island A.S. Society,” 187.

<sup>45</sup> “Rhode Island A.S. Society,” 187.



violent abolition was debated in the 1840s, it appeared to be the most popular position in the early 1850s as well. Remond and Douglass may have left the meeting frustrated, but their pleas of the slaves' just war, began resonating as the 1850s progressed.

### ACCEPTING VIOLENT EMANCIPATION

Ballou and Garrison continued their non-violence admonitions, however in 1854, the Missouri Compromise was repealed. This federal statute that prohibited slavery in the Louisiana Territory north of the proposed state of Missouri was replaced by the Kansas-Nebraska Act. The United States was expanding, and Stephen Douglas, a Democratic Senator from Illinois, wrote the law to help open new farms throughout the Midwest and help to establish the Transcontinental Railroad. Douglas wrote into the law a popular sovereignty clause that left the voters to determine if slavery would be allowed in the Kansas and Nebraska territories. This caused both pro-and-anti slavery voters to flood into Kansas with the goal of voting slavery up and down. Tensions mounted, and Kansas began to bleed in 1855.<sup>46</sup>

Missourians considered northerners' migration as a political statement against the South's "peculiar institution" and began harassing them. There were fears from both Missourians and citizens in Kansas that northern abolitionists were infiltrating the Free State. On the *Polar Star*, a ferry used on the Missouri River to bring passengers to Kansas, William C. Clark led a Bible study and argued the Creation narrative in the Old Testament implied all races including, white, black, and Indian were common ancestors. Passengers labelled him an "abolition Yankee," and during breakfast, he was struck with a chair. Fearing for his life, Clark left the boat when it stopped for firewood.<sup>47</sup> On another occasion, a Missourian remarked to a supposed southern immigrant that

"Too many infernal abolitionists are getting into the country, and for my part, I am for tarring and feathering and gutting and hanging and drowning the scoundrels until not an abolition thief shall be found in Kansas!"<sup>48</sup>

Abolitionist writings also were banned in the new Kansas territorial slave code. The *Herald of Freedom*, an antislavery publication edited by George Brown, was banished from the territory, and the Atchison postmaster returned copies of the newspaper back to Brown informing him to keep his "rotten and corrupt effusions from tainting the pure air of this portion

---

<sup>46</sup> Nicole Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era* (University of Kansas Press, 2004), 94.

<sup>47</sup> Unknown Author, *Herald of Freedom*, June 28, 1856. In *Ibid*, 94.

<sup>48</sup> John Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane, "The Liberator of Kansas" with Corroborative Incidents of Pioneer History* (Garden City, KU: 1897), 18-19.

of the Territory.”<sup>49</sup> A poem titled “Kansas Laws” threatened northerners that:

If any Yankee, in this Territory  
Shall circulate an abolition story . . .  
Then brave STRINGFELLOW, or the gallant JONES,  
Or ATCHISON, or any man of note,  
May cut his cursed antislavery throat.<sup>50</sup>

No executions took place, but abolitionists under the Kansas-Nebraska Act were limited to promulgate their message through the press. It was becoming clear for some abolitionists that to rid the nation of its sin, a violent insurrection was necessary, and Kansas would be the theater where they would make their stand.

The advances of slavery in Kansas seemed insurmountable, and some abolitionists believed that without war, slavery would take over the Kansas territory. One infamous and famous abolitionist, John Brown, was crucial to turn the struggle in Kansas toward violence. Brown, a lifelong abolitionist, became disillusioned with Ballou and Garrison’s non-violent methods to expunge slavery. The Fugitive Slave Act and the Kansas-Nebraska Act were proofs that slavery was increasing, and to defeat the figurative Goliath that was slavery, the New Testament God preached by abolitionists required an Old Testament David to fight the behemoth.

Before Brown went to Kansas, he was already committed to a violent war against slavery. Kansas presented him with the opportunity to not only help defend his elder sons who moved to Kansas, but to display God’s approval of violent opposition to evil. He petitioned the wealthy abolitionist Gerrit Smith for funds to buy guns and ammunition. Smith and others, primarily from Brown’s birthplace in Ohio, funded his “army” to fight against the largely proslavery government in Kansas. The struggle commenced when a “Free-Stater” (those who believed Kansas should be an antislavery state) was shot by a proslavery settler. Brown began his holy war by planning the murder of proslavery settlers at Pottawatomie Creek. Brown’s men slaughtered five proslavery men at midnight. The war gained traction, and Brown was further incensed when his son Frederick and neighbor David Garrison were killed in Osawatomie by General John W. Reid’s Missourian battalion. The border dispute between Kansas and Missouri turned into a war lasting nearly seven bloody years from 1855-1861.<sup>51</sup> Brown’s actions in Kansas and Missouri reignited a debate within the abolitionists on the merits

---

<sup>49</sup> Robert S. Kelley to G.W. Brown, Sept. 7, 1855, in *Herald of Freedom*, Sept. 22, 1855.

<sup>50</sup> Unknown Author in *Squatter Sovereign*, Dec. 9, 1856. In Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 64.

<sup>51</sup> Debra Goodrich Bisel, *The Civil War in Kansas: Ten Years of Turmoil* (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2012), 41-48.

of violent opposition to slavery.

Fearing Brown's actions would be seen by other abolitionists as exemplary; Ballou quickly published his beliefs regarding the activities of Brown in Kansas. In an editorial titled, "Freedom in Kansas Vs. Christian Non-Resistance," Ballou attacks abolitionists who financially or morally support violence to emancipate the growing slave population. He laments the

"majority of those who at one time or another professed to adopt it [non-violence] have fallen away from it . . . The brave champions of Anti-Slavery, whom we have ourselves delighted to honor for their talents, eloquence and devotion to the cause, such as Gerrit Smith, Henry Ward Beecher, Theodore Parker and a host of their admirers, are almost overwhelming us [non-resistant abolitionists] with their chivalrous appeals."<sup>52</sup>

Ballou's primary method of argumentation again used Christ to explain that promoting violent means to liberate even the most deserving prisoners was sinful and did not have the blessing of providence. Ballou preached patience during a time of fermenting tension.

The battle in Kansas was not a war based on abolishing chattel slavery in the United States, but rather deciding if Kansas would be a free or slave state, according to Ballou. Both free and slave states participated in upholding slavery. This was an economic battle between two differing bodies, and Ballou pled with his fellow abolitionists to recognize that the fight in Kansas was not over slavery.

"Was it [the war in Kansas] whether Kansas should be a land of freedom for all honest and well behaved emigrants, black as well as white? No. It was about if it should be possessed and ruled by Free State men, or by Slave State men. All this was well understood by the aspirants of both parties, and they went into the competitive struggle accordingly."

For Ballou, this was more than an ideological battle. If abolitionists turned to the sword to defeat slavery and abandon their peace principles as outlined by Christ in the New Testament, abolitionism would lose the moral high ground.

"Beloved friends, Smith, Beecher, &c., &c., &c., pray spare your eloquence awhile; for we have small relish for the banquet to which you invite us," remarks Ballou. "Freedom in Kansas will, no doubt, be a fine thing for such white people as are leagued with slaveholders against four millions of slaves . . . but for ourselves, we prefer Freedom of a better quality."

By taking up arms to defeat the "border ruffians" in Kansas, Ballou believed abolitionists were "deluded into shed[ding] human blood."<sup>53</sup> The war in Kansas was a struggle

---

<sup>52</sup> Adin Ballou, "Freedom in Kansas vs. Christian Non-Resistance" *Liberator* (1831-1865); May 2, 1856; 26, 18: American Periodicals, 0\_1.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

between white men and for white men. By supporting the violent efforts of Brown, abolitionists, such as Ballou, were left in a doctrinal quandary. The majority of New England abolitionists in the early 1850s ascribed to the tenets of non-violence, but recognized their efforts of moral suasion from the pulpit and the press did little to slow down the economic power of the United States' collective sin. Slavery appeared to be expanding west and without war emancipation seemed bleak.

Ballou, however, repulsed he was by the abolitionists turn to promote physical force to free the slave, did not provide an immediate practical solution. He continued to disagree with re-colonization efforts, constitutional amending, or purchasing the slaves. Regarding re-colonization, Ballou sarcastically stated,

“Let them be shipped off, whether they are willing or not – send them home – we have had enough of them. You mean that having extorted from them all we can, and stripped them of everything but life, we have no further use for them. Very generous and kind, indeed!”

Continuing, Ballou explains,

“They are not Aboriginal Americans; neither are we. Their ancestors came from Africa, ours from Europe; and here, we are in the red man's country. If there is to be any shipping off without consent, we had better let the Indian say who shall be sent home. I dare say he would colonize Europe quite as liberally as we would Africa.”<sup>54</sup>

Ballou saw purchasing slaves by the federal government as putting money back into the pockets of slave owners who, for years, gained economic prosperity on the backs of slaves. It appears that by the eve of the Civil War in 1860, he believed that immediate emancipation was the only solution and only could be achieved through continued civil disobedience via non-violent methods. Ballou's exegesis, in regard to Christ's non-violent admonitions, applied to every individual and collective situation.

Without a practical solution to free the slaves and seeing his abolitionist brethren lean toward the use of force for emancipation, Ballou contemplated leaving the American Anti-Slavery Society in early 1859 but was still an active member and recruiter. He recognized the principles he admired most in the antislavery movements were taking on new forms. Writing to Garrison, the president of the movement, Ballou felt “anxious” to have William Cobb become a member of the society based largely on his non-resistant principles. Cobb was moving to Michigan, and Ballou believed he would be an important “agent” for the abolitionists and help spread the movement to the frontier. Cobb also held similar theological views on non-

---

<sup>54</sup> Ballou, *A Discourse on the Subject of American Slavery*, 61.

violence. Ballou advised Garrison to accept Cobb, “With these suggestions we cordially commend his case to your consideration and that of your co-advisors in the American Society.”<sup>55</sup> Even though Ballou recommended Cobb to the movement in March 1859, within six months Ballou’s belief in the abolitionist movement faltered based on its adoption of using the military might of the North to free the slave, and continued expressing his possible disassociation.

In the *Liberator*, J. Miller McKim, a renowned Presbyterian minister and devoted friend of John Brown, expressed his frustration with Ballou’s proposed resignation and antagonism toward insurrection. “Anything from the pen of Adin Ballou is worthy of attention” explains McKim, but he “is not infallible.” McKim admitted the “war spirit” spread throughout the abolitionists, however,

“Our organization is made up of people of all varieties of opinion on the force question . . . no Society in the country embraces so large a proportion of peace men as does the American Anti-Slavery Society.”

Frustrated with Ballou, McKim pleads with him to return.

“Our friend [Ballou] has done good service . . . heretofore: why should he now relax his efforts? At the very time we need him most . . . This is not right . . . This looks almost like shirking duty. The voice of the majority imposes no obligation of submission . . . But, he says, ‘We are rather inclined to retire.’ Let him not forget that inclination and duty sometimes lead in opposite directions.”

McKim’s main criticism of Ballou was his intertwining abolitionism with Christianity, rather than its corollary. McKim explains that abolitionism has one goal which is to liberate the slaves. Obviously, there is hope within abolitionism for a “heart-change” among slave owners and non-abolitionists, but “no one claims that the chief end of man is to be an Abolitionist.” The society itself was not set up as a religious denomination but as a fellowship of brothers and sisters working within the

“doctrines of the Christian religion. What is that the Lord thy God doth require of thee, that to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God? Therefore, aid in the overthrow of slavery,”

argues McKim. He also suggests Ballou’s threatened disassociation from the antislavery society may have been his susceptibility to be easily offended.

---

<sup>55</sup> Adin Ballou to William Lloyd Garrison, March 21, 1859. In Boston Public Library Special Collections, MS. A. 1.2, v.29, p. 34.

“What if ‘now and then a little contempt of non-resistant softness’ does tincture expression? Cannot our friend, who knows he is in the right, bear that, and a little ‘laughter at his expense’ besides?”

McKim explains that dissent can be useful in teaching forbearance and “it does us no harm to be occasionally ‘disgusted’” with other members of the abolitionist community. He implores Ballou to understand that the criticisms come from a friend and to view them as “wholesome and edifying.” He concludes the article by begging Ballou to remain with the society.

“But pray, friend Ballou, don’t leave our ranks. The cause has need of you. ‘The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick.’ I don’t think that we are nearly as warlike and venomous as you make us out to be, but still we are bad enough to need the antidote of your gentle spirit and peace-breathing doctrines. Don’t desert us.”<sup>56</sup>

### **THE HARPER’S FERRY TRAGEDY AND ABOLITIONISM’S SUPPORT OF VIOLENCE**

It is unclear if Ballou responded to McKim, but it appears his plea comforted Ballou, and he remained in the movement. However, on 16 October, 1859, John Brown’s raid on Harper’s Ferry reignited Ballou’s contempt for violent insurrection, and it instigated a philosophical tremor within the society. Brown, along with roughly twenty men, including three free blacks and a fugitive slave, seized a United States arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Virginia. The raid failed, and more than half of the men were killed or captured. Brown was tried and found guilty of treason and hung on 2 December 1859.<sup>57</sup> The abolitionists lost one of their most provocative and influential members. For many, Brown’s martyrdom for the slaves displayed his heroism and resolve. Others were unsure of how to respond to this tragedy. Declaring Brown, a traitor, was disingenuous and disrespectful to a man who bled for the slave. However, praising Brown’s vigilantism could do further damage to an already bifurcated nation.

Ballou immediately condemned the insurrectionist-minded abolitionists and declared Brown’s actions egregious to the “ultra” wing of abolitionism that was committed to non-resistance. Ballou recognized his cherished non-resistance principles among the abolitionists were floundering, and Brown’s example of manliness produced a seductive “argument for bloody resistance, insurrectionism, and revolution.” Ballou frustrated other abolitionists by wishing “them [insurrectionists] no success, but the speediest failure.” An unknown abolitionist retorted,

---

<sup>56</sup> J. Miller McKim, “Practical Christian Anti-Slavery,” *The Liberator* (1831-1865); September 30, 1859; 29, 39, American Periodicals, 154. Andover-Harvard Theological Library.

<sup>57</sup> James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1988), 205-206.



“Our bro. Ballou . . . in such a conflict . . . hopes the oppressor will succeed against the oppressed; that the wrong side will triumph over the right . . . that US marines and Virginia troops may overcome the Virginia slaves in every encounter!”<sup>58</sup>

The abolitionists struggled to find common ground between the ultras, who were committed to non-resistance, and the others who respected the activities of Brown. Amidst this philosophical battle, Garrison, the quasi-theological leader, was asked to respond to Brown’s actions.

Garrison, who converted Ballou to non-resistance in 1837, cleverly balanced his peace principles with the justifications of Brown’s insurrection. In a speech given to a group of abolitionists at the Tremont Temple in Boston, Garrison explained his reaction to the death of Brown. Unlike Ballou, Garrison toed the line with those who were sympathetic to Brown’s fight against slavery.

“Was John Brown justified in his attempt?” asked Garrison,

“Yes, if [George] Washington was in his . . . . If men are justified in striking a blow for freedom, when the question is one of a threepenny tax on tea, then, I say, they [slaves, Brown] are a thousand times more justified.”

Any abolitionist or American citizen who viewed Brown as a bloodthirsty “traitor is a calumniator” proclaimed Garrison. He understood there was a push among abolitionists, including Ballou, to see the movement as a vehicle to spread a form of Christianity akin to a religious denomination. The sole purpose of abolitionism was to rid the United States of slavery, not to convert the United States to a form of Christianity. Garrison used the “American standard” to judge Brown’s activity rather than Christ’s, and proclaimed,

“I hesitate not to say, with all deliberation, that those who are attempting to decry [Brown] are dangerous members of the community; they are those in whom the love of liberty has died out; they are the lineal descendants of the tories of the Revolution, only a great deal worse.”<sup>59</sup>

This last proclamation was responded to with “applause” from those in attendance. Here Garrison does not present an either-or argument; rather, he cleverly proclaims his belief in non-resistance versus those who believe the opposite. Garrison, with his response to Brown, pitted two pillars of abolitionist belief against each other, namely non-resistance and individual conscience. The same “inner light” that moved Brown to his actions was the same force that governed Garrison’s decision to abstain from insurrection. For him, neither principle was

---

<sup>58</sup> Adin Ballou, “The Practical Christian” excerpt printed in *the Liberator* (1831-1865); January, 31, 1860; 30, 2; American Periodicals, 7.

<sup>59</sup> William Lloyd Garrison, “No Union With Slaveholders” *The Liberator*, vol. 29, no. 50 (Boston, MA: December, 16, 1859), 198.

mutually exclusive. Abolitionists could remain within the movement by adhering to the buffetings of conscience wherever those might lead. Each could decide in this time of peril on how best to follow God's advice, whether biblical or experiential, and any attempt to demand absolute obedience to one particular principle discussed by abolitionists would lead to the movement's failure.

Ballou was incensed by Garrison's double talk and praise of Brown. Ballou held a "special meeting" with the South Division Anti-Slavery Society in Worcester, Massachusetts. It was an attempt by him to thwart the "eulogizing and glorifying" of Brown's method of gaining traction among the abolitionists. Immediately Ballou brought the peace principles of the "old platform" of abolitionism to the forefront. In a series of speeches throughout the day, Ballou read from the antislavery declaration and constitutional pledge of 1833, ironically written by Garrison, that states abolitionists would not resort to measures of "physical resistance" to abolish slavery.

"Ours are such only as the opposition of moral purity to moral corruption – the destruction of error by the potency of truth – the overthrow of prejudice by the power of love,"<sup>60</sup>

wrote Garrison. At the close of the meeting, Ballou's resolutions did not receive acknowledgment and were "overborne by numbers" in opposition. The meeting ended by resolving

"that as Abolitionists . . . we are unable to judge of the wisdom of their [John Brown's army] measures, we are prompt to avow our cordial sympathy with the spirit and our devout admiration of [his] heroism."

Frustrated by the resolution, Ballou did not adopt it and left the "new heroes of the cause [abolitionism] to glory in the sword on their own responsibility." After Garrison's speech, Ballou frustratingly lamented "even Brother Wm. Lloyd Garrison . . . became more than an apologist; he became a eulogist of the blood-shedding hero of the Harper's Ferry tragedy."<sup>61</sup>

The preceding publications in the *Liberator* continued the debate after John Brown's hanging. Although Garrison remained virtually silent to give a definitive answer on a resistance policy, he was the editor of the *Liberator* and published AGSs and J.H. Fowler's thoughts that highlight the development of non-resistance thought among abolitionists. AGS explains

---

<sup>60</sup> William Lloyd Garrison, "Declaration of the National Anti-Slavery Convention" *The Liberator*, vol. 3, no. 50 (Boston, MA: December 14, 1833), 198.

<sup>61</sup> Ballou, *Autobiography*, 419.

“true there was a bloody side to the Harper’s Ferry movement, which every non-resistant must condemn . . . But was there not also another side to it – to John Brown?”

AGS explained that Brown exemplified the moral force behind the antislavery movement. He was not breaking any commandment by God because he did not commit to the ultras’ belief in non-resistance. He was neither convinced by “common sense . . . [or] Scripture text” that his insurrectionist activities violated the biblical exegesis of Garrison’s belief in Christ’s non-resistant teachings.

“I shall endeavor to appreciate true virtue, manliness, and heroism, in others,” wrote AGS, “even though they have not learned to distinguish between brutal forces, such as fangs and claws, swords and bullets, and those mightier weapons which are not carnal.”<sup>62</sup>

Fowler attempted to appease both sides of the argument by showing the parallels between physical resistance and non-resistance. Both agree to the principle of, “The ends justify the means,” in that non-resistance and physical resistance attempt to cure an evil with a certain diagnosis. Brown used “moral power” as his justification to take up arms. Likewise, “Henry C. Wright,” used “moral power” to take up his “pen and tongue” to defeat slavery. Brown’s

“rifle made an occasion for his moral power to act. His physical energy, applied in the form of bold resistance, made an opening, and gave him a position so that he could use his moral force.” Fowler identified his object in “this article”

was to show how “nearly the true non-resistant and his ally, the resistant, agree,” and explained to Garrison why Fowler changed his “policy.” “The times demanded the change” argued Fowler and Garrison along with other ultras needed to rethink their strategy for liberating the slave.<sup>63</sup>

Garrison, however, continued to allow non-resistants to fill the pages of the *Liberator* with anti-insurrectionist thought. William H. Furness, A Unitarian-Congregationalist minister from Pennsylvania, explained his difficulty with aggrandizing Brown’s actions. Not all the “new heroes” of abolitionism concurred with Brown’s approach. Furness saw in Brown a failure to use Christ’s example of non-violence in his approach to ending slavery. Furness used the biblical account of Peter’s aggression against Christ’s captors to understand how best to approach abolitionist calls for a violent uprising. The biblical account in John 18 explains Peter smote Malchus with his sword cutting off his right ear. Immediately, Christ commands Peter

---

<sup>62</sup> A.G.S., “John Brown...Non-Resistance” *Liberator*, vol. 30, no. 12 (Boston, MA: March 23, 1860).

<sup>63</sup> J.H. Fowler, “Physical Resistance and ‘Non-resistance,’” *Liberator*, vol. 30, no. 14, (Boston, MA: April 6, 1860).

to “Put up thy sword into thy sheath.”<sup>64</sup> Christ miraculously heals Malchus and admonishes his disciples to abstain from further violence. Furness likens this story to the situation with the slaves, and asks his fellow abolitionists, “What are we to do about him [slave] – we especially, of the North?” Brown, though justified in his use of force based on “public sentiment” that recognized self-defense as a lawful instrument of justice and liberty, nevertheless by “drawing the sword for the slave, he was wrong,” argued Furness. Similar to Ballou, Furness believed violent uprising by the abolitionists did more harm than good for their cause and the slave. “He [Brown] did not take into account the undeviating law, that violence produces violence,” and did not adhere to the council given to Peter by Christ. Furness ascribed to pre-Harper’s Ferry abolitionism that believed, “Truth is . . . much more effectual than any brute force.” He sought a less polemic approach than Ballou and explained Brown displayed “heroic courage” in his war against slavery. Brown was simply misguided and unlike trained clergy and itinerant preachers, did not spend his time pondering and debating the tenets outlined by Christ to his followers.<sup>65</sup>

Frustrated by the movement’s willingness to break bread with insurrectionists, Ballou’s involvement virtually ended by the eve of the Civil War in 1861. He became the minority among a group that previously proclaimed non-violence. Ballou left the abolitionists to rely on the “war machine” to liberate the slave and remained in Hopedale; his village committed to non-resistance; a refuge he believed that would continue to shelter non-violent principles until the Civil War ended.

### **ALONE IN HOPEDALE**

Prior to the first shots fired on 12 April, 1861 by Confederate forces upon Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor in South Carolina, Ballou recognized the war drums were beating. Although his utopian community failed to achieve its goals, and was transformed into a rural village in Massachusetts by 1861, Hopedale remained a champion of non-resistance. Ballou’s beloved periodical the *Practical Christian*, published its final issue a year prior to the Civil War after twenty years of existence, leaving Ballou without a textual vehicle to proclaim his non-resistance principles. Repentantly, Ballou, explains in his “Editorial Farewell” that he has “written some things which need amendment, and which he would correct if he had the opportunity,” however, in regard to non-resistance and theological reform, “The divine

---

<sup>64</sup> John 18:10-11 The King James Version of the Holy Bible.

<sup>65</sup> William H. Furness, “Put up thy Sword” *The Liberator*, vol. 30, no. 15 (Boston, MA: April 13, 1860), 60.

imperiality of TRUTH and LOVE must be uncompromisingly revered.”<sup>66</sup> Roughly three months prior to Fort Sumter, Ballou predicted the South’s secession. He recognized the hopes of the slaves rested on the backs of the Union soldiers, but was unable to support the North. “There is uncertainty and crooked purpose in war,” and it came with the price of corrupting the souls of everyone involved, including those who did not take up arms, argued Ballou.<sup>67</sup>

Without the support of the abolitionist movement, which largely adopted the motto “peacefully if we can, forcibly if we must,”<sup>68</sup> Ballou became indifferent and virtually non-existent within abolitionist circles. However, he hoped that his “peace breathing doctrines” would continue to influence his flock and individuals sympathetic to non-resistance in New England. With “the influx of strangers” that relocated to Hopedale after its collapse, Ballou’s cherished non-resistance principles began to be seen unreasonable to members in the Hopedale village. “We may yet be pointed at with the finger of scorn as fogies and fossils, clinging tenaciously to a superannuated Christ and a dead past,” pronounces Ballou. And if the day comes when Hopedale is no longer a bastion of non-resistance,

“then, with our organization remaining still intact, we may purchase us a new location, pack up our archives, take our sacred fire, and bid adieu to this valley – carrying with us all of Hopedale, that represented its primal past.”<sup>69</sup>

Even in Hopedale, Ballou’s spiritual leadership began to be questioned based on his insistence that Hopedalians needed to remain non-participants in the Civil War.

The war spirit was budding in Hopedale during the beginnings of the Civil War. By July 1861, there were roughly fifty remaining members of the once promising Practical Christian Republic, founded by Ballou in 1840; however, there were rumblings within the flock by those adopting war as a means to free the slave. Fearing non-resistance principles were floundering in his village, Ballou passed a series of resolves resurrecting the initial cherished principle of non-resistance by the founders of Hopedale in 1840. Those desiring further fellowship needed to sign the pledge of peace. Eleven refrained from agreeing to the old platform, including the highly influential, founding member, and close friend, George Draper.<sup>70</sup> Draper resigned, “having become satisfied . . . that I am not in spirit or feeling or

---

<sup>66</sup> Adin Ballou, “Editorial Farewell,” *Practical Christian*, vol. 26, no. 20 (April 14, 1860).

<sup>67</sup> Ballou, “Christian Non-Resistance in Extreme Cases,” 71.

<sup>68</sup> Fernando Wood “Speech,” *New York Times*, January, 8, 1861 in John Chodes, *Abe Lincoln’s Secret War Against the North* (New York, NY: Algora Publishing, 2015), 11.

<sup>69</sup> Adin Ballou, “Remarks . . . at the Annual Meeting of the Hopedale Community,” in *Hopedale Community Record Book No. 2*, January 12, 1859, 6-8.

<sup>70</sup> Spann, *From Commune to Company Town*, 150.

practice or purpose a Non-Resistant.”<sup>71</sup> His son William volunteered for the war in September 1861. Three other members offered their services to help freed slaves in Port Royal, South Carolina, but were denied by Edward Pierce, who was commissioned to establish schools and help acclimate the new citizens into the Union. Pierce wanted freed slaves at Port Royal to become healthy citizens and the three volunteers from Hopedale would take away what “little manhood left them [freed slaves] by inculcating the doctrine of non-resistance.”<sup>72</sup> Even in Hopedale, Ballou recognized that despite his twenty years of defending both the logical and divine merits of Christ’s peace commands, in the case of the Civil War even some closest to him could not remain loyal to non-resistance.

Ballou looked outward to find others partial to non-resistance. In an attempt to re-entrench non-resistance within Hopedale and throughout New England, Ballou published articles, preached, and lectured on the subject during the Civil War. In 1862, he denied any connection with Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation and resolved by a unanimous vote “to be in the future on guard ‘against all solicitations’ of that sort.”<sup>73</sup> He was particularly frustrated by fellow New England preachers who believed that using physical force was a divine commandment in the cases of self-defense and defensive war.

Often polemic, Ballou, particularly took to task the Reverend Henry Ward Beecher, the son of the famed Calvinist minister Lyman Beecher in a “review” of Henry’s sermon printed in the *Independent* in 1861. In it, Beecher explains elements of non-resistance that are inconsistent with the Gospel.

“The world has been very much divided in opinion as respects the doctrine of combating,” explains Beecher, and, “There have been great many non-combatants in the world, who have supposed that physical force and physical violence were inconsistent with a radical conception of Christianity.”

According to Beecher, Christianity only forbids physical force and physical violence when they are

“vengeful; where they proceed merely from the impulse of cruelty; where they seek a selfish end, and originate in a selfish motive.” When physical violence or force springs from “affection, or from moral sentiment, they not only are tolerated, but are

---

<sup>71</sup> George Draper quoted in Ballou, *Autobiography*, 429.

<sup>72</sup> Willie Lee Rose, *Rehearsal for Reconstruction: The Port Royal Experiment* (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1964), 48. & E.L. Pierce to Charles Sumner, March 20, 1862, Charles Sumner Papers, Houghton Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

<sup>73</sup> Spann, *From Commune to Company Town*, 150. See also the Hopedale Community, *Record Book no. 2*, January 8, 1862.



commanded, by the whole spirit of Christianity . . . I despise the whole idea of non-resistance. It is false to manhood, and essentially false to Christianity.”<sup>74</sup>

Responding, Ballou asserts:

Mr. Beecher holds that physical violence even the most deadly force, against deliberately offending and violent fellow men is right, is Christian, and befits the perfect Christian man; provided only that it be not “vengeful,” “cruel,” nor “selfish” . . . Alas for his proviso! . . . Only he must bully and kill the “scoundrel” in “love,” “from affection,” without any “selfish motive,” under “the control of the moral faculties!” Most sublime ethics!<sup>75</sup>

Beecher’s explanation of the Christian man’s duty to defend and support the oppressed by physical force and to free the slave, was seen by Ballou as contrary to scripture. In his review, he points to numerous passages in the Bible that represent the apostles and Christ as non-resistants in the face of immediate and communal danger. By 1862, Ballou believed “Perfect Christianity” required non-injurious uses of force and if those methods failed, one must suffer even as Christ suffered. “So he [Christ] died praying for his enemies,” writes Ballou, “leaving us an example that we should follow his steps.”<sup>76</sup> Beecher’s comments and Ballou’s review explain the theological struggle between various preachers and clergymen throughout New England on Christ’s teachings of non-resistance during the Civil War.

Ballou and those remaining in Hopedale committed to non-resistance largely remained outside of the conflict until the end of 1862. However, in the summer of 1863, John Heywood, was drafted into the Union army. The “Enrollment Act” passed by Congress in March 1863, forced all males between the ages of twenty and forty-five who intended on remaining United States citizens, eligible for the Union army. There were two exemptions, a payment of \$300 or finding a substitute draftee.<sup>77</sup> This was problematic for Ballou and the members of the Hopedale community. Ballou and William Heywood, John’s father, petitioned the government for an exemption based on religious grounds similar to the Quakers, Mennonites, and Shakers pleas for immunity. The government balked at Ballou and William’s request, and Ballou was left with two questions, namely, should John civilly disobey the order and go to jail becoming a martyr for non-resistance, or should the community, which was financially struggling, pay the \$300? Ballou’s understanding of non-resistance viewed existing human governments, however imperfect, as a necessity for degenerate individuals, and submissively paid taxes. If

---

<sup>74</sup> Henry Ward Beecher, “Extract” in Adin Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance Defended Against Rev. Henry Ward Beecher* (Hopedale, MA: 1862), 3-4

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid*, 7-8.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid*, 14.

<sup>77</sup> Eugene C. Murdock, *One Million Men: The Civil War Draft in the North* (Madison, WI: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1971), 197.

Ballou and the community decided to pay the \$300, they understood this money would be spent to support the war effort, thus going against their higher peace principles, but maintaining Christ's advice "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's."<sup>78</sup> Ballou likely viewed the \$300 as another tax he and others were required to tribute. After "considerable hesitancy and discussion," the \$300 was paid for. In a letter signed by John Heywood and written by Ballou, the Heywood's along with the Hopedale non-resistants explained their position and why they paid the money.

"To the governmental authorities of the United States and their constituents," begins the letter, "the undersigned, John Lowell Heywood of Hopedale . . . respectfully maketh solemn declaration, remonstrance, and protest, to wit."

Although the \$300 was paid to the government, Ballou wanted to protest. John's opposition was

"not only for himself but also on behalf of his Christian associates and all other orderly, peaceable, tax-paying, non-[in]juring subjects of the government of whatever denomination or class."

The money was given as a subjection to "the powers that be," and viewed as an "infraction" of "natural and indefeasible rights as a conscientious, peaceable subject."<sup>79</sup> Ballou later lamented the decision to pay the \$300.

"I have since feared that we acted wrongfully in the matter . . . I do not recommend a repetition of our course in future cases of a similar sort."<sup>80</sup>

Ballou and John's father chose to give in to governmental pressure instead of letting one of their own be imprisoned.

The Civil War also brought wealth to the Draper brothers leading to Ballou's loss of spiritual control in Hopedale. By 1864, government orders for military clothing reinvigorated the Drapers' textile mill that no longer was part of Ballou's Practical Christian Republic. Money flooded into the community leading to Hopedale becoming the stronghold of industry through the Drapers, rather than the province of Ballou's non-resistants. The war resulted in the closing of the Hopedale Home School where students were inculcated with non-resistant tenets. Even Ballou's daughter and son-in-law left Hopedale during the Civil War to find employment elsewhere. By Ballou's sixty-second year in 1865, his once commanding influence over the Hopedale inhabitants diminished. The old community was absorbed by the

---

<sup>78</sup> Matthew 22:21, King James Version of the Holy Bible.

<sup>79</sup> John Lowell Heywood to Governmental Authorities, in Ballou, *Autobiography*, 450-51. Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> Ballou, *Autobiography*, 450.

wealth and promises of the new Union.

When the Civil War ended, Ballou recognized that despite his prophecy in the early months of the conflict that predicted non-resistance principles would expand after the war, non-resistance did not maintain its once doctrinal or practical power after the war machine freed the slave. In 1866, Ballou responded to the call by other radical pacifists and non-resistants to meet in Boston to organize the Universal Peace Society, (called the Universal Peace Union in 1868). Ballou, William Heywood, and Anna Draper from Hopedale were part of the organizing committee that opposed the larger American Peace Society, which focused on preventing international war and supported Union troops during the Civil War. The Universal Peace Society completely espoused pacifism and maintained,

“War is a sin against God and opposed to the best interests of mankind, and its immediate abandonment is similar to a religious duty, the wisest expediency, and an imperative necessity.”<sup>81</sup>

Similar to the former Garrisonian non-resistants before the Civil War, the society disavowed all “defensive wars” and sought to spread their influence by the non-coercive methods of printing, preaching, and lecturing. In 1867, Ballou prepared two discourses in the Hopedale Church that were later published by the society. “Human Progress in Respect to Religion” and “The Ultimate Convincement of Progressive Minds in Favor of the Pure Christian religion and Church,” attempted to reignite non-resistance as the most important form of Christian living that Ballou believed would revolutionize the world. This is virtually Ballou’s last effort to convince New Englanders and the United States to adopt Christ’s peace principles. The Universal Peace Union, notwithstanding its fervor, was small in number consisting of four hundred active members and between three thousand to four thousand sympathizers in the United States. The Civil War virtually deflated the non-resistance movement. Ballou’s beloved doctrines on non-resistance did not receive widespread recognition. Not only did his cherished Hopedale Community come to an end, but non-resistance also seemed archaic to the new United States. In 1871, Ballou regrettably acknowledged that

“Never since the great apostasy against the primitive peace doctrine of Jesus in the third century have Christian nations exhibited such devotion to military force . . . . At this

---

<sup>81</sup> *Address of the Universal Peace Society to All Persons, Communities and Nations*, 2 in Peter Brock, *Pacifism in the United States: From the Colonial Era to the First World War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968), 926.

moment they have more brain, muscle, science, destructive enginery, [and] pecuniary capital invested in the war system than ever before.”<sup>82</sup>

### CONCLUSION

The religious fire that swept through the New England landscape before the Civil War was largely dormant after that. Not only were most Americans converted to Christianity, but they also became practitioners of the new union and its charter. Garrison and Ballou’s vociferations against the proslavery Constitution vanished with the addition of the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments that abolished slavery. The charter itself reached venerated heights by the third quarter of the nineteenth century as citizens applauded the Constitution’s successful emancipation of the slave and the preservation of the union. In some respects, the Constitution supplanted the Bible as both a legal and moral guide.<sup>83</sup> After the successful reunification of the North and South, it was time for the government and citizens to rebuild a nation that bled for the slave. The war ended. The slave was set free. The abolitionist movement vanished, however, for non-resistants the question of whether the use of force during the Civil War was providentially approved remained unanswered. Christian non-resistance simply became one of many interpretations of Christ’s teachings deliberated amidst the marketplace of religion in the first half of the nineteenth century, and like other non-traditional beliefs, such as Spiritualism, wandered around the countryside looking for any home that would welcome in a weary traveler.

In 1889, forty-five years after the end of the Civil War, Ballou, now eighty-six, received a friendly letter from the famed Russian writer Leo Tolstoy. Previously, Lewis G. Wilson, one of Ballou’s confidants and fellow ministers, wrote Tolstoy enclosing a group of books and articles by Ballou on non-resistance. Tolstoy responded to Ballou through Wilson labeling Ballou as “one of the first true apostles of the ‘New Time,’” and despite Ballou’s failed attempts to establish a non-resistant community and spread the message in the United States, the aged minister would “be in the future acknowledged as one of the chief benefactors of humanity.” It appears that Tolstoy was aware of Ballou’s frustration of not obtaining his utopian goals and the acceptance of violence by the larger public as a necessary evil. Tolstoy consoled Ballou writing,

---

<sup>82</sup> Adin Ballou, *Primitive Christianity and Its Corruptions vol. II. Department of Personal Righteousness. A series of Discourses Delivered in Hopedale, Mass., A.D. 1870-71, by Adin Ballou* (Lowell, MA: Thompson & Hill, Printers – The Vox Populi Press, 1899), 405.

<sup>83</sup> Michael G. Kammen, *A Machine that would Go of Itself: The Constitution in American Culture* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2006), 22.

“If . . . Mr. Ballou has experienced moments of depression in thinking that his efforts have been in vain, he has only partaken of the fate of his and our Master. Tell him please, that his efforts have not been [in] vain.”<sup>84</sup>

Despite Ballou’s lack of influence among the broader United States populace, Tolstoy represented a glimmer of hope that non-resistance would spread throughout the globe.

“I wish I could report more growth of this heavenly doctrine in my country,” Ballou wrote to Tolstoy, “but the bewitching influence of worldly politics and the temporal advantages which the old system, founded on deadly compulsion affords to multitudes of professional aspirants are almost omnipotent.”

Perhaps in Russia, non-resistance would flourish, and Ballou offered daily prayers to Tolstoy’s band of non-resistants that “this supernal faith, and that my writings minister in any degree to their edification.”<sup>85</sup>

Two months after their last correspondence, Ballou died on 5 August, 1890, at the age of eighty-seven uncompromisingly preaching, lecturing, and writing on non-resistance to his last day.<sup>86</sup> Despite Ballou’s relatively fluid biblical exegesis, Christ’s calls for peace encompassed Ballou before, during, and after the Civil War. Although Ballou desperately tried to resurrect the same non-resistant spirit of past abolitionists, his pleas were simply white noise from Hopedale that fell on a public committed to a new nation.

\*\*\*\*\*

### REFERENCES

- AGS “John Brown...Non-Resistance.” *Liberator*, vol. 30, no. 12 (23 March, 1860).
- Ahlstrom, Sydney E. *A Religious History of the American People*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Ailes, Jane and Marie Tyler-McGraw. “Leaving Virginia for Liberia: Western Virginia Emigrants and Emancipators.” *West Virginia History: A Journal of Regional Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2 (Fall, 2012): 1-34.
- Ballou, Adin. *A discourse on the Subject of American Slavery, Delivered in the First Congregational Meeting House, In Mendon, Mass., 4 July, 1837*. Boston, MA: Isaac Knapp & Cornhill, 1837.
- . *Autobiography of Adin Ballou*. Lowell, MA: The Vox Populi Press – Thompson & Hill, 1896.
- . *Christian Non-Resistance Defended Against Rev. Henry Ward Beecher*. Hopedale, MA: 1862.

---

<sup>84</sup> Leo Tolstoy to Lewis G. Wilson, July 1889 in *The Arena* vol. 3 no. 1 (December, 1890): 4.

<sup>85</sup> Adin Ballou to Leo Tolstoy, *The Dial*, vol. 3, no. 1 (December, 1890): 5

<sup>86</sup> Lewis G. Wilson, “Hopedale and Its Founder,” *New England Magazine An Illustrated Monthly*, vol. 4 (March, August, 1891): 211.

- . “Editorial Farewell.” *Practical Christian*. vol. 26, no. 20 (14 April, 1860).
- . “Freedom in Kansas vs. Christian Non-Resistance” *Liberator* vol. 26, no. 18 May 2, 1856).
- . “Genius of Reform.” *Independent Messenger*, vol. 3 (1837). Special Collections Bancroft Memorial Library, Hopedale, Massachusetts.
- . Hopedale Community Record Book No. 2. Hopedale, MA: 1859.
- . *Primitive Christianity and Its Corruptions* vol. II. Department of Personal Righteousness. A series of Discourses Delivered in Hopedale, Mass., AD 1870-71, by Adin Ballou. Lowell, MA: Thompson & Hill, Printers – The Vox Populi Press, 1899.
- . “The American Union.” *Liberty Chimes*. Providence, RI: Ladies’ Anti-Slavery Society, 1845.
- . “The Practical Christian.” *Liberator*. vol. 30, no. 2 (31 January, 1860).
- Bisel, Debra Goodrich. *The Civil War in Kansas: Ten Years of Turmoil*. Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2012.
- Brock, Peter. *Pacifism in the United States: From the Colonial Era to the First World War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Chodes, John. *Abe Lincoln’s Secret War Against the North*. New York: Algora Publishing, 2015.
- Coleman, Peter J. *Debtors and Creditors in America: Insolvency, Imprisonment for Debt, and Bankruptcy, 1607-1900*. Madison, WI: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1974.
- Drescher, Seymour. *Abolition: A History of Slavery and Antislavery*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Etcheson, Nicole. *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era*. Lawrence, KU: University of Kansas Press, 2004.
- Finkleman, Paul. “Garrison’s Constitution: The Covenant with Death and How it was Made,” *Prologue: A Quarterly Publication of the National Archives and Records Administration* (Winter, 2000): 231-245.
- Forbes, Robert Pierce. *The Missouri Compromise and Its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America*. Raleigh, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Fowler, J.H. “Physical Resistance and ‘Non-resistance.’” *Liberator*, vol. 30, no. 14 (6 April, 1860).
- Furness, William H. “Put up thy Sword.” *The Liberator*. vol. 30, no. 15 (13 April, 1860).
- Garrison, William Lloyd. “Declaration of the National Anti-Slavery Convention” *The Liberator*, vol. 3, no. 50 (Boston, MA: 14 December, 1833), 198.
- . “No Union With Slaveholders.” *The Liberator*, vol. 29, no. 50 (16 December, 1859).
- . “To the Public.” *The Liberator*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1 January, 1831).
- . “The Great Crisis!” *The Liberator*, vol. 2 no. 52 (29 December, 1832).
- Hatch, Nathan O. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1989.



- Michael G. Kammen, *A Machine that would Go of Itself: The Constitution in American Culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2006.
- McKim, J. Miller. "Practical Christian Anti-Slavery." *The Liberator*, vol. 29, no. 39 (30 September, 1859).
- McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Minkema, Kenneth P. "Jonathan Edwards on Slavery and the Slave Trade." *The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series*, Vol. 54, no. 4 (October 1997): 823-34.
- Murdock, Eugene C. *One Million Men: The Civil War Draft in the North*. Madison, WI: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1971.
- Nevins, Allan. *Ordeal of the Union: Fruits of Manifest Destiny, 1847-1852*. New York, NY: Collier Books, 1992.
- Reichert, William O. "The Philosophical Anarchism of Adin Ballou." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 27, No. 4 (August 1964): 357-74.
- "Robert S. Kelley to G.W. Brown." 7 September, 1855, in *Herald of Freedom*, 22 September, 1855.
- Rose, Willie Lee. *Rehearsal for Reconstruction: The Port Royal Experiment*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1964.
- Slaughter, Thomas P. *Bloody Dawn: The Christiana Riot and Racial Violence in the Antebellum North*. New York: Oxford Press, 1991.
- Spann, Edward K. *From Commune to Company Town 1840-1920*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1992.
- Speer, John. *Life of Gen. James H. Lane, "The Liberator of Kansas" with Corroborative Incidents of Pioneer History*. Garden City, KU: 1897.
- Tolstoy, Leo. *The Kingdom of God is Within You*. Translated by Constance Garnett. New York: Watchmaker Publishing, 1951.
- Tyler, Alice Felt. *Freedom's Ferment – Phases of American Social History to 1860*. New York: Case Press, 2007.
- Unknown Author. "Annexation of Texas." *Liberator*, vol. 14, no. 1 (8 March, 1844).
- . "Anti-Slavery Convention." *Liberator*, vol. 14, no. 9 (1 March, 1844).
- . "Anti-Slavery Lectures in Lynn." *Liberator*, vol. 8, no. 39. (28 September, 1838): 142-159.
- . "Confusion Among the Abolitionists." *African Repository and Colonial Journal*, vol. 20, no. 7 (July 1844).
- . "Curiosities of Voting.: The Letter. For Governor. For Lieut, Governor. For Senators." *Liberator*, vol. 17, no. 48 (26 November, 1847). Andover-Harvard Theological Library.
- . "Notice of the Liberator." *The Practical Christian*, vol. 1 (1840). Special Collections Bancroft Memorial Library, Hopedale, Massachusetts.
- . "Notices: The First of August." *Prisoner's Friend: A Monthly Magazine Devoted to Criminal Reform, Philosophy, Science, Literature*, 30 July, 1845.

———. “Rhode Island AS Society.” *Liberator*, vol. 21, no. 46. (14 November, 1851).

Wiebe, Robert H. *The Opening of American Society: From the Adoption of the Constitution to the Eve of Disunion*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.

Wilson, Lewis G. “Hopedale and Its Founder.” *New England Magazine An Illustrated Monthly*, vol. 4 (March, August 1891): 197-212.

Wood, Gordon S. “Evangelical America and Early Mormonism.” *New Your History* 61 (1980): 359-86.