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ABSTRACT


The origins of nonviolence currently identified with Tolstoy and Gandhi can be traced to earlier elements in the American tradition of nonviolence, particularly to the writings of Adin Ballou. In 1838, speaking before the New England Non-Resistant Society, Ballou emphasized the high moral priority--and the ultimate effectiveness--of harmlessly resisting evil at all costs. As an opponent of war and slavery, Ballou's 50 years of peace and justice ministry raised some of the same questions, and gave similar answers to some of the same problems, as those later faced by Tolstoy and Gandhi. Thus this interdisciplinary study in religion and history shows how ideas of religious pacifism, generated in an atmosphere of democratic liberty and religious freedom, moved from West to East.

This paper begins by highlighting the pacifist writings of Adin Ballou, whose distinctive interpretation of original Christianity advocated non-retaliation by physical force, non-return of evil for evil, and absolute non-injury of others. As leading theoretician for the radical peace society of his century in America, Ballou departed from the compliant non-resistance of his predecessors. He based his defense of peace on natural, reasonable, and religious grounds, making recourse in his arguments to what he termed "radical religion." He held it necessary for good men and women to stake their lives, if necessary, to attain a just and lasting peace on earth.
In each of these ways and more, Ballou prefigured Tolstoy and Gandhi. Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi each sought to promote an ideal peaceful social condition. Each considered the secular aims of eradicating war and eliminating its attendant evils to be closely allied with essential religious purposes. And each contributed to an evolving ethic of non-violent practice.

This study examines the actual correspondence, in letters, between Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi concludes, on the basis of a variety of texts, that their intercultural communication eventuated in the clarification of concepts useful to subsequent world peace actions. This study further concludes that their historic communication exemplified the movement of religious ideas from West to East.
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If, as so many agree, violence in a nuclear age is unthinkable, it seems fundamental to ask: What is thinkable? And who has been doing the thinking? What great alternatives have been devised? What great ideas have been proposed for eliminating violence while keeping open avenues of social change? And how did these ideas develop? 1

Around the world, people associate nonviolence with the name of Gandhi. Under his leadership, a nation in revolution replaced physical force with 'soul-force' or 'truth-adherence' (satyagraha). "The spirit of Gandhian non-violence has in fact reached around the world to present an alternative to violence wherever injustice reigns and violence threatens." 2

The spirit of Gandhian non-violence, now acknowledged universally or globally, had its early development in a movement of religious ideas from West to East. One hundred years before satyagraha unfolded in Gandhi's India, religious antecedents to Gandhian non-violence sprang up in the United States. Communitarian experiments grew up founded on the idea that "community, based on interdependence and social justice, was synonymous with 'peace.'" 3 Radical peace advocacy in the earliest U.S. peace societies "linked the gospel of peace with the gospel of liberty." 4

Not only did India's nonviolence, satyagraha, come after the development of philosophical 'nonresistance' in 19th century New England chronologically; but in several demonstrable ways, one model of nonviolence grew from the other.

---


Hoblitzelle notes, "Though Thoreau did exert an influence upon both Tolstoy and Gandhi, his role in the latter's development was less decisive than is generally supposed." (p.28) Although a critical analysis of Hoblitzelle's work is outside the scope of this thesis, given Ballou's eminence in the field, the fact that Hoblitzelle isolates Emerson representative of American nonresistance is problematic. Figures on p.105 of this thesis suggest that Hoblitzelle correctly placed Emerson above Thoreau; however, these figures do not explain or support Hoblitzelle's omission of Adin Ballou as an influence upon Tolstoy and Gandhi.

2 Hoblitzelle, War Against War, p.2.

3 Ibid. p. 194.

The history of modern nonviolence begins with the story of Adin Ballou. Adin Ballou (1803-1890) was a theologian, reformer, and peace advocate of rural nineteenth century New England who has been called "the leading theoretician of the non-resistance movement."  

It is my thesis that Ballou's 50 years of peace ministry raised some of the same questions and gave similar answers to some of the same problems as those later faced by Tolstoy and Gandhi. Adin Ballou's defense of peace was based on natural, reasonable, and religious grounds; his "practical Christianity" held it necessary for Christians to attain just peace through peaceable means, staking their lives if necessary.

Unlike the "old-fashioned" Christian non-resistants who, like Orange Scott, preached a more compliant non-resistance, Ballou's school of nonresistants insisted upon the Christian duty to resist evil by all moral means. It emphasized the high moral priority of harmlessly resisting evil at all costs. Adin Ballou's distinctive interpretation of original Christianity advocated non-retaliation by physical force, non-return of evil for evil, and absolute non-injury of others.

Near the end of Ballou's life, Russian novelist Leo Tolstoy, having identified himself as a non-resistant Christian, gave the utmost attention and respect to Ballou's peace ideas. Tolstoy read and re-read Ballou's works. He translated, anthologized, and paraphrased passages from Ballou, and privately, he tried to engage his wife in discussing Ballou's ideas.

---

6 Martin Green, in his introduction to Tolstoy's *Kingdom of God*, says, "An American reader will be especially interested in the precedents that Tolstoy found in William Lloyd Garrison and Adin Ballou; forty or fifty years earlier, they had arrived at the same thinking and acted on it."
7 Ballou's school of nonresistants were nicknamed 'Garrisonians' after nonresistant abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison, who wrote the group's charter. A discussion of that charter appears on p.15 of this text.
8 Tolstoy's *Complete Works* (Russian) Vol.50 p.97-98 (Edward Oldham Translation, p. 6.)
A brief correspondence between Ballou and Tolstoy confirmed that, in spite of great theological disparities and miscellaneous minor discrepancies, they agreed on the ethics of non-resistance as essential to Christianity. Overall, Tolstoy admired Ballou, and internalized his teachings. Three years after Ballou's death, Tolstoy presented Ballou's key points about nonresistance in a book which Gandhi later said "revolutionized his life." Thus Tolstoy was the medium through which Ballou's ideas reached Gandhi.

**Purposes and Definitions**

In 1959 one historian wrote, "It is especially regrettable that peace, with its various implications, is not more widely studied." A preliminary goal of any peace study is to generate a working definition of the meaning of 'peace' adequate to its own purposes.

This interdisciplinary study in religion and history highlights the writings of Adin Ballou and the activities of the New England Nonresistance Society, with the intent to demonstrate how ideas of religious pacifism, generated in an atmosphere of democratic liberty and religious freedom, moved from West to East. It concentrates on the history of U.S. peace movements between the War of Independence and the Civil War. A definition of peace adequate to the purposes of the present study should distinguish between historical peace, contemplative peace, and the vision of unitive peace.

---


The story of the past, as usually told, is punctuated by war. War and peace have grown up together, bound to each other and to problems of justice and injustice; historical peace begins when war ends, only to end when war begins again. As Matthew Melko has pointed out, historical peace is the condition of freedom from war within tribal, national, or imperial boundaries; wars separate history into pieces of peace; and historical peace has been a more prevalent condition of the human experience than has war.

Distinct from historical peace is contemplative peace. In its visionary and mystic aspects, religion often encourages individuals to cultivate inner conditions of composure, security, and harmony. Under normal conditions, contemplative peace with its accompanying transcendent joy is unavailable to most people. Unlike historical peace, which is common, contemplative peace, being the peace of the innermost heart, is rare.

A third meaning of peace, which I choose to designate as 'unitive peace' refers to the ideal peaceful social condition. This socially and ecologically conceived peace unites all members of the human family under conditions of "peaceableness, shared abundance, and beauty in nature." Such a peace embodies the utopian vision of greatest interest to Adin Ballou, about which he, Tolstoy, and Gandhi shared information.

13 Inclusive language substitutes the phrase 'unitive peace' for 'brotherhood' out of the realization (aptly expressed in Faulkner's summary of Ballou's five basic beliefs) that this ideal means uniting "All human beings as brothers and sisters acting in love towards one another." Faulkner, Adin Ballou and the Hopedale Community, p. 200.

Often, especially in English 19th century usage, the ideal peaceful social condition has been spoken of simply as 'brotherhood'. However, brotherhood in its precise sense was and is a feeling of friendship between particular men. For instance, Leo Tolstoy, when he began his letters to Adin Ballou, and later to Mohandas Gandhi, with the words, "Dear friend and brother..." exemplified the sentiment of brotherhood.

Ordinarily, threats from within and without persist within tribal, national, or imperial boundaries during non-war conditions. So many insecurities accompany historical peace that even the "security" of contemplative peace has been circumscribed, curtailed, and made false vis-a-vis existing social conditions. No historical truce negotiated at gunpoint has so far fulfilled the promise of humankind's imaginings: universal harmony, good will, and 'peace on earth.' What we can conceive has outstripped what we have achieved.

Unitive peace envisions an actual "Peace on Earth" which in its ultimate realization, would combine the best features of both historical and contemplative

Boulding points out that in the Hebrew Zion, the Elysian fields of the Greeks, in the traditions of the Koran, and elsewhere, features of humanity's shared vision of peace exist in all the major religions. In Boulding's workshops, participants, regardless of their origins, when asked to envision a world without weapons generated imagery with themes of "peaceableness, shared abundance and beauty in nature".

In answer to John Bowker, who claimed that religions, although they idealize peace, have been used by governments to give credence and justification to violence, Boulding states that historically there have existed two cultures of religion, the "holy war culture" and the "peaceable garden culture." In opposition to those who have espoused a "holy war" religious doctrine, several groups and individuals representing all the major religions have defended the grounds for unitive peace. Organized religion, she concludes, should pick up its missed opportunities within the middle way of negotiation which falls between the extremes of the two cultures of religion.

For example, at the end of our country's last domestic war, a "just and lasting peace" was envisioned and declared. By Melko's criteria, the U.S. is still in the post-Civil War peace period. Conflict unresolved by arms in that war has raged ever since. In inner cities across the nation, through rioting and random violence, skirmishes in an unofficial 'Civil War' of racial and economic injustice continue to be waged. The statistics of this unofficial war rival those of smaller warring nations, overshadowing reported civil wars.

As Adin Ballou saw it, neither true justice nor true peace could ever be the result of wars of violence. Ballou even theoretically opposed the violent methods of the American Revolution, claiming that the aims of the Revolution might have been achieved peaceably at one tenth the loss of life. Along with other members of the NRS, the only war Ballou advocated was war 'with the weapons of the spirit' which might involve self-sacrifice, but never killing. Besides eschewing the mortality rate of traditional warfare, such struggle, he claimed, would be less demoralizing to society as a whole. Unlike traditional warfare, such 'wars of the spirit' would convert, not exterminate, the enemy, and leave community life whole, not torn, in the wake of battle; nor, he theorized, would the ensuing decades and centuries be riddled with entrenched hostilities. See Adin Ballou, Discourse on Non-Resistance in Extreme Cases. (Milford, Massachusetts: Hopedale Press, 1860) pp.23-24.
peace. So named because of its unitive social function, unitive peace in its ideal form also unites unending historical peace with universal contemplative peace.

Adin Ballou and the New England Non-resistance Society were interested in unitive peace, and often spoke of their ideal social condition as 'the millennium.' Peace on earth in its ideal form--universal and everlasting--approximates the nineteenth century vision of 'millennial' peace, of which more will be said later.\textsuperscript{16} The methods of the group (the Non-resistance Society or NRS) were prototypical of much that is now current in non-violent activism. But the society's secular aims of eradicating war and eliminating its attendant evils were closely allied with the religious aim of creating actual, immediate conditions of millennial peace. Members conceived peace in broad terms and worked for reforms to inaugurate the Kingdom of God on earth. The millennial vision of peace (that of the Kingdom\textsuperscript{17}) is an essential concept in non-violence ideology, particularly as non-violence thinking evolved between 1884 and 1910.\textsuperscript{18} The book which "revolutionized" Gandhi's life, the one in which Tolstoy presents Ballou's key points, was entitled \textit{The Kingdom of God is Within You}. 

\textsuperscript{16} Millenialist interpretation of the Bible begins with Revelations 20:1-5, in which Satan is tied up in a bottomless pit for a thousand years while Jesus, and the righteous peaceably rule on earth.

\textsuperscript{17} Today, preachers and laity who acknowledge belief in a Mother/Father God may object to the word 'Kingdom.' To them, the term may call up attributes and associations of an exclusively male-deity-dominated territory. Of one group whose theology acknowledged both male and female aspects to the Deity (the Shakers) Ballou said: "Enlightened minds will never accept the doctrine that the Deity exists in two persons, a male and a female." (Adin Ballou, \textit{Practical Christian Socialism: A Conversational Exposition of the True System of Society}. New York: Fowlers & Wells, 1854) p.564.

Martin Luther King spoke of "the Beloved Community." Not only is King's language gender-neutral; the word 'Community' also avoids the surface irony of the common religious-language archaism (Kingdom). After King George's New World rule had been overthrown in 1776 and democracy established, religious liberals were still speaking of a place of ideal peace and freedom as a 'Kingdom.'

\textsuperscript{18} Leo Tolstoy's book \textit{My Religion} (Huntington Smith, translator. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1885) through which Tolstoy first made contact with American Christian non-resistors was completed in 1884; 1910 was the year that Tolstoy died, and in which, also, Gandhi named his community for satyagrahi in South Africa Tolstoy Farm.
Ballou counted education among the "instrumentalities of love and peace." He maintained that the power of arms does not determine any people's "progress, liberty, or happiness," which are assured instead by "the patient, unthanked, unglorified efforts of the wise and good through successive generations." 19

Adin Ballou was a religious teacher whose distinctively American religious ideas and ideals influenced the course of world peace history. Although they are not usually thought of as such, Tolstoy and Gandhi were both also teachers. Ballou's last wish was "not to be remembered, but to have the things he taught remembered." He said so explicitly. 20 It would seem that through his foreign correspondence, Ballou's final desire came true. In a movement of religious ideas from West to East, Ballou, Tolstoy and Gandhi were joined in evolving an ethic of non-violent practice.

The peace teachings of Adin Ballou did not attain fame or immortality in and of themselves; we remember them because they confirmed, strengthened, and informed Tolstoy's non-resistance message to Gandhi. Through Ballou's expertise as a theoretician and his predisposition as a willing correspondent, ideas which emerged from the early U.S. peace societies moved from West to East, becoming

---


20 Adin Ballou, *Autobiography of Adin Ballou, 1803-1890. Containing an Elaborate Record and Narrative of His Life from Infancy to Old Age*. (Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1975) p. 526 and 547-60. Feeling that he did so under divine guidance, Ballou prepared a sermon to be read at his own funeral. In the statement, which was read aloud during graveside services by Ballou's son-in-law, William S. Heywood, Ballou thanked God for providing him, during his lifetime, with a "host of kind friends."

"Peter clearly anticipated his decease..." Ballou began, "So have I these many years." Referring to 2 Peter 1:15, Ballou said that Peter "was not so much concerned to be personally remembered after he passed away as to have the things remembered which he had taught." Ballou indicated a like concern. Of "the doctrines, principles, and duties which I have been privileged to preach and teach," he admonished, "It is these that, now I am gone, I would have you keep always in remembrance."

a spiritual influence globally and helping to develop the active religious ideas known as satyagraha.

The chain of communication between Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi linked the peace and non-violence ideas of an American, a Russian, and an East Indian; it mingled the views of a Protestant, a maverick Eastern Orthodox, and a Hindu. This movement of ideas controverts the beliefs that spiritual wisdom moves exclusively from East to West or is exclusively owned by any one tradition.

Moreover, it demonstrates possibilities for the social transmission of values through intercultural communication. In a world that is multi-lingual and increasingly multi-traditional, there are numerous potential applications of such a paradigm. The teaching of peace, as here described, may illuminate the teaching and learning of ethical beliefs other than peace across cultural and/or generational lines.

In this movement of religious ideas from West to East, intercultural communication was furthered as world peace history was formulated and given shape. On a personal level, the dialogue between these three men characterized the meaning of 'brotherhood.' On a social level, their intercultural communication clarified concepts useful to 'nonresistance and nonviolence,' and on a world level, their exchange of ideas magnified the potential for the realization of unitive and perhaps also historical peace. Thus, the purpose of the present study is not to build up any cult of personality or ethnicity, but to show that the actual correspondence, in letters, between Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi resulted in an historic exchange of ideas which had personal, social, and perhaps also global ramifications.
Chapter I.

Early Life and Times of Adin Ballou

(1803-1846)
A rural nineteenth century New England minister with independence of mind, strong opinions, and devotion, Adin Ballou was a teacher of peace. Leo Tolstoy wrote, "I am sorry not for Adin Ballou, but for the American people, that his name and work are unknown to them." At least one historian has called the Reverend Adin Ballou "Tolstoy's forgotten American." 1 If Americans have forgotten Ballou, this study will retrieve the particular life of ministry which was Adin Ballou's from oblivion by reporting on and celebrating it.

Born when Thomas Jefferson was President, Adin Ballou lived a very long and eminently useful life through the antebellum period and the Civil War. 2 He was at various times President of the New England Nonresistance Society, organizer of the Hopedale Community, and founding member of the Universal Peace Union.

The letters of many influential American abolitionists and peace advocates "made reference to Ballou and his part in the work." 3 For example, a colleague, William Lloyd Garrison, in November, 1878, contemplated Ballou's life admiringly, saying Ballou had worked to re-structure society along the lines of the golden rule, and had:

"labored 'in season and out of season' for the good of others ...for the largest freedom of thought, inquiry, and speech in matters of religious faith and worship; and for the arrival of the blessed

---


"Tolstoy was pleased with the chance to correspond with the forgotten American, Adin Ballou."

And on p.129,

"Nonresistance sorely needed theoretical clarification. To a large extent this need was met by Tolstoy's forgotten American, Adin Ballou."


3 Faulkner, Ballou and Hopedale, p. 196.
period when all wars shall cease throughout the earth and the
kingdom of peace established thereon."  

Adin Ballou first publicly addressed the peace cause at the first annual
meeting of the Nonresistance Society—not as a member but as a concerned
minister— in Boston, in 1839. "If anyone was to be noted specially in our
Nonresistant Meeting for what they said," Lucretia Mott wrote one month later,
"that one, I think, should have been Adin Ballou..." Mott, an inspired speaker in
her own right, referred to Ballou's address on nonresistance relative to human
governments.

Ballou's impromptu remarks employed a straightforward line of reasoning.
What one does through an agent, one does oneself. Christians must not sin
through the agents of government. The powers invested in the governor of the
Commonwealth were at odds with Christianity, Ballou explained, because the
empowerment of an officer to slay enemies of the state was equivalent to the sin
of slaying one's own enemies. Ballou concluded that believers must not take part
in the affairs of state, but must instead observe God's commandments.

---

5 Letter from Lucretia Mott to Mrs. Maria Chapman, Oct 16, 1839. (Anti-Slavery Papers, Rare
Book Department, Boston Public Library).

"Despite the terminology of "nonresistance," the practice of most Christians who have [taken up
nonresistance] might better be viewed as noncompliance or conscientious objection." New
England Nonresistant Society members, by emphasizing Matt. 5 and de-emphasizing Romans
13, interpreted the Christian message as implying that they must reject any resort to violence or
threat of arms in national or personal self-defense or in retaliation for wrongdoing.
NONRESISTANCE: For Ballou's definition, see ch. 2.

7 Adin Ballou, Christian Non-Resistance in All Its Important Bearings. (New York: Da Capo
Edmund Quincy, then president of the NRS, welcomed Ballou's address as the "best explanation of the true nature of non-resistance principles, and the most effectual reply to the most common objections, that we have yet seen."\(^8\)

Ballou equated Congress's constitutional authority to write letters of marque and reprisal--letters which authorized the forcible seizure of property or subjects in retaliation for injury inflicted by another country--with piracy; and the war powers granted to Congress and the President, he equated with the perpetration of abominable crimes.\(^9\) Ballou's speech held that nonresistants were to live above human government in righteousness, and uphold just laws, yet submit peacefully to any penalty for disobedience to unjust laws.

The purpose of the NRS, he said, was "neither to purify nor to subvert human governments, but to advance that kingdom of peace and righteousness, which supersedes all such governments."\(^10\)

Numerous NRS members congratulated the newly prominent speaker, encouraging him to write down his extemporaneous speech.\(^11\) Adin Ballou did so, and at age thirty-six, his peace ministry had just begun. The men and women to whom he spoke, and who so appreciated his viewpoint, belonged to an unusual organization.

**U.S. Peace Societies**

The New England Nonresistance Society, before which Ballou spoke in 1839, was a *new* peace group. Peace Societies in the U.S. had begun in New York and Boston around 1812. In 1815, the American Peace Society had been

---

\(^8\) Lewis Perry, "Adin Ballou's Hopedale Community and the Theology of Anti-slavery" *Church History* (Vol. XXXIX, 1970): 376.


\(^10\) Perry, "Ballou's Community and Theology of Anti-slavery," p. 376.

\(^11\) Ballou's remarks were published in *The Liberator, The Non-resistant*, and in pamphlet form. For an accessible rendition of these ideas, see the section of Ballou's *Christian Non-resistance* entitled "Nonresistance Relative to Human Governments."
formed. Historian Valarie Zeigler Morris describes early U.S. peace advocacy, focusing mainly on the theology behind the religious movements to oppose war.

"In 1815, the world was sick of war. Few people today appreciate the horror and revulsion that followed the twenty years of Napoleonic wars. Homes burned, farms trampled, unimaginable national debts accumulated, a generation of soldiers lost-- these were the fruits of battle that the average person reaped in the wars of Napoleon.

Small wonder, then, that at the conclusion of the fighting, groups of concerned Christians in the United States should have banded together, resolving that never again would the world be thrown into such madness. In the fifty years between the founding of those first American peace societies and the end of the Civil War, the advocates of peace anticipated and debated virtually every major issue that Christians concerned about peace have discussed in our own century." 12

The immediate provocation to organize the Nonresistance Society (NRS), a group prototypical of much that is current in non-violent activism, came from a conservative step on the part of the American Peace Society (APS). When the APS repealed a charter clause on the issue of defensive war, NRS members, in unanimous agreement that all war should be prohibited, split from the parent society to form a new organization of their own.

The NRS organized in 1838, in solidarity behind the issue of the inviolability of human life. One writer represented this view as follows:

"I believe life, as well as liberty, is sacred. No power in the universe can have the right to kill or enslave a human being. It is not possible to protect life by killing men, any more than you can protect truth by telling lies. Human life, as well as liberty, can never be violated, in defense or as a penalty, without a violation of inalienable rights. 13

William Lloyd Garrison penned the charter for the NRS, beginning "Our country is the world, our countrymen are all mankind..."

---

Although his language did not always show it, Garrison, a leader in the NRS and first editor of its journal, had already expressed his solidarity with American women. When NRS women were granted speaking rights and full privileges of membership, four very influential peace men who had been interested in the new society asked that their names be struck from the register of those present. NRS leaders held their ground.

The better-known men and women among the 138 original NRS members and their close associates included Amos Bronson Alcott (father of Louisa May Alcott), Samuel J. May, Lydia Maria Child, William Lloyd Garrison, Lucretia Mott, Maria Weston Chapman, Theodore Weld, Edmund Quincy, Abby Kelly, Stephen Foster, and Henry Clarke Wright.

The three days of meetings in which the radically religious and egalitarian new peace group formed were likened by Garrison to the "Three Days in Paris" that sparked the French Revolution. Egalitarianism was not an incidental attribute of the non-resistants, but an inherent testimony of their religious radicalism.

Having formed from concurrent caucuses of 2 groups in Boston--the American Peace Society (APS) and the American Anti-Slavery Society--the NRS membership was composed of adherents to both peace and anti-slavery causes. In fact, the NRS addressed liberty, peace, and freedom as closely interrelated issues. "During the eleven years of the Nonresistant society's life, its members were virtually all abolitionists. One reason nonresistants were likely to be abolitionists was that nonresistants looked on slavery itself as a form of violence."  

14 When Lucretia Mott and others, his co-delegates to a "world" Anti-Slavery Conference in London, were denied seats on the floor, Garrison took a seat in the balcony with them. Bacon, Margaret H. Valiant Friend: The Life of Lucretia Mott. (New York: Walker and Company, 1990) p.92.
15 Morris, Advocates of Peace, p. 96.
Ballou said, "Nonresistance cannot be for war, capital punishment, slavery...Nor can it be for any government which is fundamentally for these things." In Adin Ballou's September 17, 1839 speech before the Nonresistance Society, he united the theology of anti-slavery with that of peace. In doing so, he epitomized the religious perfectionism and nonresistant theology at the basis of the group's solidarity. Religious perfectionism seeks the moral, religious and social perfection of the individual and the society as a whole in this life.

Nonresistance denies any absolute discretionary control of one human being by another. Instead, religious nonresistance attributes absolute sovereignty over a given soul to God alone, seeing such sovereignty as original and inherent to the soul's relationship to God. In the original and final government, God rules within, and rules over, each soul. Rightful government merely reiterates, reinforces, and helps in the earthly implementation of 'divine' moral ordinance.

Nonresistance is as friendly to government per se as it is to all other positive social organization. Merely incidental human imperfections do not significantly detract from governments which are dedicated to morally ordained principles. But certain organizations depart in principle from morally ordained law, and human governors are not legitimately invested with the power to require of the populace acts offensive to God's purposes. Those who unrightfully seize such power rebel against the Creator, and infringe the inherent rights of their co-equal citizens. The philosophy of nonresistance cannot be reconciled with unrightful de facto government "because it cannot be both for and against itself."

18 H.C Wright made it clear that nonresistants could be atheistic or theistic (see note 13, above). However, the theistic nonresistants for whom Ballou especially spoke tended to believe in the equality and perfectibility of men and women under a unifying Deity.
In making these deductions, Ballou himself was a product of his times: the historical peace he knew was sandwiched between the American War of Independence and the Civil War. Issues of "liberty, equality, fraternity" and the gospel were intertwined, so that reformers often forgot which statements of principle were secular, and which sacred. Moreover, in the religious freedom he knew and exercised, Ballou was heir to several generations of hard work and achievement.

Family Background

Members of the Ballou family, which was of French extraction, travelled to England from Normandy in the time of William the Conqueror. From England, the first immigrant ancestor of the Ballou family on record to arrive in America was Maturin Ballou. In 1646, with partner Roger Williams, Maturin Ballou co-owned Providence Plantations in Providence, Rhode Island.

From their arrival in New England to the birth of Adin Ballou, there were five generations of Americans. Adin Ballou's line of descent was as follows: Maturin Ballou was the father of James, who the was father of James Jr., who the was father of Ariel, who the was father of Ariel Jr., who the was father of Adin.

Lying adjacent to one another, Ballou lands belonging to the descendants of the

---

Since the substance of the speech was re-written into chapter 7, and since the original was unavailable, I have used Ballou's Christian Non-Resistance as a source for the ideas conveyed in this speech.

20 At the First national anti-slavery conference, Mott critically read the part of the proposed charter which stated, "We found these principles on the Bible and the Declaration of Independence as on an everlasting rock..." She volunteered the suggestion that the society transpose its phraseology. Bacon, Valiant Friend, p. 56.

21 In the pamphlet, "Introducing Quakers," (Wallingford, Pennsylvania: Pendle Hill, 1991.) Gordon Browne says that the most brutal persecution of Friends occurred in Massachusetts Bay Colony, but that "Only in Rhode Island, where Roger Williams had established the principle of religious toleration" did Friends flourish. p.2.


Ballou recalls often being mistaken for the son of his fifth cousin, the renowned Rev. Hosea Ballou, an influential Universalist related to Adin through Maturin Ballou. The repetitious names of the Ballou family line may have been the reason why, when Edmund...
second James covered approximately one square mile. The locality was the subject of a border dispute between the three colonies of Plymouth, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.23 The land the Ballou family inhabited on both sides of the Blackstone (now Pawtucket) River was "remote from any populous center, and inhabited by plain, hard-working, economical tillers of the soil." Adin Ballou's forbears were "industrious, frugal, sensible, worthy persons."24

Much Ballou land lay in Cumberland township, Rhode Island, where lived also Adin Ballou's maternal grandparents. Grandfather Levi Tower was a metallurgist and an experimenter; Mary Whipple Tower was a person of "natural dignity, strong common sense, and great benignity."25 From the marriage of widower Ariel Ballou and the eldest Tower daughter, Edilda, came two sons, Adin (our subject) and Ariel, who became a doctor. This family of four, together with six children from the father's previous marriage, made a family of ten. Thus it was into a large and established family that Adin Ballou was born Saturday, April 23, 1803.26

By the time of Adin Ballou's birth, the line between Rhode Island and Massachusetts was clearly drawn, intersecting his parents' estate. The greater part of the land belonging to his immediate family was on the Massachusetts side, but the home itself, in which Adin was born, was in Rhode Island. 27

Quincy relinquished presidency of the NRS to Adin Ballou, he referred to him as, "Adin Ballou, first of the name..."

More than one son and potential successor to Adin Ballou was born and so named, but died before age 21. Of these, Adin Augustus lived longest and became the subject of a book by his father.

25 Ibid., p.2.
26 Ibid., p.1; p.12.
27 During Adin's boyhood, the ex-colonies were still somewhat rivalous. For this reason, when Adin was later, for a brief time, sent to an unfamiliar school in Massachusetts, he was dubbed "Rhode Island Yankee."
Common lands and wild lands surrounded the area; diverse geologic and historic oddities stood as milestones and monuments to the past. In this region of New England meadows, hills, and forests, Adin Ballou grew up. Ballou's autobiography gives the following account of his own personal characteristics in childhood:

"Notwithstanding my natural sensitiveness and susceptibility to small provocations, I was generally easily governed. I ... yielded prompt submission to authority and responded heartily to kind treatment. I was readily persuaded by reasonable appeals, but stung to the quick by personal taunt and reproach." 28

Although not luxurious, the home itself was spacious and well-appointed. Wholesome food, serviceable cloth and sturdy clothing were produced at home. A cobbler made a yearly visit to craft leather shoes for each of the children. The Ballou sawmill made boards for building barns and houses.

The square mile in the midst of which the home stood had been cleared and settled largely by three of the Maturin Ballou grandsons, and was known as the "Ballou Neighborhood." Several natural features, structures, and landmarks were offset on the one hand by a distant Ballou-owned tavern and on the other by a modest, sturdy church nearby known as the Ballou Meeting House.

A mile from the door of Adin Ballou's family home stood the Ballou Meeting House. Church services there were solemn. The first Sunday that Adin walked there with his mother, around the age of five, he was impressed by the 'solemnizing' effect of the preacher's voice and of the Ballou burying ground. In later life, Adin Ballou regarded his own theology of that moment as childish,

fanciful, and outlandish "But," Ballou recorded, "neither then nor since have I lived without thinking, and thinking for myself in some fashion."\textsuperscript{29}

Adin grew up under the guidance of his mother's watchful eye and apprenticed to his father, whose law was work. From the start, Adin disdained neither labor nor the laborer. But he suffered his share of the usual farm and industrial accidents. While he was still in baby clothes, some teasing children caused him to try crossing a wobbly plank so that he nearly drowned in the flume of his father's mill. Later, the usual accidents, such as a broken arm, occurred; horses threw him and cattle kicked him as often as one might expect.

As a child Adin enjoyed farm life, and remembered being on good terms with all who helped on his father's lands. In particular the child had a good friend in Reuben Purchase, of European and Native American ancestry, who carried Adin around on his broad, bronze shoulders and playfully claimed the young boy as a son. The only unhappy year of Adin's youth occurred at age seven or eight, when his father managed a cotton mill. The entire family moved to a tenement and found employment at the factory until, in a sudden change of heart, Ariel restored his family to their original location and went back to farming. Amidst pastures of sheep and cows and fields of flax and corn the Ballou children worked and played. On a nearby hill, a wooden lantern-pole marked the place where a light had shone to summon Minute Men to arms. Visible from many places Adin and his brothers frequented, "Beacon Pole Hill" testified to Revolutionary times.

The material evidence of the Revolution was often supplemented by the testimony of direct memory.\textsuperscript{30} Adin Ballou, in his youth was very patriotic. He

\textsuperscript{29}Ballou, \textit{Autobiography}, p.12.

\textsuperscript{30}Adin Ballou as a child revered the 'Revolutionaries' and grew up listening to their stories. In his autobiography he says, "There were a few Revolutionaries, as they were
enjoyed attending town meetings, reading a leading Republican weekly paper, watching military muster, and going to Fourth of July observances. When Major William Ballou's Tavern hosted a corps of militiamen, a seven year old Adin Ballou traipsed after the sound of fife and drum for a whole afternoon.

A private grade school was organized mainly by Ballou relatives and the Ballou library loaned out a modest collection of books. "I soon began to love books, study, and learning, fondly. And from that time to the present, I have hungered and thirsted for knowledge with unsatisfied desire...I delighted in [books] from my sixth year. I liked to go to school, was easy to learn, had a good memory and ambition to excel." The first subject, other than spelling, which Adin reported especially liking was the history of the French Revolution; later, with his Wilson cousins, he enjoyed the debating club. Caleb Wilson, an uncle and a teacher of good reputation, ran the Massachusetts school at which Adin Ballou finished his education, boarding meanwhile with his cousins in Franklin, Massachusetts.

Ballou's religious biography is both complex and profound. His early religious recollections began with the sermon of Elder Stephen Place, in the Ballou Meeting House, when he was a child. At that time, though the Six Principle Baptists had built the church, the ministers "did not profess a religious faith."
Those in his parent's neighborhood were without strong religious inclination or leadership.

The community's indifference to religion changed overnight in 1813 with the arrival of the "magnetic" Zephaniah S. Crossman, who converted Adin's two eldest brothers, his parents, and at least one hundred others to the Christian Connection. Ariel Ballou, Adin's father, became a deacon.

At age 11, Adin Ballou "wept in secret" for a conversion experience. In the first of several such profound spiritual experiences of his life, Ballou described what then happened as he entered his bedroom:

"my burden was removed; a heavenly light beamed upon me, and an inexpressible peace was diffused through my soul...I rejoiced with exceeding joy and felt that I was entering upon a new life."

Several years afterwards, Cyrus, Adin's eldest brother, who had intended to become a preacher, became ill and died peacefully. One night five years later, in the same bedroom, an "apparent personage" in the likeness of Cyrus climbed through the window and accosted the eighteen year old Adin, instructing him to preach the gospel. Although the youth was initially unhappy and anxious at the news brought by this vision, eventually he resolved to preach.

The nineteen year old Adin Ballou preached under the auspices of the Christian Connection. As of September 21, 1821 he was "a member in good

---

35 The Christian Connection is the religious group under whose auspices Antioch College was founded.
36 Faulkner, Ballou and Hopedale, p. 16.
37 Ballou, Autobiography, p. 62 "How many times I have wondered at this manifestation and puzzled my rational powers to account for it; to make myself sure whether it was real or illusory, objective or subjective, divinely ordained and sent, or mysteriously originated in the wilds of my own imagination!" Not only did Adin report feeling, the entire day following, that he was in a "spiritualized or exalted condition" but periodically throughout his life, other such unusual experiences of a spiritual nature occurred. Such instances of prophetic or other-worldly experience are reported in his autobiography, on pages 85, 92, 149-50 and 154.
standing and fellowship of the Connecticut Christian Conference."

In the first few weeks after his acceptance into the order, Adin Ballou attended denominational conferences in New Bedford and Dartmouth, Massachusetts, continuing on to Boston in the company of an enthusiastic Greenwich, Massachusetts, minister--fifty-six miles by foot.

At age twenty Adin felt compelled, against the wishes of his father and ultimately those of the local Christian Connection Chapter, to embrace and preach a modified Universalist doctrine: that no soul was beyond salvation or ultimate restoration. Ballou felt that a severely punishing deity would make Himself an enemy to the majority who would then behave cruelly towards one another. "His main reasons for rejecting eternal punishment were that it was abhorrent to the holy heart, it was derogatory to the glory of God, and it was subversive of true religion." 39

But unlike most of those in his faith, Ballou not only rejected the doctrine of eternal punishment, but also Destructionism. In common with others in the Christian Connection, Ballou's father, Ariel, a deacon, accepted Destructionism, which holds that souls not saved are utterly destroyed, without trace, after death. 40

Adin Ballou independently conducted his own intellectual, emotional, and spiritual inquiry into eternity; and having found an answer privately, he stood

---

38 Ballou, Autobiography, p. 70.
39 Faulkner, Adin Ballou, p.204. For a full discussion, see Ballou’s Practical Christianity.
40 Formally, the Christian Connection confessed no particular creed but the New Testament, as interpreted by each individual for himself or herself. In actual practice, at least in Ballou's locality, the denomination was effectively comprised of destructionists, to the exclusion of other believers.

In 1855, the Christian Connection claimed a membership approximately 1/3 the size of the Universalists, half the size of the Friends, and nearly three times the size of the Unitarians. Timothy L. Smith, Revivalism and Reform in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America. (New York and Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1955) p. 21
immovable for his belief publicly.\textsuperscript{41} Ironically, for this firmness on Adin's part, Ariel was instrumental in effecting his own son's ouster from the local pulpit.

Ballou's primary religious affiliation was soon transferred to the Universalists, who welcomed him.\textsuperscript{42} Within half a year, Adin Ballou was preaching in Boston under Universalist auspices. In 1822 he was formally admitted to Massachusetts Southern Association of Universalists and was ceremoniously ordained in Milford, Massachusetts, December 10, 1823.\textsuperscript{43}

Adin Ballou's uncle, Hosea Ballou 2nd, assured Adin Ballou from the beginning that restorationism--the belief that rewards and punishments in the afterlife would precede universal salvation--was an acceptable Universalist belief. Ballou initially accepted a pulpit in Milford. In 1831, he moved from Milford to Mendon, Massachusetts. Once settled in his ministry, Ballou accepted the first of several private students of theology, Brother Seth Chandler, who was later an ordained Universalist preacher for the village of Medway.\textsuperscript{44}

A Providence Association of Universalists pledged "cordial support" to Ballou's restorationist newspaper, the \textit{Independent Messenger}. But within months the publication was under increasing pressure to conform to the Ultra-Universalist belief of no future accountability. As a result, Ballou joined with

\begin{footnotes}
\item[\textsuperscript{41}] Ballou, \textit{Autobiography}, p. 84-5. Only after searching out every reference to eternity from Genesis to Revelation, sorting these into one of three columns, reviewing the evidence to such distraction that he "could not eat, drink, sleep or appear like [him]self," and then praying until he felt assurance of divine guidance--only then did he feel that his "faith was sealed." And he adds,"I have never since felt one serious doubt of the final universal holiness and happiness of all the immortal children of God."

\item[\textsuperscript{42}] For Ballou's theology, see \textit{Primitive Christianity}, Vol. I.


\item[\textsuperscript{43}] Ballou, \textit{Autobiography}, p. 102.

In Connecticut in 1822 Ballou was admitted to the Universalist Conference \textit{in absentia}.

\item[\textsuperscript{44}] Ibid. p. 198.
\end{footnotes}
like-minded ministers to form the Massachusetts Association of Universal Restorationists, "thus consummating our separation from the Universalist denomination." Discord arose within the new association on September 29, 1837. Although eleven ministers signed Ballou's reform pledge, a vocal minority felt anti-slavery would hurt restorationism. By 1840, the group had folded.

Practical reforms gradually took precedence for Ballou over the finer points of theology and eschatology. Ballou's restorationist newspaper, The Independent Messenger, folded and gave way to another publication, The Practical Christian. In 1839, at age thirty-six, Ballou adopted and published the "Standard" of Practical Christianity, a document delineating clear behavior standards on which basis the Hopedale Community was later to be formed. In his autobiography, Ballou wryly states, "If this made me a fanatic in 1839, I am a still greater one in 1889, though doubtless a wiser one by disciplinary experience.

Adin Ballou exerted considerable influence through the Hopedale Christian Community which he founded, through his active life-long ministry, and, most significantly, through his writings. While residing in the Hopedale Community, Ballou wrote Christian Non-resistance.

"... Ballou became one of the most faithful nonresistants and abolitionists. Under his leadership, the Hopedale Community was designed as a mediating agency between the present world of sinful coercion and the peaceful future of the millennium. The Hopedale Community, in other words, was a response to the obligation of abolitionists to create new institutions which stayed clear

45 Ballou, Autobiography, p. 197. The association was formed during an August 18th meeting in Mendon, Massachusetts.
46 For the text of Ballou's "Standard," see Appendix A of this thesis.
of complicity with sin, did not condone the endurance of slavery, and did not negate the sovereignty of God."\textsuperscript{48}

With the onset of the Civil War, there occurred a sort of non-resistant diaspora. Gerritt Smith and Elihu Burritt left for England and Europe. Among non-resistants who remained in America, Garrison turned his attentions to anti-slavery, Wright to women's issues, Alcott to education, and Stearns to capital punishment. But unlike other non-resistants, Adin Ballou stayed in the country and remained faithfully devoted first and foremost to the cause of peace.

Ballou's concern for peace never flagged. From his conversion to the cause in his thirties to the end of his days, Ballou spent fifty years advocating peace. Through The New England Non-resistance Society, the Hopedale Community (later the Hopedale parish ministry), amongst his friends in the Universal Peace Union, and, later, in his foreign correspondence with Leo Tolstoy, Ballou continued to the end of his days to promote the philosophy of non-resistance and the cause of peace.

\textsuperscript{48} Perry, \textit{Radical Abolitionism}, p. 134.
Chapter II.

Language and Theology:

Premises in the Christian Non-Resistance of Adin Ballou
In 1846 Adin Ballou published his most thoroughly developed and most widely read argument. *Christian Non-Resistance* may be considered his single most significant contribution to peace theory.\(^1\) Adin Ballou's 1846 treatise belonged to "a time when a great wave of philanthropic thought and feeling seemed to be sweeping over the land and world."\(^2\) Not only preachers like Ballou, but secular thinkers as well were spearheading an effort to bring moral principles to bear on everyday life. Reformers scrutinizing community life at every level--from family to church to nation--sought a more high-minded, more Christian way of life.

Revivalist speakers in Adin Ballou's times often de-emphasized theory, dogma, and speculation. Speakers instead stressed individual experience, emotion, and action. To religious and social reformers like Theodore Parker and William Lloyd Garrison, practical ethical obligations were paramount.

Ballou's defense of the grounds for peace was unique to his era in the history of American theology. Previous generations had read *On War* by the British Jonathan Dymond and *The Lawfulness of War for Christians, Examined* by the American James Mott. Ballou's compatriot and predecessor, David Low Dodge (1774-1852) had labelled war inhumane, unwise, and criminal in a tract whose title fairly summarized Ballou's major thesis--*War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ*. Yet what distinguished Ballou from his contemporaries and his predecessors was his use of both Christian-based and nature-based

---


argumentation. Unlike Dodge or any prior Christian theologian, Ballou recognized the possibility of an absolute pacifism unlinked to Christian beliefs.3

Perhaps the first critical commentary on Ballou's *Christian Non-Resistance* was written by anti-slavery advocate William Lloyd Garrison, who reviewed the book in his newspaper, *The Liberator*. Garrison introduced his review by attesting to Ballou's competence to "state, illustrate and defend the great doctrine it inculcates," based on the author's possession of "a spirit deeply imbued with gentleness and peace." 4 Contemporary historian Christopher W. Gregory echoed Garrison's opinion when he wrote of Ballou's *Christian Non-Resistance*, "The work is worthy of careful examination because of its exposition of the tenets of Christian nonresistance as opposed to secular pacifism. Ballou's brand of commitment to peace stands out because...he adhered to his interpretation of the New Testament teaching of Christ for the rest of his life."5

Garrison, who identified himself as a nonresistant, based his positive review of the book mainly on Ballou's eminently logical presentation. Even distinct ideological opponents of nonresistance concurred with Garrison in this assessment. Writing for *The Christian Examiner* in 1848 with the purpose of "exposing error," a scathing critic admitted "The book, in the main, is written with marked ability..."6 Modern views tend to echo this consensus. In 1979, Stephen A. White of Bethany Theological Seminary wrote in *Brethren Life and Thought*, "Ballou can be credited with the compilation of one of the most

---

6 C.H.(Christian Examiner, XLIV, January, 1848). Although the author is identified only as C.H. in this source, Charles Hudson was one of Ballou's most severe critics of this period.
logically integrated, clear, and forceful presentations of the philosophy of nonresistance to be found in all of Christian literature."\(^7\)

The opening statement in *Christian Nonresistance In All its Important Bearings, Illustrated and Defended by Adin Ballou* reveals that Ballou is grounded in a Christian faith perspective. In addition, the tenor of his writing is theological. Even so, his methods appeal to human emotion as well as to natural reason. The material he has compiled is not entirely scriptural in content and approach, but is instead eclectic.

In the first part of the text, Ballou presents his arguments after the manner of Aristotle or Aquinas, defining terms, proceeding logically, and allowing each objection a thorough, systematic presentation and refutation. In the second half of the text he uses a more informal style, often anecdotal, to give examples of the experiences of those who have put into practice the doctrine he espouses.

Ballou's book is organized into seven chapters. The first three chapters expound his thesis, the last four illustrate it. Once Ballou has set out his theological tenets in essay form in chapter one, and his proofs in chapter two, he proceeds in chapter three to demonstrate his major and minor premises. At this point, under the heading "What a Christian Non-resistant Cannot Consistently Do," Ballou codifies ethical behaviors and presents his ideas in the form of a list. Chapters four, five, and six detail the practical, political ramifications and general consequences of his belief system. The seventh chapter relates his doctrine to government. Thus Ballou incorporates philosophical, scriptural, and empirical components in a methodology that uses several kinds of data.

Christian Nonresistance begins not with a definition of either resistance or non-resistance, but with a cataloging of four types of non-resistance, suggesting

\(^7\) Stephen White, "The Non-resistance Philosophy of Adin Ballou (1803-1890)", (Brethren Life and Thought, Vol. 24, Spring 1979) p.103.
that resistance then had a self-evident meaning. Ballou's sense of audience indicates that in the political life of his day, the word resistance occupied the same role that defense now occupies; both merely denote opposition, but commonly connote military might, force, weaponry, or activity.

On one level, in its day, the term non-resistance meant refusal to join the resistance (i.e., the armed resistance). Originally, "friends of peace" included those whose peace stand was limited to opposing wars of aggression. 'Non-resistant' designated the particular belief system of those "friends of peace" who, among other personal nonviolent stands, refused to bear defensive arms.

Today's ideas of anti-militarism and anti-defense resemble the peace stand of the nineteenth century nonresistance movement. Historically, those members of the American Peace Society (APS) who broke away to take a more pacifist stand on issues of personal self-defense and defensive war were known as non-resistants. Their organization, known as the New England Non-Resistant Society (NRS), organized around a position which rejected "defensive" wrongs as immoral. The APS stood for non-aggression, the NRS for the absolute pacifism of nonresistance. Most NRS members held it wrong to resort to armaments or other physical violence to deter others from attacking.

The structure of the NRS reflected the respect for individuality inherent in the belief system. Since the tendency to accept the inviolability of human life

---

8 Just as being anti-defense, now, unequivocally means one opposes military spending, being non-resistant, in the language of Ballou's day, meant a firm refusal to join the militia. Opposing monetary appropriations for war (being anti-defense) resembles opposing any call to arms (being non-resistant), except for the degree of immediacy involved. The divergence in concepts may be partly attributable to differences in the immediacy of warfare then vs. now.

9 "The APS and the NRS differed sharply in their assessment of the goal and method of peace reform. These disagreements had theological roots," Morris explains, especially since NRS members looked forward to social conditions in which the state would be "replaced by a citizenry spontaneously obedient to the commands of God." For an excellent discussion, see Morris, Advocates of Peace, p.25.
grew up in tandem with a tendency to accept a diversity of human wills, the
philosophy of nonresistance was never represented as monolithic. Instead, within
any gathering of nonresistants a range of views probably would be represented,
all of them non-violent.

Both within the NRS and outside it, many views were encompassed by
nineteenth century non-resistance (NR). A broad spectrum of perspectives was
legitimately included in nonresistance as applied to family matters, individual and
social concerns, education, and peace. Often nonresistance meant non-coercion.

For "Ultras," or 19th century extremists, non-resistance could even mean
non-arguing. Ballou, though said to be of 'irenic' disposition, never endorsed
such an extreme view of the meaning of non-resistance. For him, as for other
Garrisonian nonresistants who endorsed a zealous, reforming style of
nonresistance, reasoned debate was an important part of the search for truth.

In stating his position, Ballou identified four categories of non-resistance.
Other than Christian non-resistance, which Ballou found exemplified in the peace
teachings of the New Testament, he recognized three other separate categories--
necessitous, sentimental, and philosophical NR. In all four categories, the non-
resistant was defined by his or her individual choice to withstand injury, harm, or
wrong without responding in kind.

Philosophical non-resistance is arrived at by the mind, through reason,
logic, and independent truth-seeking; sentimental non-resistance is arrived at by
the heart, through compassionate human fellow-feeling. Necessitous non-
resistance is arrived at merely by considering physical circumstances, most likely

---

10 The friendly irony used by William L. Garrison when he called Lucretia Mott "the most
belligerent non-resistant I have ever met" played off this contrast in meanings. Obviously, for
Mott, who is said to have saved one of her abolitionist hosts from being tarred and feathered by
berating the crowd as she fearlessly followed them out into the night, confronting wrong
behaviors with strong words was not out of bounds. Lucretia Mott was a full member and
regular attender of New England Non-resistant Society meetings.
in conditions of overpowerment. In contrast, Christian non-resistance (CNR) freely expresses the spirit of Christianity, regardless of conditions. Thus Ballou limits his topic to Christian non-resistance "properly so designated."

Ballou makes it clear that philosophical and sentimental non-resistance have much in common with Christian non-resistance. Necessitous non-resistance alone because it lacks faith and courage, has nothing in common with CNR. A 'necessitous non-resistant' refrains from confrontation due to his or her own actual or assumed weakness relative to a wrongdoer's perceived strength. Necessitous non-resistance finds it necessary to calculate, weigh, appraise, and often respect the superior physical power or prowess of an attacker, oppressor, or wrongdoer. A judgment that one lacks the actual physical means to overcome wrong is at the basis of necessitous non-resistance. Ballou considers necessitous non-resistance to be un-Christian, not because this position lacks strength, power, or might, but because it lacks faith in the ultimate triumph of good over evil.

A decision to stand for what is right, regardless of the consequences to one's own person, unites nonresistors of an ethical, philosophical, or religious persuasion. Ballou's philosophical and sentimental types of non-resistance offer every possible moral answer to wrongdoing, but will not return blow for blow. In this, they arrive at the same conclusions as CNR for non-Christian, or secular, reasons. Unlike the behaviors of necessitous non-resistants, the behaviors of philosophical and sentimental non-resistants bear a strong resemblance to what Ballou considers to be Christian practice. But CNR, which incorporates the best features of both philosophic and sentimental non-resistance, is arrived at through Christian belief. ¹¹

¹¹ According to Adin Ballou, both philosophical and sentimental non-resistance share a common set of assets and drawbacks: they recommend to humankind a right course of action (perfect, even) but for a wrong (or imperfect) set of reasons. In Adin Ballou's view, both philosophical and sentimental non-resistance are mere human constructs, for which Christian
Ballou's four categories were based on classic divisions between mind and heart, body and spirit. The body is identified with necessitous non-resistance, the spirit with Christian non-resistance, mind and heart with philosophical non-resistance and sentimental non-resistance respectively.

Stephen A. White has identified Ballou's philosophical and sentimental non-resistance with rationalist and humanist pacifism, respectively. Ballou's first three categories might also be used to designate the positions of Ballou (Christian nonresistance), Tolstoy (Sentimental NR), and Gandhi (Philosophical NR). But however useful, Ballou's four categories are also open to criticism from several quarters.

One possible criticism of Ballou's system is that the categories themselves, though typical of nineteenth century thinking, are artificial. Another is that Ballou's arrangement of the categories and the human faculties they employ (spirit, mind, and heart as noble faculties and the body as ignoble) is overly hierarchical, and too severely denigrates the physical.

Had NR theorists recognized the grave potential of physical circumstances to change spirits, hearts, and minds, the NR reform movement might not have run aground so abruptly when confronted with the realities of the Civil War. The body's physical circumstances are at least one quite serious factor in any situation non-resistance is the "divine original." Yet they have in common goals, practices, and perhaps even a measure of divine guidance-- unconscious on the one hand, conscious on the other.

Unlike philosophical, sentimental, and Christian non-resistance, necessitous non-resistance has little to recommend it. Necessitous non-resistance is the nonresistance 'despots preach to their subjects', the nonresistance dictators would like to see in those they subjugate-- even, to extend the author's meaning, the nonresistance slave masters would cultivate in their slaves. Anyone who, holding in high regard superior human authority and its power to inflict physical consequences, makes a decision not to oppose an injurious oppressor, is practicing necessitous non-resistance. As the author is quick to point out, not only despots, but also 'worldly prudence' recommends the course of passive obedience and non-resistance to subjugated persons who lack the means to offer successful resistance to an injurer. Whether based on calculation or adopted unthinkingly, such a course-- although technically one of non-resistance-- has, according to Adin Ballou, "nothing in common" with CNR.

necessitating non-resistance. This criticism challenges the hierarchical division of mind and heart, body and spirit and argues for greater conceptualization of oneness of body and spirit.

Another criticism of Ballou is that he does not discuss other religious world-views. In effect, in his discussion of categories, Ballou equates the human faculty of spirit with Christianity. From a perspective which recognizes a diversity of world traditions with manifold expressions of --and approaches to-- spirit, his equation may be criticized for incompleteness. However, although Ballou is not comprehensive in his religious world-view, he wasn't guilty of ethnocentrism.

One final possible criticism of Ballou's analysis holds that an individual's stance involves the whole person, and that several faculties are commonly used in arriving at a conviction. Such an argument would break down Ballou's rigid categories of sentimental, philosophical, necessitous, and Christian nonresistance. Such critics might claim that a more modern, more holistic view would allow for the interpenetration of categories, acknowledging that a variety of elements--mind, heart, spirit, and physical circumstances-- may contribute to a single decision.

Once he has explained the four categories of Nonresistance, Ballou defines three terms--force, injury, and non-injurious force. To describe accurately what a non-resistant refuses to do Ballou is careful about word meanings connoting the use of force, describing the infliction of harm and injury, or referring to wrongs of a general nature perpetrated against others. In this regard, Ballou initially tackles the unexpectedly difficult concepts behind such simple words as force and injury as a way of laying the groundwork for an acceptable definition of Non-Resistance.
Evidently, in Ballou's time, force was popularly considered an opposite to non-resistance, notwithstanding its use in natural, neutral ways, such as to describe the force of gravity or its use in positive, abstract ways, such as to describe the 'forces' of love and truth. However, Ballou does not accept the equating of force with violence. In the universe as Ballou saw it, forces were at work in neutral, peaceful, and positive ways. He stressed that forces, whether moral or physical in nature, might be either benevolent or injurious according to their application. Ballou also noted that in a social context, one might speak of the force of public opinion or even the force of moral persuasion. Therefore Ballou refused to relinquish the term 'force' to those who equated it with violent force only.

The rigor Ballou demanded of his terminology made for a rather dense discussion, but the vernacular usage of his day did not suffice. Turning to a popular dictionary of his time, Ballou quoted the possible definitions of force as including "strength, vigor, might, violence, virtue, efficacy, validness, power of law, armament, warlike preparations, destiny, necessity, fatal compulsion."13 Those who would make force and non-resistance opposites were effectively selecting from the array of meanings listed above, coercive synonyms of force, viz., violence, power of law, "fatal compulsion" or threat at gunpoint, armaments, and warlike preparations. Their choice of synonyms from the dictionary definition emphasized force's deadly meanings, to the exclusion of all other-- perhaps more pleasant-- connotations.

Inherently, force means power of any kind whatsoever, including powers or forces that are neutral, peaceful, or positive Ballou's use of the term necessarily incorporates the positive and stresses the following synonyms (from

---

above) for force: efficacy, necessity, validness, and strength, vigor, or might. Perhaps Ballou insists upon this point because his aim is to lead his readers gently toward the belief that the power of peacemaking has a force of its own.

As with the term force, Ballou admits that he uses the term injury in the context of his discussion in "a somewhat peculiar sense."14 Judging from his use of the term and its contexts, it means damage. To injure is to harm or wrong. Included are bodily injury, harm to a person's general welfare, and even wrong done to someone's moral faculties, as when one person leads another astray.

For Ballou, considerations of whether the subject was "justly liable" for such harm are excluded. An archaic definition limits the meaning of injury to undeserved harm. (in = not; jure, as in jurisprudence, = just) Ballou takes exception to such a definition. He unequivocally states,

"I hold an injury to be an injury, whether deserved or undeserved, whether intended or unintended, whether well meant or ill meant..." 15

To harm a child, for example, while claiming the experience is a lesson would still constitute, for Ballou, the use of injurious force. Further, for Ballou, "injury" is taken to signify,

"any moral or physical force exerted by one human being upon another, the legitimate effect of which is to destroy or impair the intellectual powers, to destroy, impair, or pervert the moral and religious sentiment, or destroy or impair the absolute welfare, all things considered, of the person on whom such influence or force is exerted."

From this discussion it is clear that determining injury involves more than separating the dead from the living after a battle. Injury, for Ballou, is iniquity (of whatever kind or degree) done to another. In Ballou's eyes, not only inflicting overt physical injury, but also deluding, deceiving, cheating, or corrupting

15 Ibid. p. 8.
another human being, abusing, wronging, or damaging another person all constitute forms of *injury*.

**Non-Injurious Force** As he develops his thesis, Ballou refines his definition of *absolute injury* somewhat. First, the recipient of an action does not necessarily determine when and whether the self has been *injured*. Such a determination may at times be left to others. Secondly, Ballou mitigates his definition of *absolute injury* somewhat in describing the concept of Non-Injurious Force.

As inclusive as Ballou's definition of *injury* may at first appear to be, it does not include going contrary to the desires of an enemy-- or even of a friend. Because human wants are at times unreasonable, whether one is dealing with friend or enemy, at times "the will must be crossed." For it is not "the imaginations, thoughts and feelings" which determine what is beneficial or harmful to us.16 Non-injurious force may temporarily pain the feelings, but its methods as well as its effects are benevolent. Painful surgery is benevolent in this way. 17 Non-injurious force works "no injury, but an absolute benefit" upon those to whom it is applied.

---

17 For Ballou, the skillful surgeon, operating to save a patient, commits no wrong, because the physician renders an "absolute benefit" to the patient. Invasive medical procedures and amputation are exceptions to the general case, in which overt physical harm to life or limb would normally constitute an injury. The medical exception is, for Ballou, no exception at all, because no "absolute" harm is committed.

Non-resistants consistently opposed the doing of evil that good might come. Yet since antiquity, doctors have administered poisons that healing might come. (Our very word *pharmaceticals* comes from *pharmacon*, the Greek word for drug, which, in its extended meaning, signifies 'poison.') Ballou nonetheless unquestioningly accepted the physician's art.

Although Ballou's influence on Tolstoy, in the 1880's, was significant in the area of nonresistance, it was not comprehensive. Ballou's influence served chiefly to confirm Tolstoy's beliefs concerning the nonresistance of the Christian individual relative to church and state. During Tolstoy's unusually long lifespan a wide variety of experiences and individuals helped to model, shape, and form Tolstoy's unique beliefs. The acceptance or rejection of the physician's art may be thought of as an area of nonresistance in which Tolstoy apparently continued to follow a model of his youth, Jean-Jacques Rousseau.
Ballou further defines and defends the use of non-injurious force through examples. A sick child may refuse to take medicine; a petty thief may be "alarmed and disturbed" when "exposed in secret iniquities." Ballou holds that in these and similar cases, firm reproof is due and may be imposed non-injuriously. He asks rhetorically whether it is good for humankind to allow rampant wrongdoing--often disguised as good--to continue unchecked. Should wrongdoers be allowed, he asks,

"to perpetuate the most atrocious mischief, unexposed and unreproved? . . . On the contrary, it is good for them to be crossed . . . by all uninjurious moral and physical forces . . . To cross their will . . . is not an injury, but a substantial good, to them and to all who are connected with them." 18

Ballou addresses several objections. Admitting that "Imperfection is indeed incidental to all human judgment and conduct,"19 he insists nonetheless on adherence to the ideal of non-injury. In spite of incidental errors, those who remain pledged to the principle of non-resistance will discharge their duties "to general satisfaction" without the use of injurious force. In fact,

"The truth is, that whatever cannot be done uninjuriously can scarcely

---

There is evidence that Tolstoy, a self-named non-resistant, opposed in extremis medical procedures. After describing the brutal details of his sister Masha's surgery he said, in a letter to a friend, "...things are so arranged that with all these aids, there's as much danger as there would be without treatment." His letter went on to express the reasons why, in his view, such invasive medical procedures are wrong. Tolstoy concluded, "My general impression is that these are traps into which doctors try to snare people. And they are terribly offensive to me."(Tolstoy's Letters, R.F. Christian, trans., ed. (New York: Scribner, 1978 p.578 ). Leo Tolstoy's negative views of the medical profession are in contrast to Ballou's confident optimism.

In the language of governments today, though, military actions have become 'operations'. Whether or not the medical exception represented an area of inconsistency for the non-resistants, Ballou did not claim an "absolute benefit" would follow from any operation. 'Operations' of a military character would almost certainly have been rejected by 19th century non-resistants who followed Ballou.

18 Ballou, Christian Non-Resistance, p. 11.
19 Ibid., p. 11.
ever be done at all. Or if done, had better have been left alone." 20

Ballou applies his conclusions to criminology, personal self-defense, and war. More particularly, he applies this same thinking to the care and treatment of children and others lacking mature and reasoned judgment, including the mentally ill. 21 The offensive acts of a variety of categories of persons, from ill-


This quote from Ballou echoes the sentiment expressed by Chinese Taoists in the phrase Wei wu wei. Ballou reiterates the impossibility of achieving good through evil means, and says, in effect, that there are cases in which it is better to 'wage without waging' (Wei wu wei).

Possibly, among the reasons why Ballou's writings held so great an appeal for Tolstoy that he translated several of them into Russian, was the element in Non-resistance which echoed Lao-tzu. (Tolstoy read and admired the Taoists and especially Lao-Tzu; at one time, Tolstoy "discovered" Lao-tzu in a French edition and worked with a Chinese scholar to translate the Tao Teh Ching into Russian). Whether or not Ballou's transcendentalist contemporaries influenced him to consider eastern viewpoints and thereby contributed to the development of Ballou's views in this regard remains a matter of speculation. (For characters of Wei wu wei, see Robert B. Blakeney) p. 39.

21 At this point in his text, Ballou makes some claims that he fails to substantiate. Ballou states that the 'recent' experience of mental health professionals bears out the benefits to patients of 'scrupulously and judiciously' adhering to non-injury. Ballou reports that the recent experience of caregivers experimenting with reforms bears out the efficacy of a kind, personal, and consistently non-injurious approach.

The patients, who Ballou termed 'non-compos mentis persons' were those "frequently disposed to perpetuate outrages and inflict injuries, either on themselves or others" (Ballou, Christian Non-Resistance, p.3). A therapy of kindness was tried with these patients. Ballou stated the conclusions of research in a very general way; citation conventions appropriate to his day were lax by modern standards. Had he been pressed to do so, Ballou might well have named reformers in education, health, and mental health whose work lent support to his claims, such as Mann, Dix, and Woodward. For example, it was the young Horace Mann who spoke before the Massachusetts Legislature in 1830, seeking funding for a model Mental Health facility. Later joined in his efforts by the Boston Prison Discipline Society, Mann saw a new facility, the first of its kind, opened at Worcester, Massachusetts in 1833.

At Worcester's inception, the hospital was the North's first attempt to offer such innovative social services to the mentally ill. In 1833, the other United States hospitals for lunatics were four dreary institutions of confinement in slave states. In contrast, Worcester was innovative, structured, and personal in tone. It offered patients "a therapy of kindness that [was] often very effective." See Ronald G. Walters, American Reformers, 1815-1860. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978) p. 202.

Samuel B. Woodward administered the new facility, which claimed to be able to restore and discharge between 80 and 90 percent of its patients. Other administrators following Worcester's lead, claimed 100% cure rates. Woodward himself believed that success rates should be at least comparable to recovery rates from other severe diseases. Historian Ronald Walters states that although statistics were perhaps inaccurate- inflated, for example, by patients "cured" more than once- even the 50% cure rate which one 20th century historian estimates they achieved was impressive by modern standards.

Fortunately for those institutionalized in the South, Dorothea Dix's work for asylum reform was not geographically limited to the North. Her religiously-inspired style of asylum reform emphasized "internal guidance" in the face of the world's confusing "choices and fluidity" (201).
natured children to the deliriously ill, "ought to be kindly and uninjuriously prevented by the muscular energy of their friends." The key term here is uninjuriously. Thus, if a situation requires the use of force for its resolution, it logically requires the use of non-injurious force, which causes no injury of any kind.

From the above discussion it is clear that Ballou's definitions are basic to his argument. His definitions of force, injury, and non-injurious force not only explain, limit, and clarify his terms but also promote and advance his thesis. By definition, the use of injurious force destroys, impairs, or perverts some aspect of an individual's well-being. In this way, injurious force is seen as not solving, but instead creating problems. Non-injurious force, because consistent with Nonresistance, remains as a viable logical alternative. Terms such as force and injury in turn become building blocks in Ballou's explanation and defense of non-resistance and of CNR.

It follows that, as qualified here by Adin Ballou, non-resistance does not renounce the use of moral persuasion or even of limited, benevolent physical force. The non-resistant adopts an attitude of "abstaining totally from the infliction of personal injury as a means of resistance." Thus, to withstand injury, harm, or wrong without responding in kind--without resorting to injurious force--is to be a non-resistant.

Ballou begins defining non-resistance by showing that it does not denote an attitude of passive acceptance of natural disasters, of the ravages of sin, Satan, or

---

any other manifestation of evil, nor of the irritations of insects and the onslaughts of wild beasts. Ballou states that resistance to such forces, influences, creatures, and circumstances, and their harm, is blameless.

Thus Ballou makes it clear he intends to limit the application of the term to human interactions. Within the realm of human conduct, Ballou stresses the active, interactive role of non-resistance. For Ballou, non-resistance is not passive acceptance. "Learn to discriminate," Ballou was later to write in a tract of the same name,

"between no resistance of evil at all, and nonresistance of evil with evil— injury with injury. Non-resistants can, may and ought to resist evil in

23 The American wilderness closed and the Park Service opened in 1890, the year of Ballou's death. There is little historical evidence of 19th Century non-resistants having applied NR to the animal kingdom at large, that is, to "wild beasts." Although domesticated animals were sometimes thought of as needing protection, in the 19th Century United States, due to unfortunate circumstances partially attributable to prevailing frontier conditions and mentality, the protection of wild animals was rarely a consideration.

Some Hopedale residents, out of respect for the inviolability of life, were vegetarians. Residents of a short-lived community founded by Alcott, called Fruitlands, used no draft horses; and although they did so out of respect for the principle of non-coercion, the community had little farm produce, and was forced to close the first winter. Hopedale men, women, children, and animals worked. However, the needs of the workers at Hopedale were to be duly met, including those of the domesticated animals, and undue harshness in their treatment was to be avoided. A pledge adopted in 1838 at the inception of Ballou's Hopedale Community states that as Christian nonresistants, residents of Hopedale would avoid exhibiting cruelty to animals and would instead show kindness to all "God's creatures."

In 19th Century nonresistance thinking, as represented by Ballou, both common sense and respect for human life nonetheless required forcible resistance to the onslaughts of "wild beasts." Ballou's nonresistance was based upon an appeal to conscience. Since animal species (other than human) were thought to lack conscience, animals—especially predators—acting as free agents might be subject to forcible or even deadly resistance. One potential problem with this style of thinking was illustrated by the case of Charles Stearns, who, like Ballou, made an exception to NR with regard to "wild beasts."

Although Stearns originally went beyond Ballou by denying that "non-injurious physical force" was ever necessary in human interaction, he still did not oppose taking the life of an animal. But "Bloody Kansas" later challenged the beliefs of this devoted servant of non-resistance. In a letter to Garrison, Stearns admitted his change of mind. "The cold-blooded murder, last night, of one of our best citizens has decided me...these [pro-slavery] fiends...are to be killed as you would shoot a wild beast. I always said I would shoot a wild beast..." (Morris, Advocates of Peace, p. 185.) Stearns's example shows the potential abuse of Ballou's argument excepting wild animals.
many ways, but never with evil, by doing injury to the soul or body of any human being."24

Faced with wrongs, there are steps the non-resistant may (and in some cases, must) take. Ballou says,

"I go further . . . I claim the right to offer the utmost moral resistance, not sinful, of which God has made me capable, to every manifestation of evil among mankind. Nay I hold it my duty to offer such moral resistance. In this way, my very non-resistance becomes the highest kind of resistance to evil."

Defining his conception of non-resistance further, Ballou states:

"in cases where deadly violence is inflicted with deliberation and malice aforethought, one may nobly throw his body as a temporary barrier between the destroyer and his helpless victim, choosing to die in that position, rather than be a passive spectator." 25

From this discussion it is clear that, for Ballou, the term non-resistance denotes a challenge within Christian ethics; appropriately associated with engagement, commitment and courage, Non-Resistance is a concept at once demanding and positive in its significance.

Principles at the Conceptual Basis of Nonresistance

Although similarities exist between Ballou's writings and those of Dymond, Mott, Dodge, and Ballou's other Christian predecessors, Ballou does more than simply add rigor, style, and the force of reason to a well-trodden path. Ballou makes a significant conceptual contribution in the way he assigns meanings to the premises and principles relevant to his subject. In the next section, Ballou distinguishes two principles to be at the conceptual basis of nonresistance. His distinctions present substantial ethical and conceptual challenges.

The first principle from which non resistance proceeds is an absolute, unerringly wise love. To describe this principle, Ballou adjoins,

"Of this it has been said--'Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.' Or as the amiable John expressed it--'He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.'"\textsuperscript{26}

Ballou names this principle "all perfect love," and states that this "pure, enlightened, conscientious principle"\textsuperscript{27} gives rise to human benevolence. Although Ballou does not use the term, the principle which gives rise to human benevolence and non resistance might also be called "perfect compassion." In that it prompts actions of benevolence, righteousness, and goodness without thought of return, this principle is uncircumscribed by conditions and consequences. Such compassion --the source of nonresistance-- "intuitively and spontaneously dictates the doing of good to others"\textsuperscript{28} and neither asks that kindness be returned for kindness nor responds in kind to wrongs.

As to the extent of such fellow-feeling, Ballou explicitly states that when Jesus said,"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,"

"He showed that the 'neighbor' intended was any human being, a stranger, an enemy, a bitter foe... the greatest criminal, the veriest wretch of our race."\textsuperscript{29}

Ballou states that such forbearant compassion, introduced long ago, represents Truth. And yet human beings "could not clearly perceive it, much less appreciate its excellency."\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid. p. 21.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid. p. 21.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid. p. 22.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid. p. 22-23.
A second principle at the moral basis of nonresistance is a kind of unshakable faith or loyalty in the power of goodness itself. Ballou identifies the sub-principle of non-resistance as "faith in the inherent superiority of good over evil, truth over error, right over wrong, and love over hatred."\(^1\) This principle, inherent in Christian peace teachings, holds that where evil exists, it is the especial province of good, and good alone, to overcome it.

Long-term positive consequences do necessarily attend upon goodness. Ballou names this idea "the essential efficacy of good."\(^2\) Ballou admits that the 'transformative' effects of goodness as a "counteracting force to resist evil" may not always be observable in a single lifetime. His assertion, "Evil can only be overcome with good," therefore becomes an article of faith.

Effectiveness in counteracting wrong and competence in neutralizing evil are among the gifts or powers of goodness. That which Ballou calls "the essential efficacy of good," since it gives rise to great conviction and inner strength, could also be called "transforming power."\(^3\) Ultimately, Ballou's entire thesis in *Christian Non-Resistance* may be read as an argument in vindication of the strength of goodness possible to humankind in a regenerate condition.\(^4\)

---

31 Ibid. p. 25.
32 Valarie Ziegler Morris provides a clear though fairly sceptical discussion of the supposed "efficacy" of nonresistant goodness as per Ballou. See Morris, *Advocates of Peace*, pp. 104-5.
33 Although Ballou does not use the term "transforming power" --a phrase of modern coinage-- he does, however, demonstrate the potential of nonresistance by using examples of many crime-prone individuals or criminals who renounced their criminal intentions. The terminology I have adopted here is from a booklet by Lawrence Apsey, organizer of a successful program for prison inmates, called Alternatives to Violence. He reports that "Experience has shown that there is a power capable of transforming evil situations into good ones without violence... we shall refer to it as 'Transforming Power.'" I would argue that Apsey's phrase, like Ballou's, names the gifts of overcoming strength and corrective inspiration inherent in goodness, and that Ballou writes of the same phenomena under the rubric "the efficacy of goodness."


34 A theodicy is an argument which vindicates God's all-powerful goodness and justice in a world where evil nonetheless exists. The argument Ballou makes here is analogous to a theodicy.
Although the Christian love from which Christian non-resistance springs has received extensive treatment in both religious and secular circles, faith in the essential efficacy of goodness is a less familiar but no less necessary theme. From compassion springs altruism; but from the transforming power of goodness springs the ability to bring about conversion.\textsuperscript{35} Just as one principle is associated with Christian love, the other principle is associated with Christian hope. For Ballou, both are important aspects of Christian non-resistance; and taken together, the two principles define his conception of what makes CNR viable.\textsuperscript{36}

In our culture, there is a false belief that to be good is to be weak or ineffective. Christian love holds virtue (or goodness) to be its own reward. But Christian faith legitimates the expectation that, after its own fashion, virtue (or goodness) will ultimately prevail or be rewarded.\textsuperscript{37} Just as "perfect compassion" overturns estrangement and violence, "transforming power" reverses the misconception that to be good is to be victimized.

---


\textsuperscript{36} Non-resistance contains inherent paradoxes. Morris is fairly unsympathetic to nonresistant claims of efficacy, which she sees as standing in absolute contradiction to the Non-resistant reliance on a martyr-like "ethic of duty." Morris, \textit{Advocates of Peace}, p. 105. When a nonresistant calculates end results, one important factor in the calculation is that the results of a human lifetime can continue to accrue after its termination.

\textsuperscript{37} Lawrence Apsey, an instrumental presence in the Alternatives to Violence programs currently deployed in prisons across the nation, claims, "experience shows that the force of a just cause, long persisted in, actually dissolves prejudice and selfishness." (Apsey, \textit{Transforming}, p. 7). The same author later speaks of "an ideological faith in Transforming Power" as a desirable element in nonviolent actions, p.50.
For Ballou, these principles were not contradictory. CNR sprang from a disinterested principle; yet Ballou and his colleagues in the Non-resistant Society were also keenly interested in the future. They held that CNR was worth any imaginable sacrifice, and also argued that sole reliance on benevolent means of righting wrongs tended to be safe, effective, and ultimately justifiable in terms of long-range results. To the nonresistants, these twin assertions were no more contradictory than the principles which gave rise to them.

In his discussion of language and theology thus far, Ballou's purpose has been to provide a conceptual and linguistic structure with which to understand non-resistance. He has attempted to describe non-resistance as a phenomenon and explain its underlying principles. In the course of laying out definitions and principles, Ballou not only clarified his linguistic and theological premises, but also built a logically integrated vocabulary by means of which to express insights original to his writings. Ballou's premises laid a foundation on which to develop his theological argument. Ballou's theology held that an indwelling presence among "the good" led them to oppose, confront, and convert evil (in the context of a world replete with evils) without resort to evil means.

Ballou's eclectic argumentation had secular and religious aspects. Ballou's audience was a mixed group; his eclecticism answered to the condition of the Society as a whole. According to one historian, "Some nonresistants derived their belief from 'considerations of safety and expediency...some from [human] nature. Some from the Gospel, and some from all these sources.'"38

38 Mabee, Black Freedom, p. 68.
Chapter III.
Reason and Revelation:
Style and Content of Ballou's Argumentation
In his book *Christian Non-Resistance*, Ballou's opening statement declares that Christian nonresistance is the particular form of nonresistance exemplified by the life and teachings of Jesus. Ballou's argumentation, although bolstered by definitions in his Chapter One, reinforced by deductive reasoning from natural law in Chapter Four, and supported by case histories in Chapters Four, Five and Six, nonetheless ultimately rises or falls on the substance of his scriptural interpretation in Chapters Two and Three. Here, Ballou devotes the heart of his text in *Christian Nonresistance* to an explication of scripture, primarily the New Testament. From the religious core of Ballou's argumentation one can discern that the New Testament gospels--particularly the Sermon on the Mount--significantly shaped Ballou's particular non-resistant stance.

"What is Christian Non-resistance? It is that original, peculiar kind of nonresistance, which was enjoined and exemplified by Jesus Christ, according to the Scriptures of the New Testament." ¹

Biblical themes and allusions were used to express and to evoke the meanings and purposes of nonresistance long before Adin Ballou became the leading theoretician of the nonresistance movement in the 19th century United States. And Ballou's scriptural interpretations echoed and substantiated biblical allusions contained in the NRS charter itself, authored by William Lloyd Garrison in 1838. The society's charter contained the following language:

"We are bound by the laws of a Kingdom which is not of this world, the subjects of which are forbidden to fight...We believe that the penal code of the old covenant, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' has been abrogated by Jesus Christ, and that under the new covenant, the forgiveness instead of the punishment of enemies has been enjoined upon all his disciples in all cases whatsoever...But while we shall adhere

to the doctrine of nonresistance...we purpose, in a moral and spiritual sense, to speak and act boldly in the cause of God."

As spokesperson, theologian, and theoretician for the NRS, Ballou's scholarly, theological arguments made frequent use of scriptural references, and his conclusions gave credibility to the absolute pacifism of the NRS. Ballou's exposition from scripture and Garrison's charter for the NRS had similar aims. But where Garrison's statements were declarative and political, Ballou's were scholarly and theological. Where Garrison simply presented a position, Ballou gave support to a similar view, or faith perspective, using scriptural references.

A juxtaposition of portions of Garrison's statement with the opening of Ballou's Chapter Two, entitled *Scriptural Proofs*, exposes marked similarities in content between these two documents. Without citing specific biblical references, the NRS charter above states, "the penal code of the old covenant, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' has been abrogated." In a general way, Ballou's scriptural discussion supported this statement. He quoted from Matthew to explain the New Testament dispensation, and from Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy to explain the provisions of the old Mosaic code. After comparing the ancient code with the new one, and carefully examining texts corroborative of each, Ballou stated his conclusion that the New Testament dispensation overturned the ancient code.

The charter continues, "under the new covenant, the forgiveness instead of the punishment of enemies has been enjoined upon all disciples in

---


3 Ballou uses Jesus' Sermon on the Mount in Matt. 5:38-41; also Ex. 21:23-25; Lev. 24:19-20; and Deut. 19:18-20.
all cases whatsoever." Ballou's numerous quotations show that punishment, hatred, and vengeance toward enemies is interdicted by scripture, and that scripture instead enjoins forgiveness and love of neighbor.

The miscellaneous texts Ballou offers in his next section, Further Important Proofs, can best be understood in relation to Matt. 5:39, the "resist not evil" verse, which serves as a central, organizing text for Ballou's discussion of nonresistance. Ballou cites four additional passages which gave biblical support to William Lloyd Garrison's words in the original Nonresistant Society charter,"We are bound by the laws of a Kingdom which is not of this world, the subjects of which are forbidden to fight."

From this discussion, it is clear that Ballou's first three proofs--concerning nonretaliation towards evildoers, love of enemies, and forgiveness--are closely linked to each other and to segments of the NRS charter statement. As he constructs a theological defense for nonresistance, Ballou supports and gives credibility to Garrison's declarative statements. We can easily discern within Ballou's discussion from the Biblical source three major themes: perfectionism, forgiveness, and nonresistance.

Ballou pointed to Jesus in the temptation, and cited the apostolic testimonies, to support his claim that Christ and the early Christians "never trusted in carnal weapons for the security of their persons." Imitatio Christi language abounds in the literature of nonresistance.

---

4 Matt. 5:43-43; Deut. 13:12-16; Deut.20:16-17; Deut.7:2 and Psal.35:1-8.
5 Jno. 18:36; Matt. 10:16; Luke 9:52-56; Matt. 26:50-53; Jno. 8:3-11.
7 Rom. 12:2,14,19-21; 1 Cor. 10:3-5; Gal 5:22-25; Col. 3:12; and 1 Thes. 5:15, Heb.
12:1,2,3,14; James 1:19, 12; James 4:1,7; 1 Peter 2:19-23; 1 Peter 4:12,20; 1 Peter 3:14,15; 1 Peter 4:13-19; 1 Jno 2: 6,11; 1 Jno. 3:14,15; and 1 Jno. 4:12,20.
Throughout his text, but especially in the two second chapters, Ballou made reference to the life and teachings of Jesus as providing a pattern or model for nonresistant behavior. By endorsing the expectation that human beings voluntarily cast off their moral imperfections and begin to live a Christ-like life, Ballou revealed an attitude of Christian perfectionism.

"In its purest form, perfectionism, the doctrine of personal holiness, told [lay persons] that they could become literally perfect by accepting Christ as their mentor and guide."9 Convinced as Ballou was of the "latent perfectibility of humankind and society," 10 he tended toward a literal reading of several other key Bible passages--among them, the final verses of Matthew 5:

For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye?
do not even the publicans the same?
And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?
Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.
That ye may be the children of your father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. 11

---


To many, Jesus' behavior--especially on the cross, but at many other junctures as well--might seem unreachable. Not so for Christian perfectionists, including Ballou. Throughout his writings on the subject, Ballou consistently held to the notion that Jesus' teachings were definitely practical and reachable by ordinary persons through regeneration. For more information on the meaning of Christian perfectionism, see the writings of John Humphrey Noyes.


11 Matthew 5:45,46,47,48. In his article on covenanting, John H. Yoder explains that disparities exist between the overlapping concepts of duty in relation to a law, and reciprocality in relation to a promise or covenant.

For Ballou, forgiveness is not granted to the elect as part of a covenant, but somehow legislated. Throughout Ballou's discussion of Christian non-resistance, his word choice...
In instructing lay persons to imitate Jesus, a key concept is forgiveness. Essentially, the perfection sought after is that of a God, who, "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." Abundant New Testament passages instruct forgiveness; Ballou selected several of these for use in his scriptural proofs of nonresistance. Forgiveness of trespasses, ordinarily upheld by a variety of Christian sectarians, nonetheless had degrees. Ballou's stated intent was to "carry the obligation...as far as Jesus had and no further."12

In actuality, Ballou outstripped many other theologians in the solemnity with which he saw fit to regard the obligation of Christian forgiveness. Among the quotations he used were the following:

> forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us...
> (Matt.6: 12)
> Then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him?
> Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven. (Matt. 18-22)

indicates that he considers the mandate to forgive an obligation, or a form of Christian duty; this is revealed by his use of 'law,' 'dispensation,' and other quasi-legal terms.

Ballou exegetes law in the proscriptive- not the descriptive- sense; he considers the juxtaposing of Old and New dispensations as described in the Sermon on the Mount to be tantamount to repealing an old code and adopting a new one.

According to one view, the language of Jesus "I say that ye..." merely describes and promises conditions, states, and emotions (such as forgiveness) which those who follow Him will be led to attain. It is possible to exegete the bestowal not as that of a law, but of a gift. Since forgiveness and peace are associated (and opposed to revenge and war) such an exegesis would rest on passages such as John 14:27, in which it is written, "Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." According to this view, forgiveness would be not an obligation and a duty, but an inheritance and a gift.

John P. Reeder, Jr.'s article "Forgiveness: Tradition and Appropriation" (Journal of Religious Ethics, Vol.15, p. 136-40) discusses the issue of making forgiveness a duty. For Reeder, the distinction between choice and duty determines whether non-resistance itself is superogatory- or over and above the calling - or a standard requirement. In his discussion of moral autonomy, Reeder takes the position that forgiveness, which was freely given, becomes a free choice to give again.

Among the reasons Ballou gave for replacing retaliation with forgiveness was the idea of creating a resulting reciprocity originating in the heart of the deity. Ballou demonstrated this idea of reciprocity by utilizing biblical passages on the subject of forgiveness, including the following:

And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses. (Mark 11: 25)

For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly father will also forgive you: But if ye forgive not men their trespasses neither will your Father forgive your trespasses. (Matt. 6: 12-15)

Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven. (Luke 6: 37)

In biblical interpretation, a single passage often provides a key text around which to organize supportive ideas. The entire outlook of millennialism, popular in the nineteenth century, was organized around a single reference (Rev. 20:1-5) to a thousand-year period in which Satan would be bound. To take a more contemporary example, feminist New Testament interpretation begins with Galatians 3:28, which states that in Christ there is neither male nor female. For Ballou, Matthew 5:39, in which Jesus instructs the multitudes, is such a text. Ballou claims that this passage exhorts good people\(^\text{13}\) of every country through all time to accept

\(^{13}\) Ballou, *Christian Nonresistance*, p. 107. Ballou here implies that the "comparatively good" are the ones to whom the message of nonresistance is addressed, for he says, "The question is, whether we shall preach nonresistance to the good, as well as non-aggression to the bad; or whether we shall insist only on non-aggression, leaving the comparatively good to resist injury with injury, so long as aggression shall continue." He explains, "The good wish the bad to reform. Will they return good for evil, and thereby hasten that reform? or will they return evil for evil, and thereby frustrate that reform?" Ballou then rhetorically asks, "Which shall take the lead in the great work of reform? Shall the good wait till the bad cease from aggression before they leave off inflicting injury in self-defense? Christianity says no. It bids them be "the salt of the earth," and "the light of the world;" to suffer wrong rather than do wrong, "to overcome evil with good." Ballou concludes, "God has ordered the work begun and prosecuted from both ends at once; the bad to cease from aggressive injury, and the good defensive injury."
the challenge and duty of nonresistance. The passage he uses reads as follows:

Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you,
That ye resist not evil [by evil means] - Matt.5:38,39

Ballou states that the phrase 'Christian non-resistance' was derived directly from the words "resist not evil" in this biblical passage. He claims that, rightly interpreted, this organizing text, standing alone, would give succinct expression to a view he finds reiterated throughout the New Testament.

According to Ballou, scripture is best interpreted by the following process,"Consider the context; consider parallel texts; consider examples; consider the known spirit of Christianity." 14 If all these concur, a sound interpretation- neither going beyond nor falling short of the intended meaning- has been reached. Ballou uses this method to examine conflicting interpretations of Matthew 5:39, comparing parallel texts, and developing his own reasoned "proof" that Christian scriptures enjoin radical peace principles.

Among the corroborative passages Ballou cites to reinforce the message of Matthew 5:39 one quotation plainly restates the theme. "See that none render evil for evil... both among yourselves, and to all..."(Col.3:12) Differently stated, this passage reiterates the nonresistant message Ballou exegetes from the New Testament. Nonresistance, which stands for noninjury and non-retaliation, opposes the taking of life absolutely, opposes human injury absolutely, and has special provisions against the lawfulness of bloodshed in war and as punishment.

Against bloodshed as punishment, Ballou cites the passage in which Jesus instructed a crowd to let the first stone be cast by one who was without sin. Against bloodshed in war, he cites the passage saying that to live by the sword is to die by the sword. On the subject of the apostles, Ballou rhetorically asks, "Did they ever slay any human being? Ever threaten to do so?...I answer confidently, NO."

Ballou states that the apostles-- early disciples of Jesus-- did not rely on military protection or governmental agencies of any kind to Christianize the world. Seeking out impartial confirmation of his views, Ballou turns to an early historical source unsympathetic to both nonresistance and to Christianity. As evidence that "the early Christians were unequivocal nonresistants," Ballou says that many murmured against the early religious group for their pacifism. He cites the reproof of Celsus, who said to the Christians, "You will not bear arms in the service of the empire when your services are needed." Ballou also cites nineteenth century historian Gibbon, who seemed dazed that Christians, "knew not how to reconcile [the defense of persons and property] with the doctrine that enjoined forgiveness of past injuries..." and would not "be convinced that it was lawful, on any occasion, to shed the blood of their fellow creatures, either by the sword of justice or that of war."

Not unlike the early Christians, Ballou encountered many who objected to his views. In response, Ballou not only promoted his proposed hypothesis, but also allotted considerable time toward refuting objections to

15 from Jno. 8:3-11.
16 from Matt 26: 50-53.
18 William Gibbon was author of The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.
19 Ballou, Christian Nonresistance , p.56.
his thesis. His answers to scriptural "objections" are quite detailed, and his reasoning quite thorough. Among the scriptural objections Ballou confronted are the following: Do you avoid the mass of biblical evidence against nonresistance by "throwing away" the Old Testament? Does your interpretation overlook significant examples from the story of the life and teachings of Jesus? Do you give a correct exegesis of the passage, "I say unto you, that ye resist not evil."

"questions were being raised concerning the consistency of nonresistance with the Old Testament, which gave divine sanction to the warfare and governmental system of the Jews. There was also the problem that Jesus instructed his followers to obey Caesar and the powers that be. . . . Perhaps the only man capable of a systematic, theological defense of nonresistance was Adin Ballou."\(^{20}\)

Perhaps the most significant criticism of Ballou’s scriptural defense of non-resistance is that he eliminated ample evidence to the contrary provided in the Old Testament. A great proportion of Ballou's case for nonresistance is made from scriptural sources in the New Testament. In Ballou's role as theological spokesperson for nonresistance, nowhere was his ability to address potential criticisms more crucial than in facing charges that he failed to use the whole bible. His answer to this criticism focused on his conception of the proper relationship between the Old and New Testaments.

Just as his evaluation of the New Testament highlighted its fulfillment of ancient promises, Ballou's discussion of the Old Testament emphasized its prophetic role. The Old Testament was "to be held in reverence as prophecy. " While Ballou admitted the existence in the Old Testament of "precepts and examples" contrary to non-resistance, his

\(^{20}\) Perry, *Radical Abolitionism*, p. 130.
interpretation, a standard Christian one, emphasized the role of the Old Testament in predicting and heralding the Christ.21

"If ye had believed Moses ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me." Ballou first selected passages from the New Testament, followed by passages from the Old Testament which corroborated the view that "by accepting [the New Testament] as a rule of faith and practice, I rendered most honorable obedience to the teachings of the Old."22

Ballou emphasized that "The New Testament supersedes the Old on all questions of divine truth and human duty. In affirming this, I only affirm what both Testaments unequivocally declare respecting themselves and each other." Because the Old Testament predicted and heralded the Christ, Ballou claimed that as a whole it was "for Christ and the supreme authority of his teachings, non-resistance included."23

By overturning the precepts of the ancient code, Ballou concluded, non-resistance does not destroy the ancient law. Instead, the new dispensation fulfills the fundamental purpose of law— which was justice—in a new way. Non-injury fulfills the purposes of ancient Mosaic Law by providing humanity with a new means by which to "put away the evil from amongst [our]selves."

Did Jesus ever exemplify or teach lessons which conflict with the interpretation Ballou has given of nonresistance? Ballou did not face objections of this kind categorically, but individually, one by one. Notable

22 Ballou, Christian Nonresistance, p.66.
23 Ibid, p.66.
among his replies are Ballou's interpretation of Romans 13, instructing Christians to obey the powers that be. Also notable are Ballou's views of the probable meaning and demeanor of Jesus' behavior on two occasions—first when he cleansed the temple, and again when he asked the disciples to purchase swords.

First, Ballou reconstructs the "particular facts of the case" as he imagines the incident in the temple in Jerusalem, when Jesus found "those that sold oxen, and sheep, and doves, and the changers of money, sitting." Jesus, making "a scourge of small cords," drove the merchants and their animals away.

The issue, Ballou states, is not whether it was rightful to cause the merchants to be smitten in their consciences and leave—for, he trusts, that is granted "on all sides." Instead, the issue is whether injury to persons or property was necessarily committed in this incident. Essentially, Ballou argues that the makeshift scourge was itself merely symbolic or emblematic; that Jesus caused the "traffickers" suddenly to remove themselves and their effects from the temple through the strength of his zeal and the intensity of his powerful personal presence. Ballou says, "I want some proof that he touched a single person with his scourge, and that in overthrowing the money changers' tables he exhibited a single undignified gesture." Until then, Ballou says, his own interpretation stands: Jesus "severely scourged their minds with just reproof, of which his rush scourge was a significant emblem," and did "nothing but good to all parties concerned."

---

24 Ballou, Christian Nonresistance, p.70.
25 Ibid, p.70.
26 Ibid, p.72.
Ballou gives a similarly symbolic interpretation of Jesus' request for swords. Swords, Ballou says, may conceivably be used for two purposes— for injurious resistance, or, "on a memorable occasion, as the significant emblem of injurious resistance" they may be used "for the purpose of emphatically inculcating non-resistance." 27 In other words, swords may be used for destruction or instruction. Ballou holds that the latter was the case when, at the last passover, Jesus said, "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one."

Continuing with the same text, which reads, "Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, it is enough," (Luke 22:38) Ballou rejoins, "How could two swords be enough to arm twelve men for war or self-defence?" 28 If injurious resistance—self defense—had been intended, Ballou claims, two swords would not have been enough for a party of twelve. Ballou, who recognized the value of material aids in teaching, claimed that "the sole purpose" for which the swords were provided was educational. Ballou argues that Jesus taught nonresistance when he took the Centurion's ear, severed by means of one of the two swords, and immediately restored it. Jesus taught nonresistance when he gave the mandate to "Put up thy sword again into his [sic] place." Ballou claims that it was not fortuitous, but by design, that Jesus was able to seize both these opportunities to instruct nonresistance— the two swords were obtained for instructional purposes alone. The swords were obtained and intended only to "emphatically, finally, and everlastingly prohibit the use of the instrument, even by the innocent in self-defense." Ballou also states that the

27 Ballou, Christian Nonresistance, p.73.
28 Ibid., p.73.
disciples understood the lesson and henceforth "conscientiously eschewed the use of the sword." 29

Ballou also states that the apostles refrained from imprecating harm on their own opponents or those of the Lord. For example, Ballou admits that Peter reproved a husband and wife who conspired to hold back part of their religious gift, but denies that Peter caused or wished for the sudden death of the couple. Peter was not implicated in the shock and demise of Ananias and Sapphira, whose experiences stemmed from their own iniquitous behaviors and the Lord's visitation. Ballou further says that the apostles, when at liberty, did not seek legal or military protection. In Acts 22, when Paul informed his guards that he was a free-born Roman citizen, he did not threaten his captors but left them to judge their best course of action for themselves. "All he did was to remind those who were about to violate the Roman law by scourging him uncondemned, of his rights." 30 When imprisoned by the Romans, Paul did not request 460 soldiers to monitor his passage to Cesarea. Although, through his nephew, Paul informed authorities that 40 conspirators plotted treachery against their prisoner's life, the chief captain employed the soldiers on his own volition.

Ballou next confronted another particularly confounding passage, Romans 13:1-7. Rulers, this verse declares, are ministers ordained of God "to execute wrath on him that doeth evil." This objection had been used against an interpretation of absolute nonresistance from New Testament sources, to defend penal injury, and to justify war.

29 Ballou, Christian Nonresistance, p.74.
30 Ibid., p. 92.
Ballou argues that while Christians are everywhere enjoined to "render respect and submission" to governments "in all things not involving disobedience to God," nonetheless kings, counsellors, rulers, and magistrates are still not absolved from the "common obligations" to "love God with their whole heart, and to love their neighbors as themselves."

If kings, counsellors, rulers, and magistrates are consciously to do God's bidding, Ballou reasons, they are also to "forgive the trespasses of their offenders, to love their enemies, bless those that curse them and do good to those that hate them." According to Ballou's interpretation, few kings have consciously done God's bidding; but according to Ballou's interpretation of Romans 13, unconsciously all Kings have done God's will. Since history works through these various sorts of magistrates, Ballou affirms that even the wickedest of kings and pharaohs serve somehow as "instruments in the grand economy of [God's] providence." But even though the great wickedness of kings may be "overruled in the providence of God for the good of mankind," Ballou believes that such rulers will be punished by God according to the evil that they intended, not rewarded according the good purposes they unconsciously served.

To show "in what sense 'the powers that be are ordained of God,'" Ballou gave several examples. When Pharaoh hastened the exodus of the children of Israel to the promised land, Ballou would have it that unconsciously he ministered to God's beneficent purposes. After the journey of the Israelites, "probably the whole human race is now in a

---

32 Ibid., p.82.
33 Ibid., p.82.
better condition." Likewise the proud, ambitious Monarch of Assyria and King Nebuchadnezzar both were unwittingly obliged ultimately to "subserve" noble purposes in spite of their nefarious immediate purposes.

In respect to the biblical verse "Resist not evil [with evil]," Ballou holds that the language of the Gospel is straightforward and clear; the passage simply means what it says. Upon identifying this key passage as central to the meaning of Christian non-resistance, Ballou discusses both key terms-- both 'resist' and 'evil.'

To arrive at his interpretation, Ballou weighs the relative merits of four possible meanings of the word 'evil'. Natural catastrophes are experienced as great evils, but it is blameless to resist these. Moral temptations propose many wrongs, sins, or evils, to the human mind but for a Christian to resist and to overcome these is commendable. Spiritual delusion likewise can blamelessly be resisted, and must be resisted if one is to live a Christian life. Ballou concludes that nonresistance to three out of four of the options he has generated would lead to a logical absurdity. Natural sufferings and catastrophes, moral temptations and devastations, and spiritual delusions and diversions all represent types of evils which must be resisted.

Remaining is personal evil. Must one resist a personal assault or attack by one's ignorant fellow human being, or not? In his search for an appropriate meaning for the term 'evil' Ballou has exhausted several possibilities as absurd or logically inconsistent with the biblical context. He sees the only possible remaining one as personal evil, a real or threatened assault on one's person by another human being. Encompassed by Ballou's phrase 'personal evil' is his aforementioned concept of absolute personal
injury, which includes any physical harm or wrong directed by one individual towards another.

Having decided evil in this context is harm "inflicted on human beings by human beings," Ballou next interprets resistance to evil by distinguishing between four possible significations of the verb 'to resist'. Of four possible meanings-- to offer passive resistance, to remonstrate or rebuke, to uninjuriously correct, or to resist by inflicting injury-- 'resist' in "Resist Not Evil" refers only to the last of these four meanings. The author arrives at this conclusion by evaluating contextual considerations, noting the surrounding references to the Mosaic code.

Thus Ballou claims that for non-resistants the verse, "But I say unto you that ye resist not evil," (Mathew 5:39) is at the heart of the Christian Gospel; he summarizes the intent of the phrase "resist not evil" as "resist not personal injury with personal injury." Other people have evaded the full claim that revenge and punishment are never permissible; Ballou claims that these interpretations are "evasions" of the key text.

Ballou identifies seven positions which he considers to be common misinterpretations of "Resist not evil." He refutes these--to him-- false views or "evasions." He holds that when subjected to a reasonable scrutiny, none of these positions presents a serious challenge to the CNR faith perspective; yet since all have been preached by well-regarded ministers to large and credulous audiences, their refutation is necessary.

Ballou's scriptural argumentation at this point adopts an analytical, Thomistic style. Ballou was familiar with St. Thomas Aquinas' writings,

---

which presented a model of rigor in scriptural analysis. Using reason and logic to convey his deductions from revealed truth systematically, Aquinas rhetorically raised logical objections to a proposed hypothesis and methodically refuted each objection. In this way he built an interpretive construct. Ballou's method, though less tied to an established format, also relied heavily on his ability to disprove opposing views. Ballou built his case for complete nonresistance around this key, organizing text (Matt. 5:39) by employing a Thomistic style of argumentation.

Ballou holds that the doctrine "Resist not evil [with evil]," correctly interpreted, overturns ancient codes. Specifically, the New Testament dispensation contradicts 'lex talionis,' the law of reciprocating or responding in kind (i.e. to injuries with corresponding injuries). In other words, the New Testament code abrogated just those statutes which had provided for proportionate punishment (proportionate to the crime). Ballou understood 'lex talionis' to require legal retaliation; he held that the new dispensation did not uphold reciprocal injury, but overturned the retaliatory provisions of the ancient Old Testament code. His replies to the seven major objections are as follows.

First, some people claim that the law of "an eye for and eye.." (Ex 21:24) was never intended to be overturned by the Sermon on the Mount. Instead, they say, only the harsher applications of the old laws, based on explanations found in the margins of ancient Hebrew documents, were intended to be reversed--not the Mosaic code itself, but only its

---

35 Adin Ballou, Primitive Christianity, (Mystic, Connecticut: Universalist Publishing House, 1890) Vol. 1 p.119. Aquinas' writings presented a model of rigor. After stating several objections to a proposed hypothesis, and using the phrase on the contrary, it is written... Aquinas then stated a scriptural precept. Then, following the formula I answer that... Aquinas proceeded to refute each objection.
glosses. (Case 1) Ballou attributes the first evasion to unsupported supposition, adding that the "overstraining" of such codes-- already harsh: in his judgement-- seems incredible.36

Next, some people have evaded the full meaning of the passage by claiming that revenge and punishment are permissible when undertaken with a non-punitive attitude; or that private revenges may be wrong, but the decision and judgement of a public magistrate upholding justice should stand; or again, that NR is applicable to petty infractions and minor violations, but was never intended to be applied to extreme cases. (Cases 2, 3, 4) Some have claimed that the doctrine of NR was necessary for early Christians, but is no longer necessary; or that in worldly matters, Christians are to defend their rights however they see fit, but as representatives of the church, they are to bear all manner of inflictions. (Cases 5, 6) The evasions Ballou lists, from simple to subtle, use a variety of devices, and entail an entire progression of refutations.

To those who claim that revenge and punishment are permissible for Christians when undertaken with a non-punitive attitude, Ballou counters that, according to this evasion, Jesus would be "smoothly construed to have said nothing at all."37 Even the Mosaic code, in its severity, warned against vengeance of heart in those whose office it was to

36 Modern scriptural scholarship concurs that 'lex talionis,' in the context of its own time in history, had a goal of clemency and a purpose of limiting excessive punishment. The law forbade going beyond that which might be considered proportionate-- an eye for an eye, not a life for an eye. Thus, especially in relation to previously existent practices, the emphasis of 'lex talionis' was that legally inflicted injuries should not exceed those inflicted during the crime itself.

Ballou often said that New Testament precepts expressed the spirit but not the letter of the ancient law. Although Ballou did not appreciate 'lex talionis' as an expression of clemency, the view of modern scriptural scholarship that, in its time, 'lex talionis' had a moderating effect, would tend to support Ballou's view of scripture as self-consistent.

mete out punishment. "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people. . . Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart." (Lev. 19) Ballou quotes like passages from Deuteronomy, Exodus, and Leviticus to prove his point. He further states that, in his view, death is still death, and injury still injury, however "gently and politely" inflicted. In a characteristic appeal to the emotions, Ballou says that, as in the case of a "beautiful damsel" who stabs her lover while embracing him, or a mother who smothers the child she has just kissed, "seeming love only renders the infliction of death or torture on offenders the more abhorrent to Christian sensibility." 38 (Reply to case 2)

To those who claim that private revenges may be wrong, but that the judgement of a public magistrate should stand, Ballou bitingly replies that Jesus did not say, "You have heard that it hath been said, let every man take vengeance on his own offenders. . . but I say unto you. . . carry all your causes into the courts for adjudication." Here, Ballou finally makes reference to the biblical verses which advise turning the other cheek, offering your cloak if your coat is taken, and yielding yourself up as a willing prisoner(Matt 5:39-41). Ballou states that Jesus enjoined nonresistance "alike in respect to personal assault and . . . wrong." 39 Since Jesus never sued at law or taught his followers to do so, Ballou calls this a "lame" objection. (Reply to case 3)

To those who claim that NR is applicable to petty infractions and minor violations, but was never intended to be applied to extreme cases, Ballou answers by saying that there is no clear-cut definition of 'minor violations.' Ballou calls this objection, "very accommodating, but very

38 Ballou, Christian Non-Resistance, p. 31.
39 Ibid., p.32.
fallacious," since, in the opinion of the injured party, nearly all infractions "are too great to be endured." 40 (Reply to case 4)

To those who claim that the doctrine of nonresistance was necessary for early Christians, but is no longer necessary, Ballou replies that "their assertion is "utterly unsupported by a single hint in the context." Furthermore, proponents of this theory seem to Ballou to be saying that early Christians, being outnumbered by the Roman legions, were therefore instructed to practice necessitous nonresistance. So, Ballou continues with rancorous humor, Jesus addressed early Christians saying, in effect, "Crawl like spaniels when you cannot help yourselves, but fight like dragons when you have a fair prospect of overmatching your enemies." Ballou finds the imputation of such an addage to the saviour "utterly derogatory to the character of Jesus," and "too fallacious to need a reply." 41 (Reply to case 5)

To those who claim that Christians are to defend their rights in worldly matters, but bear all manner of inflictions as representatives of the church, Ballou says their position "stands on the same sandy foundation with the others." 42 How could it be that Christians as such are to suffer insult and outrage, when meanwhile as "men of the world, politician, merchants, tradesmen, money-getters" they follow worldly expediency and "resist even unto death to all who threaten their lives, liberty, or property?" 43 Ballou finds the bare statement of their position sufficiently absurd as to serve as its own refutation. (Reply to case 6)

41 Ibid., p. 33.
42 Ibid., p. 34.
43 Ibid., p. 34.
Finally, a group of critics (Case 7) claims to be uncertain what the passage does mean; but claim nonetheless to know for certain that Ballou's interpretation is incorrect. In no sense can Matthew 5:39 mean the overturning or 'destruction' of a law, because it is written, "Think not I am come to destroy the law." (Matt. 5:17) Those who object in this way seem to assert either that Jesus contradicted himself (an argument only an infidel would make) or that every provision from Moses' times--from circumcision to ceremonial sacrifice--is binding upon modern Christians (a conclusion no modern Christian would accept). Since both are absurd, Ballou says this is not a real objection but a frivolous quibble.

Nonetheless, Ballou's discussion of the final evasion moves his argument to new ground. In Matthew 5:18-20, Jesus says he has not come to destroy, but to fulfill the law and the prophets. Ballou resolves this claims moves into a discussion of the intended relationship between the Old Testament and New Testament.

Critics claimed that Ballou's biblical interpretations "threw away" the Old Testament. He refuted these charges by maintaining that he used both Old and New Testaments to best advantage.

According to Ballou, the law of the Old Testament, because it prescribed punishment corresponding in kind to a crime, admitted the infliction of injury in certain cases. Non-injury is considered a tenet of the new covenant since the New Testament does not admit of the need for human beings to practice self-defensive, retaliatory, or vindictive punishment.

This discussion has demonstrated Adin Ballou's method in the chapter Answers to Scriptural Objections of his Christian Non-resistance. Ballou read the New Testament dispensation, particularly the words "Resist
not Evil" to forbid the returning of "personal injury with personal injury." In Ballou's judgment, these words prohibiting self-defensive injury, retaliatory injury, and injury inflicted as vindictive punishment were meant to advance society from a pre-Christian to a Christian code of ethics. His reading thus emphatically disallowed that individuals, groups, or governments might henceforth righteously inflict retaliatory, defensive, or vindictive injury on public or private offenders.

After countering scriptural objections, Ballou answers the philosophical claim that nature-- particularly human nature-- puts constraints upon the would-be practitioner of Christian nonresistance. Ballou answers adversaries who claim that nonresistance, "however plausibly defended from scripture," is nonetheless a false doctrine due to being "contrary to nature."44 Such adversaries "confidently assert" that nonresistance "must be as wrong as it is impracticable" under nature's first law -- that of self-preservation. Ballou's answer is definite and clear: nonresistance is not contrary to nature. His reasoned arguments to this effect are followed up with anecdotal illustrations.

Within the religious context of Christian Non-resistance, Ballou's argument from nature essentially speaks to the unconverted. Unlike Ballou's previous argumentation, in his chapter Non-resistance not Contrary to Nature Ballou does not assume a set of theological beliefs, or argue from scripture. Instead, he constructs a secular argument. Ballou demonstrates that the opponent's position is logically untenable, and shows nonresistance to be "radically harmonious with" the laws of human nature.

44 Ballou, Christian Non-Resistance, p.98.
as in the arguments addressed to the unconverted in St. Thomas' *Summa Contra Gentiles*.

After defining his terms, Ballou distinguishes sharply between the propensities human beings bring to life, and the means—or methods—human beings commonly choose to express those propensities. Ballou does not question whether the Law of Self-preservation is operative. He questions whether the common method of self-preservation is a true method. A true method, he says, "must, on the whole, work well. It must preserve human life and secure humankind against injury, more certainly and effectually than any other possible method."\(^{45}\)

Injurious resistance, Ballou argues, has failed to provide the security it promised to those who employed it as a means of self-preservation. He claims that "the general method of self-preservation, by injurious and deadly resistance to aggression, is a false method."\(^{46}\)

"There was a first aggression, but so many mutual wrongs have succeeded between the parties, that none but God can determine which is most culpable. This is the confusion which attends the operation of the general method of self-preservation. It professes to eschew all aggression, but invariably, it runs into it. It promises personal security, but exposes its subjects not only to aggravated assaults, but to every species of danger, sacrifice, and calamity. It shakes the fist, brandishes the sword, and holds up the rod *in terrorem* to keep the peace, but constantly excites, provokes, and perpetuates war... It does not conduces to self-preservation, but to self-destruction, and ought therefore to be discarded."\(^{47}\)

While execrating injurious resistance as a means of self-preservation which has failed, which defeats its own object, which runs into the very

---


\(^{46}\) Ibid., p. 108.

\(^{47}\) Ibid., p. 105.
wrongs it aims to prevent, and which "has made a bad matter incomparably worse,"48 Ballou calls Christian nonresistance "the keystone in the arch of moral obligation. " He insists that CNR "proposes the very thing which the law of self-preservation demands, viz: the universal inviolability of human life now held so cheap and sacrificed so recklessly." 49

Whereas self-preservation is the first law of human nature, Ballou says that human beings by nature are also social creatures; nonresistance would allow a more complete expression of their true social nature. By nature human beings are religious, moral beings whose spirituality would be enhanced and furthered by the practice of nonresistance. By nature human beings are rational creatures, ill at ease with inconsistency and contradiction; nonresistance conforms to their desire for Truth. By nature human beings are aspiring, inventive creatures who seek improvement and progress. Because nonresistance would promote the self-preservation of the species while giving the greatest possible scope to positive social, moral, rational, and inventive tendencies, Ballou finds nonresistance "radically harmonious with" five great laws of human nature. He concludes that, "Both aggressive and resistant injury can be unlearned, abandoned, forever eschewed, without annihilating or perverting any essential constituent, element, property, quality, or capability of human beings." 50

Ballou's illustrations supplement his arguments from scripture and nature; his examples show the application of CNR to everyday life and

48 Ibid., p. 108.
49 Ibid., p. 113.
50 Ibid., p. 108. Ballou's 1846 opinion is consistent with that of modern scholars, including 20 whose statement to the same effect was circulated worldwide by UNESCO. Numerous scholars from a wide range of disciplines are still endorsing the 1986 "Seville Statement," which holds that, in the opinion of their professional discipline, human beings as a species are not inevitably predisposed to aggression and war as a result of innate physiology. TESOL-Italy Newsletter, (January, 1994): 5-7.
reflect the ambiance of New England NRS members who circulated popular stories and anecdotes. Considering that some of his illustrations had inspirational purposes, Ballou's stories hark back to the lore of saints' lives. The natural examples Ballou cites are not meant to defend his position but merely illustrate it; they therefore have a supplementary role.

**Conclusion**

Ballou combined reason and revelation to defend Christian non-resistance according to his particular faith perspective. Here Ballou provides the biblical derivation of his Christian Nonresistance doctrine and a logical defense of his position, together with numerous examples. In this text, Ballou is ideologically consistent and methodologically eclectic. He uses several kinds of data and employs a theology which is predictably grounded in a New Testament perspective.

Ballou shaped his approach from enduring and contemporary theological traditions. Ballou's arguments from scripture had antecedents in the syllogisms of early church writers. Like Aquinas, Ballou combined reason and revelation; but he also employed methods reflecting his own

---

51 For Ballou, men and women need not be professing Christians to make use of the forbearance and transforming power his book describes. His illustrations isolate a particular style of behavior, but cut across ethnographic lines to include people unlike himself.

It is true that Ballou's New England neighbors, as they encroached upon one another and resolved their neighborly disputes, are well represented in his examples. The relation of Pennsylvania Quakers to Native Americans—an obvious example—also figures quite largely. But Ballou also includes a sprinkling of such abstruse examples as a "colored" matron rebuking a rude sailor with kindness (although he broke her clay pipe) and an Inuit deciding not to avenge his father's death, in his selection of stories designed to demonstrate the essence of nonresistance. Ballou, *Christian Nonresistance*, Ch.5-6.

52 For definitions of key terms and principles, see chapter 2; for Ballou's conclusions on Non-resistance Relative to Governments see chapters 1 and 4 of this study.


As sources for his religious opinions, Ballou lists not only Old and New Testaments, but also the Christian apocryphal writings, the works of the Church fathers, and ecclesiastical history. Ballou refers to Thomas Aquinas when discussing the "disgrace" of the Church's sale of penances. Even so, Ballou's argumentation shows a possible
times. His chapter, *Christian Non-resistance Not Contrary to Nature* grew out of a milieu in which religious liberals were attempting to resolve apparent conflicts between the findings of science and the tenets of faith. His methods in transcribing experiential examples from an oral source resemble folkloric documentation. Ballou used contextual considerations to guide his scriptural interpretation, and employed systematic logic in his theological deductions in *Christian Nonresistance*.

---

54 To lend immediacy and cogency to his ethical discussion, Ballou uses a profusion of real-life examples. Similarly, in ethical discussions concerning violent vs. nonviolent alternatives, contemporary American Mennonite scholar John H. Yoder in *What would you do? A Serious Answer to a Standard Question*. (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1983) and Tolstoy in *What then Must We Do?* use sufficient empirical examples to add persuasiveness and urgency to their ethical arguments.
Chapter IV.
Practice and Teaching of Nonresistance 1846-1890:
Individuals and Governments
From 1846, the year he finished his book, to his death in 1890, Ballou continued to practice and to promote the principles he described in *Christian Non-Resistance*. No matter how Ballou's contemporaries received his doctrines, Ballou himself remained faithful to his beliefs. This chapter will examine aspects of the adherence to principle which characterized the second forty years of Ballou's life, and elaborate the social context of that period.

In the United States, "nonresistance leadership was always confined to a small area of New England, though adherents were scattered throughout the North."1 In his writings on nonresistance, Ballou spoke for the New England NRS, but his basic position also represented that of a larger community. The circulation of the NRS journal, *The Non-Resistant*, reveals that two vicinities comprised the major nonresistant strongholds--Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and Boston, Massachusetts. Philadelphia friends sympathetic to nonresistance were instrumental in getting Ballou's *Christian Nonresistance* published. "I prepared a small volume of 240 pages..." Ballou writes in his autobiography. "It was published by my good friend, James Miller McKim, of Philadelphia."2

Ballou's *Christian Non-Resistance* was "re-published by friends of the cause in England."3 In England, France, and elsewhere in Europe,

---


2 Unlike Boston and New York, which he visited repeatedly, Ballou made only one visit to Philadelphia. His 1854 visit to Philadelphia was part of a 33-day tour which included visits to Washington, D.C.; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Montreal, Canada.

3 The fact that Adin Ballou counted James Miller McKim as a friend links Ballou somewhat more closely to the city of Philadelphia, where Quakers--and therefore, pacifists--were numerous. McKim, a Presbyterian, was a close friend to Philadelphia Quaker Lucretia Mott. So much did McKim learn from Mott and so lively were their discussions that some even said McKim, a generation younger than Mott, took the place of Mott's youngest son Thomas, who died.

there were indigenous nonresistants, like George Sand, and visiting lecturers on nonresistance from America, like NRS speaker Henry C. Wright. Though not a nonresistant, American Elihu Burritt, the "learned blacksmith" from New England, also lectured in Europe, promoting penny postage between all countries, and negotiated international peace.

Ballou was elected president of the New England Non-resistance Society in 1843, wrote *Christian Non-Resistance* in 1846, and was President of Hopedale, the only nonresistant community in the U.S., from 1841 to 1851. But beyond these facts, in ways that are difficult to disentangle, Ballou both represented and influenced nonresistant and pacifist thinking throughout mid-nineteenth century America.

Letters, articles, and speeches from the earlier decades of the century show that ideas expressed in Ballou's *Christian Nonresistance* were being seriously considered, not only within the immediate circle of New England nonresistants, but within the general social context of that period. A good example of the interest in nonresistance is the fascination it held for Transcendentalists Thoreau and Emerson.

Henry David Thoreau opposed the Mexican American war and slavery. In *Walden*, he mused that "Goodness is the only instrument that never fails."4 A modern peace historian, stating that Thoreau's *Civil Disobedience* "brought together the arguments proposed by others in an eloquent and economical way," mentioned that Thoreau "profited from and built upon" Ballou's arguments. 5

---

4 Michael True. *Justice Seekers, Peacemakers; 32 Portraits in Courage.* (Mystic, Connecticut: XXIII Publishers, 1985) p. 163. Although he was not a disciple of nonviolence, in making this statement, Thoreau seemed to be summarizing *kaldodia* (the principle Ballou identified as underlying nonresistance).

5 Ibid., p. 163-164. Other than the Declaration of Independence or Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail," True recognizes no document as being as influential
When Ralph Waldo Emerson spoke before Harvard Divinity School in 1838, he advised students of religion to "Trust the principle of nonresistance." In the same address, Emerson had spoken of those who practiced nonresistance as, essentially, friends to all--as individuals of "immense industry" and of "love, honor, and truth."  

Nonresistance also found acceptance among the nineteenth-century African-American literati. In the 1830's, African-American novelist Lydia Maria Child, editor of a New York newspaper, said she considered nonresistance to be the distinguishing feature of Christianity. Writing for the National Reformer, African-American lumber merchant William Whipper had described the idea of nonresistance as "irresistible," predicting it would ultimately "remodel the civil and ecclesiastical codes throughout the entire globe."  

In the mid-1840's, Fredrick Douglass complimented Sojourner Truth by calling her a nonresistant. Later, after Douglass' views shifted away from Garrisonian nonresistance, "she heard him persuading an audience to believe that slavery could only be destroyed by blood. Disturbed, she waited till he sat down after his speech, and then, when a

---

7 Hoblitzelle, War Against War, p. 54. Of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Hoblitzelle wrote that, "Though he never fully adopted [the NRS] position, its attraction for him was great." The quotes are the words of Carlyle, cited by Emery Neff, Carlyle (London, 1932), p. 228. cited by Hoblitzelle p. 57.
8 L.M. Child to J.M. McKim, Jan. 26, 1842, Cornell U.
Child did not join the Non-resistance Society for a variety of reasons, but mainly because her religious liberalism, influenced by the Swedenborgians, went beyond that of most NRS members. And yet nonresistance, she stated, is "the idea which distinguishes the gospel of Christ from all other wise and philosophic utterance; it is this which makes it holy."
William Whipper lived and worked in Pennsylvania.
hush of deep concern had come over the audience, she called out sharply, 'Frederick, is God dead?' In a flash, the audience swung to her view."

To many nonresistants, European-American and African-American alike, the whip of slavery was equally as abhorrent as the muskets and cannons of war. Originally, the abolitionist movement as represented by the charter of the American Anti-Slavery Society was non-violent; in 1833 William Lloyd Garrison himself was responsible for an article of the Constitution of the society promising it would never "in any way, countenance the oppressed in vindicating their rights by resorting to physical force."11

As champions of nonresistance, the Garrisonian abolitionists disavowed war, capital punishment, and above all, slavery. Ballou, together with other Garrisonian abolitionists who were professing Christians, recognized that "slavery interfered with the brotherhood which Christ called for."12 Not only brotherhood, but nonresistance itself, stood, by definition, in opposition to slavery. Equality, in turn, was so basic a belief to the nonresistance movement that one historian has characterized the New England Non-resistance Society as "an expression of abolitionism."13 The two movements were intimately interwoven.

As Ballou had explained in his 1839 speech before the NRS, Nonresistance Relative to Human Governments, nonresistance per se stood entirely opposed to the unenlightened exercise of one man's will over another. Men, women, and children could not be truly free, Ballou

12 Gregory, Evolving Theology of Ballou, p. 66.
13 Perry, Radical Abolitionism, p.56
explained, under human government, which Ballou described as "the will of man...exercising absolute authority over man, by means of cunning or physical force." The nonresistant stand against participation in government--non-voting, non-resort to the courts, non-election to office--was based on the idea that all human government was a slavery of sorts, and slavery was reprehensible in every case. The power of the slavemasters was merely one example, though an exaggerated one, of human government's inherent abuse of power.

American nonresistance drew not only from egalitarian passages in the Bible, but also from the Declaration of Independence. Because the federal Constitution represented a compromise position--it not only endorsed military might, but made concessions to the continued existence of slavery--NRS members in general did not give the U.S. Constitution (and the human government it inaugurated) the same respect which they gave to the Declaration of Independence. NRS abolitionists overwhelmingly accorded the Declaration of Independence the highest respect--and near-reverence--for its assertions about personal freedom and due equality of all under God.

Ballou went far towards consolidating the distinctively egalitarian, American character of New England nonresistance. In doing so, he construed the teachings of both church and state about equality more radically than most would. Although Ballou accepted a positive temporary role for human governments, he insisted that ultimately such imperfect

---

15 Ibid., p.11.
16 For Ballou, slavery typified that which was worst in human government. Just because he expressed a limited acceptance of human government--itself a form of slavery--does not mean that Ballou ever accepted a positive temporary role for chattel slavery, which
governments were destined to dissolve. In the millennium epoch, such imperfect governments would dissipate, cease, and expire due to natural causes. Once each person consistently acknowledged a personal responsibility to report directly to God, no mortal would need hold an official post and no law other than that written in the heart of each would need to be obeyed. God alone could infallibly prescribe moral duties, Ballou explained. God alone could claim "primary undivided allegiance, as indispensable to the enjoyment of pure and endless happiness." 17

As a minister and a man of religious concerns, Ballou explicitly wrote about anti-slavery as a religious movement, and of crimes against the movement as violations of religious freedom.

"Thousands of people in the American Union," he wrote,"...have long believed the chattel slavery of our country to be a great sin against God and humanity. They have felt impelled by the dictates of their consciences to pray, preach, and testify against it as such as a sin." 18

Reparations have not been exacted, Ballou noted, when such persons of conscience have been treated by pro-slavery forces, "with scorn, insult, and persecution in thousands of instances, and at the South almost

---

Ballou rejected utterly from the time his conscience was first awakened to it in 1837 until his death in 1890.

Ballou himself insisted that he was not—and actually was not—hostile to governments such as they are, which, he saw, invariably reflected the present degree of enlightenment amongst the populace. Ballou's solution was unstintingly to insist upon the primacy of education for its improving and reforming effects upon the conscience of the populace. Education in this, its broadest sense, included ministry.

17 Ballou said, "If men will not be governed by God, it is their doom to be enslaved by one another." The nonresistant solution lay in an appeal to individual conscience, as a means of ushering in divine government. Ballou, Nonresistance in Relation to Human Governments, p. 14.

uniformly with personal outrage, with cruel punishment, and sometimes death." 19

Bailou also expressed outrage that, in defiance of the very Constitution his opponents said they endorsed, the "slave power" (essentially, the South) was allowed to obstruct the instrumentalities of just peace. He was incensed that "anti-slavery meetings have been mobbed down in instances too numerous to mention. Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati and nearly all the large cities of the North have been disgraced by these mobs, sometimes involving gross outrage on person and property." 20 He vehemently protested the disruption of U.S. mail between North and South, and the demolition, by mobs, of anti-slavery printing presses such as Lovejoy's. The peaceful liberation arsenal had been plundered.

As the antebellum years progressed, pro-slavery vehemence presented non-resistant abolitionists with increasing challenges. Violent opposition experienced by Northern abolitionists in the early days of the movement had hurled nonresistance into prominence as not just a theoretical question but also a practical problem. 21 And although the

20 Ibid., p. 22.
21 For example, when angry mobs led the abolitionist ring leader Garrison through the streets of Boston with a rope around his neck, his nonresistance did not falter. (To Garrison's credit, his nonresistance did not falter on this occasion, on his own behalf. Only later did it, on behalf of the oppressed slave.) The mayor, for Garrison's own protection, arrested him, and while at the front of the building angry mobs clamored, Garrison exited a second story window at the back. Though Garrison escaped personal violence through a combination of luck, friends, and the use of mayoral protection, others were not so fortunate.

Due to Garrison's public prominence, Carleton Mabee, like other historians, names the nonresistant abolitionist group to which Adin Ballou belonged at this period "Garrisonian abolitionists." Compared to a more conservative second group Mabee calls "Tappanites," and even his third group, the Quakers, Garrisonians were militant in their abolitionism (see Mabee, Black Freedom, p.1-5). Yet since, as explained in the previous paragraph, the early militancy of this group nonetheless professed an absolute insistence on moral weapons
abolitionist movement as represented by the charter of the American Anti-Slavery Society was non-violent, when violence was threatened against their own persons, individual abolitionists varied in their actual responses.

The same year that Ballou wrote *Christian Non-Resistance*, he made a lecture tour to eastern Pennsylvania under the auspices of the American Anti-Slavery Society (AASS). Ballou opposed both war and slavery adamantly, first as a nonresistant and then as a Practical Christian. In 1848 Ballou made a second anti-slavery tour with the AASS, this time through upstate New York.22

Ballou's religious views were inseparable from his views on peace and equality. But many churches of the period upheld both the war powers of the state and slavery. Ballou considered such churches "unregenerate." The radical theology behind the nonresistant abolitionism which Ballou expressed in his AASS speeches "discomfited Southerners bent on protecting . . . Christian conservatism."23

Church and state colluded so closely in upholding slavery, Ballou noted, "as to demand withdrawal from both on the part of every enlightened, conscientious opponent of the gigantic crime."24

Ballou's 1841 solution to the problem of collusion had been to create the Hopedale Community, a place apart. In constituting the 'Fraternal Organization,' Ballou was at once taking a stand outside existing
governments through a personal "declaration of independence," inaugurating an alternative to established churches, and instituting a new work system based on co-operation and choice.

Besides its example, Hopedale also sent out speakers to surrounding towns. Henry C. Wright, whose "nominal center of operations" was Hopedale, "traversed the country on his mission" as "lecturing agent" for the NRS. From September, 1848, Oliver Johnson, an "abolitionist, . . peace man, and general moral reformer on Christian principles," who belonged to Hopedale's "Practical Christian Ministry", also accepted speaking engagements. In Fall of 1845, for example, Ballou gave lectures entitled *Christian Nonresistance*, *Fraternal Organization*, *The Inviolability of Human Life*, and *Nonresistance Relative to Human Governments* in towns surrounding Hopedale, such as Northbridge, Massachusetts; Cumberland, Rhode Island; and Hampton, Connecticut.

The community also provided a gathering-ground and platform from which anti-slavery and nonresistant speakers could-- and did-- commune with sympathetic audiences. Lecturers from outside the community were frequently invited in. Early each August, a special set of anti-slavery talks was held on the anniversary of peaceable emancipation of slaves in the British West Indies.

Anna Thwing Field, who grew up at Hopedale, retained this memory of the annual event and of the colorful cast of speakers:

"Annually in August, in a small pine grove . . . Hopedale had an Anti-Slavery Meeting. I recall many earnest men and women who spoke from the platform. There came Parker Pillsbury, the dark-skinned, dark-haired scowling man who stormed across the stage,

shook his clenched fists and said things that scared one; ably
seconded by Charles Burleigh who wore his hair and beard long,
having vowed he would never cut them till the slave was free.
William Lloyd Garrison, always earnest but more moderate in voice
and wiser in counsel-- was always present, and usually Wendell
Phillips with his gentlemanly ways and scholarly oratory.
Among the women speakers were Lucy Stone Blackwell, Abby
Kelly Foster and Anna Dickenson.26

Field went on to remember speeches by Frederick Douglass, who, she said,
was an interesting speaker; and she recalled a man-- who later married and
settled at Hopedale-- whose hand was branded with the letters S.S.when
punished for stealing slaves. "I well remember... the man of large stature
called Henry Box Brown," Field continued. "He was a slave and had come
all the way from the South, sent by friends in a dry goods box." 27 Another
sometime speaker at Hopedale was Truth.

Sojourner Truth had spoken saying that "her home should be open
to the man who had held her as a slave and had so much wronged her. She
would feed him and take care of him if he was hungry or poor." 28
Personal nonresistance became an honorable theme among several ex-
slaves, who combined forgiveness of the slaveholder with continuous,
vigorous opposition to the barbaric slaveholding custom.29

26 Heywood, Abigail, et al. Hopedale Reminiscences: Papers Read before the Hopedale
Ladies Sewing Society and Branch Alliance. (Hopedale, Massachusetts: Hopedale School
Press, 1910) p. 22.
27 Ibid., p. 23.
28 Mabee, Black Freedom, p.270.
29 Many individuals committed to eschewing violence proposed actions towards immediate
emancipation. The plan probably closest to Ballou's conception of non-injurious resistance
was proposed by Charles K. Whipple, treasurer of the NRS. His plan allowed escaping
slaves to tie up slaveholders as necessary in retreating en masse to well-provisioned "places
of secure resort" in the Appalachian mountains. (For details, see Mabee, Black Freedom,
p.325). Whipple's suggestions against slave-hunters who came North, detailed on p. 302,
were actually successfully followed and confirm the credibility of his exceptional, original
leadership.
Henry Bibb of Detroit, an influential and inspirational speaker and abolitionist, made a careful distinction. He could not forget that his wife and infant child had been cruelly whipped. But he found it in his heart to forgive. When he wrote to his Kentucky ex-master inviting him for a friendly visit, he displayed extraordinary magnanimity. "As it was the custom of your country to treat your fellowmen as you did me and my little family, I can freely forgive you," Bibb wrote. 30 These are sentiments of which Ballou would have approved.

Ballou's personal practice of non-resistance centered around the founding of the Hopedale Community. In the early years of Hopedale, Brother Whittemore, Ballou's former debate opponent, described the community as "a band of brothers and sisters who seek to honor God by good lives...they live quietly and peaceably, and the Lord blesses them." Hopedale Community tried to put CNR into practice.

The Hopedale Community

Set apart from the world at large, Hopedale was an experiment in the practice of radical peace principles. In 1838, Ballou had pondered the incompatibility of existing human governments with the Christian nonresistance he espoused. "As logical consistency was part of my religion..., ought I to take a stand outside the body politic as represented by state and nation ?"31 Together with a group of like-minded contemporaries, Ballou answered this question in the affirmative. Starting in 1841, his group attempted to practice nonresistant principles in a

---

30 Mabee, *Black Freedom*, p. 270. One reader has suggested that Bibb's statement was merely made for effect, staged, and served a rhetorical purpose. However, Bibb made this assertion voluntarily, without prompting, and I find no evidence to support the notion that his statement was insincere or staged.

collective which became a 300 member religious community at Hopedale, Massachusetts.

The Hopedale community, by virtue of its adherence to Christian religious faith, was of a nonresistant persuasion. The community was non-coercive in structure and egalitarian by design. Although more modest in their claims than members of the Oneida Community, Hopedalians were likewise religious perfectionists, who, theoretically at least, each sought to live in accordance with enlightened conscience. What did Ballou mean when he advocated, as the only true government on earth, direct rule by heavenly powers over the lives of individual Christians? He wrote,

With us, at present, perfect individuality is a fundamental idea... We believe that by setting the individual right with his [or her] Creator, we shall set social relationships right. We therefore go for unabridged independence of mind, conscience, duty, and responsibility; for direct divine government over the human soul... We believe this is possible, and that it is every[one's] priviledge, by the grace of God, to attain such a state.

The people of Hopedale wished to know "if there was any such thing as man's being and doing right from the law of God written on his heart, without the aid of external bonds and restraints."34

---

32 Members of John Humphrey Noyes' perfectionist community at Oneida regarded regenerate men and women as saints, amongst whom the communion of love and its consummation could not be considered sinful. They therefore instituted a system of complex marriage which was much misunderstood by outsiders. Many mistakenly associated Oneida's complex marriage practice with Free Love. In fact, personal freedoms at Oneida were in certain respects much curtailed. For example, in the practice of 'stirpiculture'--a kind of moral 'eugenics' inaugurated in the interests of creating ethically and spiritually enhanced progeny--Oneida allowed community decisionmaking in matters of procreation.


The Hopedale Charter included a pledge by all participants to lead temperate, Christian lives. At the same time, it entailed a withdrawal of allegiance from the larger body politic. Members did not set aside the objectives of 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness' but did state that they could not "seek the preservation of our property, our reputation, our personal liberty, or our life by sacrificing conscience."35

"Placing unlimited confidence in our heavenly Father, we distrust all other guidance and protection... Hence we voluntarily withdraw from all interference with the governments of this world," read the Standard of Practical Christianity.36

The perfectionist intentions of the non-resistants were often mistaken for a form of anarchism.

However, the Hopedale Charter preached peaceable submission to (not obedience under) existing powers in the event that human governments imposed penalties consequent upon their obedience to duty. The rationale for this line of behavior was that allegiance to conscience in conformity with divine, eternal ordinance was thought to be worth the price of any penalty that might be imposed by mere human governments, which would not endure forever. In 1855, Ballou's non-resistant colleague William Lloyd Garrison refuted the charge as follows:

"Non-resistance makes [us] self-governed. The kingdom of God is within [each person]. Some speak of anarchy in connection with non-resistance. But this principle teaches those who receive it to be just, and upright, and kind, and true, in all relations of life. It is [persons] of violence who furnish anarchists."

35 Ballou, History of Hopedale, p. 4. (Charter)
36 Ballou, Ibid., p. 4.
Ballou "believed the aim of nonresistance was not to purify or reform human government, not to subvert or overthrow it, and not to advocate anarchy. Ballou said that the object of non-resistance was to supersede human governments with the Kingdom of Christ. He felt that this end was not necessarily impractical in the present state of the world."  

Ballou's projections and his estimate of the feasibility of such a large-scale social experiment were based on immediate conditions of religious fervor and ferment. The era of revivalism and reform in which Ballou lived was intense.  

But based on observation, Ballou found existing governments, which he called *de facto* governments, contrary both to equality and to non-resistance. He did not recognize the authority of *de facto* human governments in any particulars in which those governments departed from divine edict.  Thus Ballou's Hopedale Community voluntarily withdrew

---

37 Faulkner, *Adin Ballou*, p.188.

38 Horace Mann's 19th century diary provides evidence of the religious ferment which was part of the tenor of the times, and its effect on everyday lives. From a canal boat journey through Pennsylvania comes the following April, 1840 diary entry (Antiochiana: Robert Straker Collection, Horace Mann Diary, p. 1108):

> At [a certain town] eight or ten clergymen, of various denominations... joined the boat, and we now had upwards of seventy passengers on board... At night one of these clergymen put the question to the vote of the passengers, whether they would have religious exercises. The majority voted in favor of his proposal, and we had prayers and psalms. The majority knelt on the floor, which had been defiled all day by tobacco saliva...they prayed fervently to God for spiritual blessings, and also for refreshing slumbers and sound health...They were not rough, wild, excited fanatics; on the contrary...they were gentle, kind, cultivated Christian[s].

Such was the atmosphere of religiosity that this anonymous-- but perhaps representative--crowd would kneel on a wooden boat floor coated with saliva while praying for health. Besides promoting natural reason, nineteenth century liberal religion attempted to bring the spirit of revivalism in line with sound health practices.

39 Compare Thoreau's statement, "I cannot for an instant recognize that political organization as my government which is the slave's government also." Ravitch, Diane. *The American Reader: Words that Moved a Nation*. (New York: Harper Collins, 1980) p. 69. Though a transcendentalist and not a non-resistant like Ballou, Thoreau reacted to identical historical events with similar responses. Thoreau went on to say that an individual cannot
from "a government of constitutional violence." Where human laws contradicted 'God's Law', those at Hopedale considered it treasonable to forsake their first allegiance to divine edicts.

For Ballou, the Hopedale experiment was not a reaction to any particular unjust laws; its purpose was rather to embody Practical Christianity in an attractive living prototype, which, copied in other locations, could conceivably establish what Ballou thought of as the Practical Christian Republic. But such a chain of communities across the face of the continent was not to materialize.40

The history of the times in which Ballou lived, together with the prospects for immediate historical peace instead took an unforeseen turn. Although the U.S. government prosecuted a war against Mexico in 1846, it had been unpopular.41 That same year, in the face of a letter-writing campaign which produced a flurry of signatures, the United States and Great Britain turned back from the brink of armed conflict to settle their differences over the Oregon territories diplomatically.42 Thus, in the 1850's, there had been no war in decades on U.S. soil which had broad popular support.

without disgrace be associated with an American government which, having "undertaken to be the refuge of liberty" holds one-sixth of its population in slavery. In this, Ballou not only would have agreed with him, but actually went beyond Thoreau by declaring the Hopedale Community a place apart, neither associated with nor 'interfering with' state and federal governments within whose jurisdiction he resided.

40 A proposed satellite community in Minnesota came the closest of any place other than Hopedale itself to duplicating the experiment. For an extended discussion of the eventual outcomes at Hopedale, see Adin Ballou, History of the Hopedale Community.
41 Mabee, Black Freedom, p. 352. "According to Liberty party leader William Godell, among nearly thirty Liberty Party papers in the country, only four clearly supported the war."
42 Bacon, Valiant Friend, p. 113. Mott's biographer, Margaret Bacon, describes the role of American and British women in the Friendly Address Committee, a popular movement "for a peaceful settlement of the struggle" made famous by the slogan "54-40 or Fight!" Ultimately, of course, the two countries did not fight.
To fully understand the transition which occurred, it may be necessary to back up. In 1845, when the U.S. annexed Texas as a slave state, Ballou, Garrison, Stephen Foster, and Frederick Douglass had dramatically signed a refusal-to-fight pledge, knowing that to fight in defense of such a boundary would be to defend slavery itself. On August 1, 1845, Worcester, Massachusetts and surrounding towns had hosted many West Indian Emancipation Day celebration picnics (with Hopedale residents extremely well represented) at which such pledges were widely circulated. Abolitionists and pacifists experienced a brief season of political unity.

But, as historian Calleton Mabee noted, "As part of a compromise over the question of extending slavery into the vast territory conquered from Mexico, in September 1850, the South pushed Congress into enacting a more severe fugitive slave law," under which civilians could be commandeered to help capture accused fugitive slaves. Trial by jury no longer pertained in such cases; and judges, who might still find some accused runaways "not guilty," were offered twice as much compensation for their work if runaway trials resulted in a guilty verdict.43

With the introduction of these new and patently unjust Fugitive Slave Laws, the aid and defense of ex-slaves became a heated issue on Northern soil. Lynching was a threat to any abolitionist speaker or pamphleteer venturing into the South, and in the North incidents of attack which tested the nonresistance principles of individual abolitionists were surprisingly common. After their tragic passage, even Ballou and Garrison, who had been close allies in the NRS, eventually disagreed with

one another under the pressure of increasingly difficult, immediate moral choices leading up to the Civil War. Many abolitionists compromised NR principles in attempting to resolve clashes with their opponents. Ballou maintained his non-resistant stance while around him his society (the NRS) was torn asunder.

The blatant injustice of the fugitive laws, which made even humanitarian aid to escapees a crime, aligned churches less radical than Ballou's with a 'higher law' position. For example, in Peoria, Illinois the Presbyterian Synod declared that man-made laws notwithstanding, God's law requiring Christians to 'feed the hungry and clothe the naked' included fugitive slaves. Garrisonians also agreed to "hide the outcast, and betray not him that wandereth."

Not only the Garrisonian nonresistants, but also Tappanites and Quakers were tested by the times. Among those willing to provide help, the degree and type of assistance which it was acceptable to provide became an issue. Nonresistant abolitionists did not want to see slave territories expanding westward, but they had a problem with the fact that Henry Ward Beecher's congregation took up a collection to supply Sharp's rifles to Kansas settlers. But even Quaker associated Robert Purvis, 44 whose dedication to helping escaping slaves was mainly

---

44 Robert Purvis was someone whom Henry Cadbury spoke of as "very likely a Friend, and certainly closely associated with Friends." Purvis took the side of non-resistance in a debate against Henry Highland Garnet (1815-1882) who studied at Oneida Theological Seminary.

Garnet, Purvis' debate opponent, had lectured in England and Scotland, and in his lifetime became both minister to Liberia, and the first clergyman of African-American descent to deliver a sermon before the U.S. House of Representatives. His 1843 speech, "Call to Rebellion," delivered to the NNC (National Negro Convention) in Buffalo, New York urged "African Americans, both slave and free, to make a motto of resistance to slavery, including armed rebellion, if necessary."

Ravitch, American Reader, p. 108.
peaceful, nonetheless found that in at least one instance, his conscience allowed him to hand a gun to a hunted fugitive. 45

Among those who agreed upon the justice of immediate liberty for the slaves, hotly contested issues of practical morality arose. Issues included whether to obey or break the cruel and unjust Fugitive Slave Laws; if breaking an unjust law— as in the Underground Railroad— whether to do so clandestinely or openly; and if breaking an unjust law openly, in defiance of the armed pro-slavery powers, whether to arm in self-defense, or not. The ultimate choice for abolitionists and slaves alike was between a resort to armed insurrection, and adherence to nonviolent means towards freedom.

The way these issues were handled was in itself a study in complexity. Acting each according to his or her own conscience, abolitionists, and anti-slavery sympathizers, and the escaping slaves themselves created many permutations and combinations of basic models of resistance and nonresistance. The deserved reputation of Friends for non-violence was the refuge of at least one armed man, who, disguising

Garnet’s views, like those of David Walker, were expressed in moving oratory. In a statement Ballou would have endorsed, Walker said, "Men of color, who are also of sense, for you particularly is my appeal designed. . . go to work and enlighten your brethren! " (Nelson, Documents of Upheaval, p.20) In another statement with implications contrary to nonresistance which Ballou would probably not have endorsed, Walker also said, "The Indians would not rest day or night, they would be up all times of night[planning to resist violence through violent means] . . . but my color, (some, not all) are willing to stand still and be murdered by the cruel whites." (Nelson, Documents of Upheaval, p.24).

45 Notwithstanding the legendary proportion of names associated with Underground Railroad and aid to fugitives- Purvis, Tubman, and Quakers like Coffin- the largest group of heroes were those who freed themselves. Ballou in 1861 estimated that three-fourths of American slavery’s escapees succeeded on their own unassisted efforts; and Larry Gara’s 1981 study confirmed Ballou’s estimate. Slaves were also born faster than they could escape; so compared with the abolition of slavery itself, Maria Chapman called the aiding of fugitives "a retail rather than a wholesale measure."
Mabee, Black Freedom, p. 274.
age, race, gender, and religion, walked away from slavery in the guise of an aged, veiled Quaker woman. History does not accurately reflect the incidence of non-resistant behavior on a grassroots level since, without the element of drama, such events tend to be unrecorded. But the point is that --theoretical debates aside-- contested issues of principle were often compromised to the exigencies of the moment.

It is not within the scope of this paper to show the process by which American abolitionism, once solemnly dedicated to reliance on 'moral suasion' and the 'sword of the spirit' gradually condoned, endorsed, and finally cheered insurrectionary violence. But one example will show how the Fugitive Slave Acts, by mandating armed co-operation with the law, inadvertently created heroes for nonviolent abolitionism. In Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, two nonresistants achieved notoriety when they refused to co-operate with a slave capture. Their religious refusal to bear arms against their neighbors brought these two men somewhat fortuitous fame, largely because neighboring abolitionist William Parker presented an armed challenge to the local deputy.

The incident began when slaveholder Gorsuch, his son, and a marshal pursued an escaped slave into the section of Lancaster County where Parker had been training and arming men. Not surprisingly, Parker's lightly armed group of one hundred bested the marshal, the slaveholder, and his son in armed confrontation. Escaping to Canada, victorious Parker gave Fredrick Douglass the weapon that fatally shot slaveholder Gorsuch.

Under the fugitive slave laws, refusing to assist Gorsuch at the marshal's order was an illegal act. Not only because of their refusal to comply with a marshal's order to bear arms, but because of the event's
outcome-- an ex-slave had dramatically led a large group of freemen northward-- nonresistant refusers Castner Hanway and Elijah Lewis were convicted of treason. The two Quakers were imprisoned side by side with alleged insurrectionaries. At the next Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society meeting, ex-prisoners Hanway and Lewis were brought forward by the presiding James Mott, who modestly named the two men "The Christiana Traitors," after the Lancaster County town where they resided. The Society's undisguised pride in the pair was voiced by visiting Congressman Giddings of Ohio, who rated the honor of saluting Hanway and Lewis higher than being received by a prince. Since a death had occurred, AASS member McKim felt it necessary for the Society to re-affirm its 1833 non-violent Declaration of Sentiments-- which in this case, it did. (In contrast, when Ballou later asked a branch AASS meeting in Worcester, Massachusetts, to re-state its charter principles of non-violence, a quorum of the votes was not reached.)46

As issues surrounding emancipation continued to heat up, violence erupted not only in expected places, but in unexpected places as well. In May 1856, South Carolina's Preston Brooks used his cane to inflict a wound on the Massachusetts Senator who had donated so many books to Hopedale's library-- Charles Sumner. Ballou's statement: "For lawful and parliamentary speech Charles Sumner was all but assassinated in the Senate Chamber in Washington. For lawful freedom of speech hundreds of good men and women have been shamefully abused. . ."47

46 For more information, see p. 86 of this thesis.
47 Ballou, Violations of the Federal Constitution in the "Irrepressible Conflict" Between the Pro-slavery and Anti-Slavery Sentiments of the American People (Hopedale, Massachusetts, 1861) p.23.
As an abolitionist, Ballou felt his constitutional freedoms and those of his colleagues were compromised, including freedom of religion, assembly, speech, and the press, and habeas corpus. 48

"The State of Georgia offered a reward of $5,000 for the bringing of Wm. Lloyd Garrison within their limits, which could only be done by some form of kidnapping! His crime was speaking, writing, and printing, in a constitutional and peaceable manner, against slavery."

Ballou was also incensed that the constitutional provision for the citizens of each state to be entitled to the "privileges and immunities of the several states" was often abrogated by the South. In particular, as a New Englander, Ballou was upset that

"Colored citizens of Massachusetts and other Northern States, going as sailors to Southern ports, have for many years been subject to imprisonment the moment their vessels reached the wharves. . . Under what pretext? Merely that these colored sailors might incite the slaves to uneasiness, or entice them away. When these innocent citizens of the Free States have been thus imprisoned, they or their employers were forced to pay the expense of their imprisonment [or] be sold into slavery to pay for the cost of the wrong inflicted on them." 49

Ballou usually spoke and wrote on religious subjects, but as the country moved toward armed conflict on the eve of the Civil War, Ballou's writing reached its most political. In January and February of 1861, in "various and sundry places" he spoke on Violations of the Constitution In the Irrepressible Conflict between Pro-Slavery and Anti-Slavery Sentiments of the American People.

In this speech, Ballou explained that even though the contract which brought the states together was imperfect, it contained important promises

49 Ibid., p. 25.
of human rights. "If [the U. S. Constitution] had never been violated against the liberty and human rights it so solemnly guarantees, the convulsions now rending our Republic in pieces would never have happened."\(^{50}\)

While conceding the role of "noble minds" in the federal constitution's authorship, Ballou states that the people's "immediate leaders" were "practically, if not theoretically pro-slavery," because they "thought chiefly of freemen's rights."\(^{51}\) Ballou concurred with Jefferson, that "one hour of the [chattel slave's] bondage is fraught with more misery than ages of that which our fathers rose in rebellion to oppose."\(^{52}\) Containing provisions such as three-fifths representation of slaves in the House of Representatives "to the sole advantage of slaveholders," among other concessions, its measures had still been violated most flagrantly not by the North but by the South.

As events of the late 1850's pressed nonresistant abolitionists towards a critical juncture, Ballou never wavered. His absolutism was such that Ballou continued to denounce the use of injurious force and hold up the inviolability of human life even under adverse circumstances. Few within the ranks of anti-slavery 'held to principle' in this respect as did Ballou.

As embittered schisms between pro-slavery and anti-slavery forces rent the Senate, and the tide of violent behavior rose, the Anti-Slavery Society itself experienced a deep rift. On one side, Garrison and Wright led those ready to cheer insurrectionary violence by slaves; on the other,

---

\(^{50}\) Ibid., p. 5.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., p. 9.

\(^{52}\) Ibid., p. 19.
Ballou, almost singlehandedly, sought to re-commit the Society to its original purposes supporting only non-violent means of emancipation.

Most nonresistants agreed not only on radical peace principles, but also that God required that everyone judge for themselves the will of God and govern themselves by that private understanding. 53 Anti-slavery, because it sought to eliminate the dominion of "man over man" attracted reformers of an anti-institutional temperament. But even though many abolitionists saw their goal as an end to coercion of every kind, few experimented-- as Ballou did at Hopedale-- with solutions to the problem of corrupt institutions. "Abolitionism... did not follow Ballou into the problems of developing the types of institutions by which the world might be made free." 54

At the 1857 American Anti-Slavery Society meeting, violence-tolerant and anti-violence forces clashed on the floor. H.C. Wright, presiding for William Lloyd Garrison, President of the American Anti-Slavery Society, pronounced the slogan, "Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God," and encouraged the view that the best course was to let each individual's private choice dictate whether to proceed armed or unarmed. Abby Kelly Foster reminded those present that "the war exists already, and has been waged unremittingly ever since the slave has been in bondage." 55

53 Perry, Radical Abolitionism, p.53. Non-resistant H.C. Wright was asked whether this meant that given Brigham Young's belief system, it would be a sin not to practice polygamy. After a disclaimer in which Wright pointed out that Abraham, David, and others may have approved that custom, but Wright himself unqualifiedly rejected the practice, he went on to affirm the principle of conscience-- that whosoever fails to follow his or her own highest convictions of right traitorously sins against the integrity of his or her own soul.


55 Nelson, Documents of Upheaval, p.222.
Using the tenet of governance by conscience, Garrison developed the delicate position which justified a graded ethic. While he personally chose to act through moral (i.e., non-resistant) methods only, he accepted various standards from others on behalf of their own defense of personal liberty. Ballou was sorely disappointed in Garrison for failing to insist on a universal application of nonresistant principles. Although he might have tolerated such an opinion in a less influential figure, considering that Garrison's influence was akin to that of a general over an army, Ballou never really forgave his colleague for condoning a resort to arms.

Like McKim before him, Ballou in 1857 addressed a local branch of the American Anti-Salvery Society (this time in Worcester, Massachusetts) and recommended a re-affirmation of the non-violent clause of the Anti-Slavery Society's charter. Ballou's resolution-- unlike McKim's several years previously-- was not enacted. 56

So in the wake of John Brown, Ballou and Garrison can be seen to have parted ways, when, on January 13, 1860, Garrison published a 'Reply to the Practical Christian.' Truman Nelson, who has edited selections from *The Liberator* in a book entitled *Documents of Upheaval* summarizes their split as follows:

"Garrison's position on John Brown completely estranged him from the doctrinaire pacifists and New Testament Fundamentalists. Adin Ballou kept sniping at him in his paper the Practical Christian. Garrison reluctantly issued a counterblast which confirmed for all time that he had abandoned pure pacifism and nonresistance." 57

The "counterblast" stated,

---

56 Carleton Mabee wrote that a variety of nonviolent approaches were already in progress at the time of the Brown crisis. Efforts such as those of Mott, Burritt, Whipple, the American Missionary Association, and others, redoubled and combined into a co-ordinated campaign might well have achieved results, suggests Mabee. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, p.327.

We have very great respect for the intellectual clearness and moral insight of our Hopedale coadjutor, and for many years past have seldom found occasion to dissent from his convictions in any direction; but we cannot view the Harper's Ferry incident as he does...there is scope for an honest difference of opinion..." 58

Adin Ballou expressed much regret "that this case of John Brown should have been turned so effectively against Christian nonresistance, and made so seductive an argument for bloody resistance, for insurrectionism, and for revolution." Garrison responded to Ballou's dismay by saying,

"We have no such fear, and come to no such conclusion. Where freedom reigns, though obtained by the sword, we expect a growth of the peace principle, which is utterly impossible where slavery holds undisputed mastery. Is there no such thing as progress towards the highest Christian position? 59

Whereas Garrison would admit no gradualism in his liberation efforts, under duress he did admit of gradualism in his adherence to peace principles. Ballou opposed him, adhering to peace principles absolutely, even under charges of gradualism in his stand against the tyranny and coercion of slavery.60

In 1860, considering whether or not extreme cases require one to deviate from absolute non-resistance, Ballou wrote:

THE DOWN-TRODDEN PEOPLES

"Next, the down-trodden peoples of the earth, how are they to get rid of their tyrants, without fighting? Let me ask, rather, how they have got rid of them, and are getting rid of them, with fighting?... Behold their condition. It is not fighting that they need. They have had too much of this. It is education, intelligence, virtue, moral principle and industrial economy. These are the instrumentalities of love and peace. And they cannot do their work, like a bloody battle, in one day. They require the patient, unthanked, unglorified efforts of the wise and good through successive generations. With these, any

58 Nelson, Documents of Upheaval, p. 268.
59 Ibid., p. 269.
60 Ballou's willingness to wait is most clearly expressed in his Discourse on Christian Non-Resistance in Extreme Cases. p. 25-26.
people may and will become free, truly and happily free. Without these, no people can become so." 61

Next, under how to work unarmed for the the liberation of slaves, he says:

"purify the minds of [the] people wherever they may be reached to the uttermost. Regenerate public sentiment at the North, and thus ultimately at the South by every possible means. Put away from the people their dominant selfishness and sordidness. Patiently and perseveringly use all the instrumentalities of benevolence and peace. Look forward a century, yes, a thousand years, and do just the self-sacrificing work which will, in the long run, render all classes wisest, best, and happiest." 62

Ballou holds to the conclusion that, "neither the will nor the power to fight with deadly weapons determines any people's progress, liberty, or happiness." 63 But to Ballou's American Anti-Slavery colleagues ready to cheer the North towards victory should it move to crush the South's slave power militarily, Ballou's words reeked of gradualism and were practically meaningless.

Integrally, opposition to war and to slavery were equally essential to non-resistance. Yet in the chimera of antebellum events, it at times seemed as though the inviolability of human life was a value to be weighed against immediacy in emancipation. History does not disclose whether or not both moral aims--peace and liberation--might potentially have been achieved simultaneously. But the genius to seize time and circumstance so as to

62 Ibid., p. 27.
63 Belonging to the first post-revolutionary European-American generation did not exempt Ballou from hard work or the natural tragedies of life, but it exempted him from first-hand knowledge and experience of human oppression in its cruelest forms. A potential criticism of Ballou, withal, is that not first hand, but second-hand experience informed his opinions about people's need for emancipation, and whether--and if so, how long--it was rational to wait. Ballou's position was not among those whose liberty was sacrificed daily and hourly to the tyranny of others wielding force over him.
achieve both goals simultaneously was lacking in America in the 1860's. Emancipation was Garrison's uncompromisable goal; Ballou's was nonviolence.

One peace historian summed up Ballou's perseverance in the cause this way:

Perhaps the most remarkable example of Adin Ballou's faithfulness to nonviolence was his steadfastness, as other abolitionists and nonresisters came to justify the violent means of John Brown in his raid on Harper's Ferry in 1859 and of the national government's "war to end slavery" shortly afterward. One by one, Ballou's old friends and fellow non-resistants drifted away, forgot their earlier commitment to nonviolence--William Lloyd Garrison, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, even that most persistent nonviolent activist, Stephen Symonds Foster." 64

Ballou's religious commitment to CNR principles and their practical implications did not waver. An historian of the 1960's observed that:

"Ballou was completely consistent in his non-resistance principles. He did not deviate as many others did when the Civil War began. He carried his ideas to their logical end..." 65

Ballou was much criticized during the Civil War. But his strongest statement of his peace stance was not written in response to Civil War conditions; as we have seen, it was written in 1846--the year the U.S. threatened an unnecessary war against Britain and pursued an unjust war against Mexico. Did Ballou, facing incidents and conditions of the 1850's and 60's, maintain his absolute pacifism because he envisioned the possibility of nonviolent developments such as were not

---

64 True, Portraits in Courage, p. 175.
65 Faulkner, Ballou and Hopedale, p. 194.
to take place in America until the 1950's and 60's? He advised others to look forward a hundred or more years; perhaps he took his own advice.

After the war, Ballou joined with new associates--including John Heywood and Alfred Love--to form the Universal Peace Union. For many years, Lucretia Mott, one of very few nonviolent abolitionists who remained so during the war, was Vice President of this organization.

"In 1865 [Ballou] presided over a meeting in Boston at which the Universal Peace Union was organized. Ballou remained in the organization for the rest of his life and often spoke at its meetings and contributed to its funds. Ballou appreciated the work of the Peace Union, and Alfred H. Love was one of his valued friends." 67

When Garrison had passed away and Ballou was still alive, so deep had been the rift between Garrison and Ballou that the younger Garrison knew neither of Ballou's whereabouts nor his work. In response to a request by a curious Russian for names of his father's still-active colleagues, the younger Garrison mentioned none. Ballou's name was omitted, notwithstanding that Ballou was at that very time approaching 50 years of continuous advocacy and practice in the field of radical peace principles known as non-resistance. In spite of the younger Garrison's

66 Words are less convincing than deeds. Through no fault of his own, the fact that Ballou was heir to many personal liberties, which, at the time of his birth, were so recently defended by the sword, stands as a just reproach against his preaching of patience and nonresistance to "downtrodden peoples." There was speculation by Ballou and other nonresistants that instead of fighting the American Revolution, colonists might have achieved their aims nonviolently by protesting British taxes en masse, filling the prisons, and adhering continuously both to peaceful methods and to their insistent demands for independence. Without history behind it, their words remain just that--a matter of mere speculation. To other peoples engaged in a struggle for liberty, speculative words pale beside the reality of their own daily experience.

67 Faulkner, Ballou and Hopedale, p.195.
omission, Leo Tolstoy and Adin Ballou found each other and engaged in a brief but significant correspondence on the subject of nonresistance. It was through this correspondence that Ballou's nonresistant ideas lived on after his death.

When Adin Ballou was over eighty years of age, friends prevailed upon him to write his life's story. Ballou's early years had featured hard, productive work, a profoundly searching intellect, an ascetic streak, and a sincere regard for the importance of religious matters. As a youth, his outlook was promising. From age 18 on, he maintained an active ministry, preaching in conformity with his own direct spiritual experience. Through the years, by taking on an ever-widening set of social concerns, Ballou's views, which included Restorationism, abolitionism, and nonresistance, gradually became known in his neighborhood, state, and region. During his middle years, he assumed a leadership role at the Hopedale Community and displayed considerable organizational skills.

The second half of the Ballou autobiography tells of the high attrition rate of Ballou's originally non-resistant colleagues in time of war; only a tiny handful of persons, mostly Hopedalians, remained true to Ballou's understanding of the non-resistant standard. In time, the experiment which was Hopedale also ended. Thus it was that at the close of his years, Ballou recognized that some of his most 'disinterested and earnest labors' on behalf of non-resistance had met with defeat. In 1890 all of Ballou's major works, including *Primitive Christianity and its Corruptions*, *Practical Christian Socialism*, and *Christian Nonresistance*

68 For the provisions of Ballou's Practical Christian Standard, see Appendix A.
were out of print. 69 Ballou, clear-sighted and robust throughout his adult life, experienced several days of weakness and blindness before he died peacefully on August 5, 1890.

---

Chapter V.

From Non-Resistance to Non-Violent Resistance:
An Examination of Ballou's Historical Influence through Tolstoy and Gandhi
1890-1910
In *The Universe Bends toward Justice: A Reader on Christian Non-violence in the U.S.*, Angie O'Gorman introduces extracts of Ballou's writing by mentioning that he influenced Tolstoy and Gandhi. This influence from West to East is also acknowledged in the *Non-Violent Activist*’s announcement of a new award to be offered by the Unitarian Universalist Peace Fellowship. In announcing the 1993 recipient, the War Resisters League gave the following description of the UUPF award: "The award is named for the 19th century minister, Adin Ballou, who was the founder of Hopedale Community and a leading peace activist who influenced Tolstoy and Gandhi." This award has been designated the Adin Ballou Award.  

In the 1990's, several publications, such as those I have cited above, have attributed to Ballou a certain influence on Tolstoy and then Gandhi. Such sources, while indicating that Ballou has gained a measure of recognition and acclaim, often do not elaborate upon the nature of the historical evidence supporting their claims. Thus editors of anthologies and magazines may acknowledge Ballou's importance to Tolstoy and Gandhi as a given, without delineating the nature of the communication that existed between them. My purpose in the present chapter will be to examine the historical record more thoroughly than heretofore for evidence of whether, and if so, how, Adin Ballou was important to both these heroes of nonviolence.

The issues Ballou raised in *Christian Non-resistance* were intricate and varied. Tolstoy and Gandhi faced similar issues; both not only read Ballou, but also arrived at solutions with similarities to those offered by Ballou. To demonstrate the linkage of their beliefs, this chapter relies on primary sources which reveal the nature of the communication that passed between Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi.

---

1 *Nonviolent Activist*, Vol. 10. This is the bimonthly War Resister's League Publication. *The Rural Southern Voice for Peace (RSVP)* was the 1993 recipient of the Adin Ballou Award.
The respective birth and death dates of these three contributors to world nonviolence ideology are: (1803-1890) Ballou, (1828 - 1910) Tolstoy, and (1869-1948) Gandhi. The time line below illustrates the overlapping nature of their life spans.

1803 +---------------------Ballou-----------------------+ 1890

1828 +----------------------Tolstoy-------------------+ 1910

1869 +-------------Gandhi-------------+ 1948

This chart shows that though all three men were long-lived, all three were alive at once for only a short period--just 21 years. Data from the lives, letters, and works of the three provide evidence that each younger man actively and measurably benefited from the assimilated experience and mature perspective of his octogenarian predecessor. In assessing their mutual influence and the impact of the communication between them, we will see how each younger man used the ideas of his predecessor to reinforce his own original nonresistant/nonviolent theory and practice.

After Ballou's death, a Hopedale colleague published the letters of Ballou and Tolstoy in a literary magazine. The editor, Rev. Lewis G. Wilson, was the person who originally linked Tolstoy with Ballou. Wilson mailed Tolstoy an assortment of Ballou's writings, assuming that, in the face of governmental oppression, Tolstoy would appreciate the introduction to a like-minded individual. Wilson hoped Tolstoy would be strengthened and encouraged "that on the other side of the globe there dwelt a man who could fully sympathize with him."

---

2 It was during a still shorter period--usually just one year at the end of the older man's life--that they directly communicated. See p.95 and p. 109 of this thesis.
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The December, 1890, edition of the magazine *The Arena*, contains Wilson's article entitled "The Christian Doctrine of Nonresistance." The letters exchanged between Ballou and Tolstoy during the final year of the American nonresistant's lifetime are the highlight of the article. In the letters Ballou and Tolstoy define and defend their respective positions relative to nonresistance, thereby offering a concise clarification and differentiation of the concepts used by each. Wilson presents the letters and notes:

"It is a fact worth engaging the interest of all students of social advancement, that, during the last year, these two men [Count Tolstoy and the Rev. Adin Ballou] have come into personal intellectual contact, and the main features of their respective views of the doctrine [of nonresistance] have been laid side by side before us."  

Through Wilson, Tolstoy was the first to send a message to Ballou. "Please tell him," wrote Tolstoy, "that his work did great good to my soul, and I pray and hope that I may do the same to others." Another message in the same letter said, "Tell him, please, that his efforts have not been in vain. They give great strength to people, as I can judge from myself." Tolstoy differed from Ballou on several points, but predicted that the American non-resistant would eventually be "acknowledged as one of the chief benefactors of humanity."

---

3 Wilson's subtitle reads, "By Count Leo Tolstoi and the Rev. Adin Ballou. Unpublished Correspondence compiled by Rev. Lewis G. Wilson." Wilson emphasizes that Adin Ballou reflects his New England environment, whereas Tolstoy is the product of "Russian antecedents and traditions." The Russian surveillance and oppression Tolstoy experienced contrasts sharply, Wilson suggests, with the generations of political and religious independence and intellectual freedom Ballou is heir to. Wilson, by way of introduction, gives an account of Ballou's experiment at Hopedale as clear, concise, and vivid as any published up to the present.


5 Ibid., p. 4.

6 Ibid., p.4.
Ballou, thinking that he was "soon to pass into the realm of the Invisible," responded with sincere thanks for Tolstoy's appreciation of his work, and acknowledged their different opinions on specific areas of nonresistance. They held different views on the proper Christian view of property and the correct nonresistant attitude toward the criminally insane. For Ballou, noninjurious restraint of the criminally insane made sense and did not compromise the principles of Christian nonresistance. But Tolstoy felt that a true Christian would "prefer to be killed by a madman than to deprive him of his liberty." A true Christian could never hold property and "the term property can have no signification for him," admonished Tolstoy. "But food, raiment, and shelter are necessaries of mortal existence to Christians as to all human beings," answered Ballou. "Such differences," wrote Ballou, "are to be expected among free and independent minds."

Perhaps most importantly, Ballou and Tolstoy differed stylistically over how best to express nonresistance principles. Tolstoy's style of expressing principles was lofty and inspirational. Ballou relied on a more pedestrian style of formulation, which viewed statements of principle as careful, accurate, how-to instructions. From their contrasting styles of expression arose many minor points of difference. Ballou, true to his customary style of argument, enumerated six such minor points of difference between the great Russian novelist's nonresistance and his own, each of which he carefully answered. Most importantly, Tolstoy and Ballou identified a general discrepancy over where compromise was allowable in the theory and practice of nonresistance.

7 Ibid., p.5.
8 Ibid., p. 4.
9 Ibid., p. 4.
10 Ibid., p.5.
Both uncompromising at heart, Ballou and Tolstoy differed as to where, on the continuum of theory to practice, a certain degree of compromise of nonresistance principles might be considered inevitable. Ballou and Tolstoy differed as nonresistants, not because either of them welcomed compromise, but because each of them refused to bend in different areas. Tolstoy utterly refused to compromise theory, and Ballou thoroughly refused to compromise practice.

To Tolstoy, bending theory towards what seems practical is wrong, almost immoral, since it lowers one's sights of the Christian ideal. In support of an absolutely pure, though unrealizable, expression of Christian nonresistance, Tolstoy argues that in geometry, the definition of a line as the shortest distance between two points does not change just because such a line will never be drawn. For Tolstoy, some degree of compromise in putting Christian nonresistance into practice is inevitable, and not sinful if one does one's best. From an opposite perspective, Ballou stated that, "In ethics, I think no doctrine is sound that cannot be put into practice uncompromisingly."  

For Ballou, the issue of Christians and property was a clear example. In his longest theological discourse, Ballou had said, "We can give all we have, including ourselves, for the good of humanity, in ways that shall enlighten, reform, elevate, and save them, without impoverishing ourselves and depriving ourselves of the means of further helpfulfulness in the world."  

11 Italics mine. Throughout the above discussion, quotes are from Wilson, Unpublished Correspondence p. 6-7. Frederic Carpenter, when reproducing the same material (minus Wilson's omissions) in 1931, went back to Tolstoy's British English spelling (practise for practice, etc.) Carpenter also gave us such details as that, marked on the envelope of the letter which Tolstoy sent to Ballou were the words, "From Count Leo Tolstoy, Russian Non Resistant."

12 Ballou, Primitive Christianity. Vol. II. p. 237. See also page 239 for six guidelines Ballou constructs to express his understanding of the proper Christian attitude towards--and uses of --property.
carried to its ultimate end, would result in absurdity. If Christians were entirely without means, what would become of Christian charity?

Tolstoy, however, was sure that, "As soon as I admit in principle my right to property I necessarily will try to keep it from others and to increase it, and will therefore deviate very far from the ideal of Christ." To Tolstoy, it seemed that Ballou was willing to make too many concessions. Tolstoy saw inroads in Ballou's system for the possibility of a violent approach and for means and methods which would violate what Tolstoy regarded as basic teachings of Christ.

Thus, although opposed to arguing, the Russian nonresistant did not fail to answer his New England counterpart point for point. Anything else would not have satisfied Ballou. "Man never attains perfection, but only approaches it," Tolstoy maintained in his next letter to Ballou. "Every deed of the best man his whole life [sic] will always be only a practical compromise. . . and such a compromise is not a sin but a necessary condition of every Christian life." Later, Ballou was to thank Tolstoy for his explanation of "the compromise in practice of an uncompromisable theory." This statement is hard to interpret without hearing the speaker's tone. It could be yet another instance in which they disagreed; but it is also possible that Ballou appreciated the elegance of Tolstoy's statement.

14 Tolstoy, although he opens his letter with the statement "I will not argue with your objections. It would not bring us to anything," not only answers Ballou about compromise, on which Ballou requested clarification-- he works into his discussion examples which clarify his disapproval of Christians holding property and nonresistants restraining the criminally insane, referring Ballou to his longer works on theological issues. From the autobiography, we know of Ballou's disappointment early in his career when he rode many long miles to the house of a minister who refused to support, explain, or even privately discuss the opposing theological views he held. Had Tolstoy not upheld his views, I might agree with historians who say that Ballou and Tolstoy parted company on unfriendly terms.
Tolstoy went on to explain that, unlike practical compromises, he considered theoretical compromises to be debasing of the Christian ideal, and therefore sinful. Aware of Ballou's position that in "cases of delirium, partial delirium, and passional outrage...the assailant, as well as the victim, will have reason for thankfulness that beneficent restraint and prevention was imposed," Tolstoy wrote, "I consider the admission of force (be it even benevolent) over a madman (the great difficulty is to give a strict definition of a madman) to be such a theoretical compromise." Therefore the initial impression conveyed by the letters is one of frank disagreements. Even though they agreed on nonresistance fundamentals, from Ballou's perspective, Tolstoy not only overstated his generalities, but also had serious shortcomings in theology. Ballou had long ago found he approved of much in Tolstoy's ethics, but, as the above discussion makes clear, he took exception to Tolstoy on many specifics.

The value of these letters does not lie only in the level of mutual approbation they express; the nuances of contrast in the views are also enlightening and instructive. The letters between Ballou and Tolstoy indicate distinct differences about religion— for example, about the duty of Christian charity (Ballou) vs. Christian poverty (Tolstoy) and a nonresistant's use of non-injurious force vs. total non-harm. Underlying these differences were broad areas of agreement which gave rise to similar positions on certain ethical and political issues.

The correspondence between Ballou and Tolstoy ends with a re-affirmation of shared principles and commitments. Less than three months before he died, Ballou wrote his final letter to Tolstoy, thanking him profusely, agreeing with him

---

16 Wilson, *Unpublished Correspondence*, p.5.
17 Ibid., p. 10.
to let their "wordy differences... sleep." Any perceived discourtesy was not so meant; Ballou accepted their differences in dogma and was willing to emphasize their commonalities. In particular, Ballou endorsed the following of Tolstoy's statement . . . , quoting it back to him:

"I firmly believe that if I consecrated all my powers to the fulfillment of the Master's will, which is so clearly expressed in his words and in my conscience, nevertheless should I not guess quite rightly the aims and plans of the master whom I serve, he would still aid and do the best for me," and adding, "So we will trustfully govern ourselves accordingly." 19

Thus Ballou joined Tolstoy in concluding that each person must live up to 'is or her own highest light. Another aspect of their conciliation or co-operation was that, through Tolstoy's efforts to have Ballou's works translated into Russian, the two men made several converts to non-resistance. Ballou's last letter stated his gratification at having "a goodly few Non-Resistant brethren in Russia." And, most touching considering the nearness of his own death, Ballou remembered these converts daily in his prayers. Before discussing the progress of nonresistance in the world in general and in America in particular, Ballou used these facts to confirm the bond he had established with the Russian nonresistant.

In closing, Ballou wished Tolstoy "benedictions divine and innumerable." Wilson points out that Tolstoy, at his family estate of Yasnaya Polyana, Russia, received the final written statement by Ballou on nonresistance. The next letter from Yasnaya Polyana to Hopedale was Tolstoy's daughter's expression of her father's grief that Ballou had died. Tolstoy went on to promulgate nonresistance, translating three of Ballou's works into Russian and often naming Ballou approvingly in his writings. 20

20 At least three of Ballou's works were translated, or sent out to Leo Weiner for translation, by Tolstoy -- the Catechism of Nonresistance, How Many People are Needed to Turn Evil into Justice, and Studies on Christian Nonresistance to Evil. Tolstoy's complete references to
Tolstoy on doctrinal specifics, Ballou's writings confirmed Tolstoy in his belief concerning the inviolability of human life and the Christian duty of non-injury.

Ballou also encouraged, strengthened and inspired Tolstoy in a renewed commitment to nonresistance. In Tolstoy's *Cycle of Reading*, containing selections from the world's greatest authors, the first entry, and many subsequent ones, are by Ballou. Some sayings by Ballou were so significant to Tolstoy that he included them in the inspirational book of daily readings more than once. From Tolstoy's introduction to the daily readings, the following statement shows the "clarity and beauty" Tolstoy found in Ballou's writing:

> In each human body there lives the same divine principle, and therefore no single person, no collection of people can have the right to disrupt this established union of divine principle and human body, i.e., to deprive a human of life.  

Wilson said that Ballou was the prototype of Tolstoy in American nonresistance. Modern peace historian Michael True introduces his short portrait of Leo Tolstoy by saying, "It was Tolstoy who confirmed the reputations of several American theoreticians: William Lloyd Garrison, Henry David Thoreau, and Adin Ballou." And nineteenth century historian Seldes said that Tolstoy considered Ballou "the greatest of American writers."  

Ballou did more than any other American-- including Thoreau-- to strengthen Tolstoy's religious conviction of the validity of nonresistance. To have influenced Tolstoy in this way was of no small account since, "In the history of

---

Ballou in his complete works (in print only in Russian) have been translated into English by Edward U. Oldham of 3443 Grinnell Rd., Yellow Springs, Ohio.


nonviolence, Tolstoy and Gandhi occupy special places: among Americans, only Dorothy Day, and Martin Luther King, Jr. enjoy such distinction."24

Peace historian Michael True has characterized Tolstoy's nonresistance writings--essays, pamphlets, letters, and books--as prolific. True said that from Tolstoy's 1880 conversion to NR until his death in 1910, Tolstoy's letters and writings on nonresistance and nonviolence, "constitute a major library on the subject."25 True remarks that the interconnectedness of peace and justice issues in Tolstoy's writings is extremely clear, and that, "Everyone committed to nonviolence, from Gandhi to the Catholic Worker movement, from Martin Luther King, Jr. to the youngest draft resister, regards Tolstoy's pamphlets as basic texts."

Even before he became a Christian, Tolstoy was prepared for nonresistance by a combination of factors--by his keen observations of human experience, by the promptings of his heart, and by his surroundings. When Tolstoy as a young man travelled to France, for example, and happened to be present in a public square to witness the French use of the guillotine, the cruelty of the execution agitated him greatly. Only by processing the experience with cousin Alexandrine of Geneva, a devout Christian, did Tolstoy gain some perspective on the matter, which revolted him extremely. Another example of Tolstoy's learning not from books, but from the experiences and persons surrounding him in life, occurred at age nineteen. At that time Tolstoy, being hospitalized in Kazan due to illness, heard stories from an eastern monk, wounded by highwaymen, recuperating on the bed next to him. The monk, when attacked with lethal force, had refused to strike back. Admitted to the hospital in critical condition, this monk became one of many such teachers and pilgrims who passed through Tolstoy's early life. In these and other ways,

24 True, Michael. 40 More Justice Seekers and Peacemakers (Mystic, Connecticut: XXIII Publishers, 1992) p. 129 (also previous quote this paragraph)
25 Ibid., p. 130.
Tolstoy's beliefs grew not only out of Bible's New Testament but also from his multifaceted experience.

Tolstoy said that the Bible needed to be read unclouded by extraneous superstitious beliefs so that Christ's true ethical teachings could be grasped. Religious writings by Tolstoy include his own Russian translation of the gospels, with commentary, from the late 1870's. A full account of Tolstoy's religious and moral development can be found in his book called Confessions. In 1884, Confessions was followed in publication by another volume about Tolstoy's religious beliefs, entitled What I Believe.

In his later life, Tolstoy identified with a nonresistant interpretation of Christianity. There were many reasons for this identification, which dated at least from 1880. One of the first American authors to strengthen Tolstoy's identification with a nonresistant interpretation of Christianity was nonresistant abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison. Tolstoy said that when reading Garrison, Tolstoy's own religious conversion experience of 20 years earlier came back to him clearly.26

American writers, with their legacy of religious and political freedom and their recent experience promoting the emancipation of the slaves, captivated Tolstoy's imagination. Tolstoy not only read Ballou and Garrison, but also the writings of their American colleagues Emerson, Thoreau, and Parker.27 Tolstoy read Ralph Waldo Emerson on non-resistance, Henry David Thoreau on nonviolent civil disobedience, and Theodore Parker on a new aspect of liberal religion.28

26 Tolstoy, Diary.
27 Theodore Parker was William Lloyd Garrison's pastor.
28 Both Emerson and Thoreau belonged to Brook Farm, a companion community to Adin Ballou's Hopedale. Theodore Parker, whose liberal religious views appealed to Tolstoy, once invited Ballou to speak before Parker's New York congregation.

However, Ballou's lecture before Parker's audience was not wholly satisfactory. Ballou's ideas on Christian nonresistance differed from Parker's usual themes, and the group, Ballou said later, was impatient to again hear Parker's "silver tones."
Among the American authors who inspired Tolstoy, and their works, Ballou and his nonresistant writings had a profound and deeply religious influence upon Tolstoy.

That Ballou influenced Tolstoy is not a matter of speculation. In Tolstoy's open letter to the American people, which introduces the American edition of Tolstoy's book On Civil Disobedience and Non-violence, Tolstoy acknowledges that Ballou was one of very few Americans who especially influenced him.

When Tolstoy's American editor, Ernest Crosby, asked for a letter from Tolstoy to warn the American people against too close an identification with the values of the rising American industrialists, Tolstoy wrote:

"If I had to address the American people, I should like to thank them for their writers who flourished about the fifties. I would mention Garrison, Parker, Emerson, Ballou, and Thoreau...as those who, I think, specially influenced me...And I should like to ask the American people why they do not pay more attention to these voices...and continue the good work in which they made such hopeful progress."

Tolstoy's diary from the period when he first read Ballou clearly shows that the Russian nonresistant was profoundly impressed by the American nonresistant's writings. Also, within what True calls the "small library" of Tolstoy's writings on the American liberal religious tradition and its foundations for civil disobedience and nonviolence, the names of Ballou, Parker, Garrison, Emerson and Thoreau (together with references to their works) appear with

29 Tolstoy, On Civil Disobedience and Nonviolence, p. i.
30 "19 June 1889: Rose early...Very interesting material on nonresistance from America. 5 hours...It is all an agonizing and improper life. All evil and tormented. June 20th: Rose at six and went to plow...but did not omit anger. O God, help me to love, to display love, and to pray. Read Adin Ballou's Nonresistance. Gave to Leo to translate. Excellent. Lay down early in the evening. 21st. Rose at six...Again from Wilson about Ballou. Joyful. 22nd: Rose at 7...Wrote a letter to Wilson about Ballou." June 23: Having steeped himself in Ballou's writings for four days, Tolstoy enters a sample conversation with his wife into the diary. "What wonderful articles on Nonresistance," Tolstoy begins. His wife's answers indicate she believes she understands NR principles, but is cynical about their application.
considerable frequency. Ballou, however, is most often mentioned. As the table below shows, Theodore Parker's name appears in a quotation reference or discussion fifty times, Thoreau approximately eighty times, Garrison one hundred and sixty times. Emerson and his works are referenced in the complete works of Tolstoy two hundred times; Ballou and his works two hundred and four times. For ease of comparison, I have compiled the data as follows:

Table 2. Comparison of Five American Authors who Flourished in the Fifties and whom Leo Tolstoy Acknowledges Especially Influenced Him. Frequency of Appearance in Tolstoy's Complete Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Author</th>
<th>Number of times referenced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adin Ballou</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Waldo Emerson</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Lloyd Garrison</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry David Thoreau</td>
<td>80+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Parker</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart clearly shows Ballou, Garrison, Emerson, Parker, and Thoreau not only came to Tolstoy's attention, but were each frequently referred to by him. It supports the notion that, as Harrison Hoblitzelle contends, Emerson's nonresistant writings were more important to Tolstoy than those of Thoreau.

---

31 Figures taken from Index to Tolstoy's complete works (in Russian only) with help from Jared Ingersoll, Slavic librarian, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

32 Merle E. Curti has written an article on Emerson's Harvard graduation speech On War, in which he compares Emerson's message with that of itinerant nonresistant speaker Henry Clark Wright. For reference, see p. 64 of this thesis.

33 Hoblitzelle, War Against War, p. 28.
Thoreau is frequently credited in popular literature with having influenced Tolstoy and Gandhi. Ballou's influence is seldom cited. But figures suggest that on the contrary, in importance to Tolstoy, Ballou's nonresistant writings may have equalled or exceeded those of Emerson, which, in turn, exceeded those of Thoreau. Even Garrison is mentioned twice as often as Thoreau.

Tolstoy's writings specifically on nonresistance are both vibrant and voluminous. In 1893, Tolstoy published *The Kingdom of God is Within You.* Later, editor Earnest Crosby compiled many of the Tolstoy peace essays into a volume entitled *On Civil Disobedience and Nonviolence.* Tolstoy's words, True states, are more vital now for having been written for an "unsympathetic audience" at a time when "the very idea of nonviolence was foreign to many Christians." When Tolstoy spoke and wrote to his Russian colleagues and co-nationals, about the experiences and ideas of these Americans, he was often carrying through on the intention he expressed in a letter to Ballou -- the intention of promulgating, during the remainder of his lifetime, the nonresistant ideal.

"Prior to Leo Tolstoy and Mohandas Gandhi, Adin Ballou contributed more to our understanding of nonviolence perhaps, than anyone in recent history, and both the Russian count and the Indian mahatma studied Ballou's works and furthered the insights formulated in his carefully reasoned, generous spirited, and synthesizing treatment of the subject."36

Upon publication of *What I Believe,* Tolstoy's manifesto of nonresistance, he heard from sympathizers in many quarters. Friends half a world away

---

34 Almer Maude explains in a footnote to *The Kingdom of God* that Tolstoy has apparently made a free translation- with revisions and condensation- from a longer work by Ballou. If it is true (as it appears to be) that this longer work was Ballou's *Christian Non-resistance,* then the original, as I mentioned in Chapter 3 of this paper, follows a format more closely descended from that of Aquinas.

corresponded with Tolstoy. American Quakers told Tolstoy about Garrison and clarified the similarities and differences between Friends' religious opinions and Tolstoy's own. Using the statements of Friends, Mennonites, a 15th century Czechoslovakian nonresistant by the name of Helchitsky, and others, Tolstoy prepared the third and perhaps most powerful account of his religious beliefs in his life.

The opening chapter of Tolstoy's *Kingdom of God* contained all the evidence its author could muster to disprove the view that Christianity was in any way compatible with the institutionalized murder of war. Tolstoy's initial arguments not only would have had the late Rev. Adin Ballou's approval, but also leaned on the supportive evidence of Ballou's conclusions. Tolstoy's longest passage from Ballou in *The Kingdom of God is Within You* is in short question-and-answer form. Tolstoy entitled this passage "A Catechism of Nonresistance" by Adin Ballou.

In discussing Adin Ballou's work, its importance, and its unwarranted lack of recognition, Tolstoy stated his opinion that work as important as Ballou's would not be ignored without cause. Tolstoy attributed the general silence and lack of controversy over Ballou to a form of tacit conspiracy. Precisely what kind of "conspiracy of silence" Tolstoy meant is unclear.

Perhaps Tolstoy thought churches and governments feared Ballou's clearly-stated arguments because they did not want change. When *The Kingdom of God is Within You*, with its rendition of Ballou's nonresistant Catechism, was published, Gandhi was a relatively unknown Hindu barrister in South Africa. A Quaker named Mr. Coates was supplying the young lawyer with evangelical and inspirational books. Among other books, Coates sent Gandhi Tolstoy's latest religious work. This small volume by Tolstoy can be considered germane to the transformative power and process Gandhi was undergoing at the time. Tolstoy's
Kingdom of God was in Gandhi's hands as he was handcuffed in Durban and sentenced to prison by General Smutts.\(^{37}\)

In the hands of Gandhi, jailed in South Africa, *The Kingdom of God is Within You* had great impact. Gandhi, in his journal, noted the degree of its impression upon him as follows:

"Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You* overwhelmed me. It left an abiding impression on me. Before the independent thinking, profound morality, and the truthfulness of this book, all the books given me by Mr. Coates seemed to pale into insignificance.

A complete examination of the letters of Tolstoy and Gandhi is outside the scope of this thesis. But a note to the above journal entry describes Gandhi's contact with Tolstoy's NR thought and subsequent correspondence with him as follows:

Gandhi read Count Leo Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You* and said that it gave his conviction of satyagraha "a permanent form." In 1909 he wrote a long letter to Tolstoy, who noted in his diary that he had received "a pleasant letter from a Hindu of the Transvaal." Gandhi wrote again in April 1910, enclosing a copy of his newly published book, *Hind Swaraj*. Gandhi's third and last letter was written August 15, 1910. Though ill, Tolstoy replied on the day he received it. In his long letter he admitted that "the longer I live, and especially now, when I vividly feel the nearness of death, I want to tell others what I feel so particularly clearly and what to my mind is of great importance--namely, that which is called passive resistance, but which is in reality nothing more than the teaching of love uncorrupted by false interpretations." Gandhi received the letter several days after Tolstoy's death of November 21, 1910."\(^{38}\)

\(^{37}\) Martin Green's introduction to the English edition dramatically replays the incidents of Gandhi's two readings of *The Kingdom of God is Within You* in prison. According to Green, it was Gandhi's re-reading of the book, at a point in time when events had created an extraordinary receptivity to the material, that gave it the greatest impact.

As with Leo Tolstoy and Adin Ballou, Gandhi contacted Tolstoy just before the final year of the venerable teacher's life. In an interaction similar to that between Ballou and Tolstoy, Gandhi and Tolstoy had specific points at which their religious opinions differed. But just as Tolstoy's interest in nonresistance intensified as he wrote to Ballou in 1889 and 1890, Gandhi’s peace commitment gained strength when he corresponded with Tolstoy in 1909 and 1910.

In 1909, Gandhi wrote asking permission to publish Tolstoy's 'Letter to a Hindu.' Tolstoy's first letter to Gandhi congratulated his 'non-resistance.' The two exchanged views; reincarnation was a point about which they differed. When Tolstoy grouped reincarnation with groundless superstition, Gandhi asked permission to omit the word reincarnation in his own re-publication of Tolstoy's statement. Tolstoy, although he justified his own usage, did not refuse, but he left Gandhi to do as he chose.

In the correspondence with Tolstoy, Gandhi communicated his deeply held beliefs and enclosed the story of his life. Tolstoy, well-read in Far Eastern languages and literatures, was able at a critical moment to encourage Gandhi to be true to India's own peace traditions, which dated back to Asoka. Soon after contacting Tolstoy, Gandhi named his Transvaal community "Tolstoy Farm, Gandhi's Transvaal community." Peace activism, simplicity, conviction, and asceticism were all components of communal life at "Tolstoy Farm." where most, but not all residents were family members of imprisoned satyagrahis, or nonviolence workers.

The story of Tolstoy's influence upon Gandhi is as intricate as that of Ballou's influence on Tolstoy, and has been documented by scholars as prolific and

---

39 India's is perhaps the longest known tradition of nonviolence in the history of the world, dating back to the pre-Christian era rock tablet inscriptions of peace convert King Asoka, who saw 100,000 killed in battle, and vowed that such would never happen again.
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popular as Martin Green and as terse and scholarly as Harrison Hoblitzelle. Martin Green of Tufts University has written extensively comparing Tolstoy and Gandhi, and has concluded that both practiced personal religious asceticism as part of their nonviolent means to a just peace. Since Ballou's life also contains an element of personal religious asceticism, his life provides a third point in the comparison with Tolstoy and Gandhi.

Ballou, when describing his own Christian perspective on personal nonresistance, implied that under duress, there are some things--many things, in fact--a Christian non-resistant should be willing to give up. Although not about asceticism per se, Ballou's statement points to a renunciative side of his philosophy:

"I may be robbed, but I shall be rich; I may be murdered, but I shall live forever; I may suffer the loss of all things earthly, but I will gain all things heavenly. If I cannot confidently say this, am I a Christian?"

When Gandhi named his first community "Tolstoy Farm," he did so partly out of respect and admiration for choices Tolstoy successively made to give up several luxuries and leisure activities of the standard Russian aristocratic lifestyle. Tolstoy gave up drinking whiskey, stopped going hunting, and began to avoid eating meat. Gandhi was also positively impressed that late in life, Tolstoy identified closely with the pilgrims and peasants of Russia. Count Tolstoy gave up the finery of his class, donned rough peasant-like clothes, adopted a celibate lifestyle, and faithfully followed a regimen of outdoor work--plowing, planting, and harvesting.

Tolstoy's efforts to live simply resonated with choices Gandhi later made to own little, to transport himself by foot, to wear only homespun cloth. Gandhi's asceticism allowed him to embark on marches and fasts in solidarity with what he perceived to be pressing needs for India's people.
Examples of Gandhi's religious asceticism in solidarity with the needs of Indian people include his 1932 vow to fast unto death if conditions for India's 'Untouchables' did not improve, and a 1947 fast to end religious strife--between Hindus and Muslims--in India. Had he not identified himself closely with the people of his country and their needs, these actions by Gandhi would have been impossible. The element of self-denial implied in his renunciation is self-evident.

In his autobiography, Ballou records that during his formative period, he subjected himself to "a stricter self-discipline than at any other time of my life. . . . I prayed much in secret, had my seasons of fasting and self-examination. . . . and gradually took on a phase of decided asceticism." Ballou's asceticism, although utterly lacking in renown, manifested itself earlier in life than that of Tolstoy or Gandhi. As his life progressed, Ballou also took stands on temperance and the non-use of tobacco. In founding Hopedale, Ballou in some sense renounced the world for religious concerns; he made sacrifices to the various causes of reform he adopted, and consistently refused to accept a salaried ministry.

In reviewing the lives of these three men, it is clear that Ballou, Tolstoy and Gandhi not only shared a personal religious asceticism; they shared other similarities of religious perspective as well. Each subscribed to an egalitarian view

---

40 Adin Ballou, Autobiography. p. 44.
41 Barbara Faulkner in 1965 and Christopher Gregory in 1990 each published dissertations yielding much of value on the life of Ballou. Unlike the present study, which focuses on Ballou as a teacher of peace--looking at him as an author on nonresistance, a Nonresistance Society member, and an influence on world nonresistance teachings--both of these studies try to be fairly comprehensive on the subject of Ballou's life, and attempt to treat one or more aspects of Ballou's belief system within the context of his total life. Yet neither report extensively about Ballou's asceticism early in life. Ballou's early asceticism, which is mentioned in his autobiography, was totally voluntary, and was most pronounced in his youth, when self-denial often comes with greater difficulty than it does in age.

By way of contrast, neither Tolstoy nor Gandhi voluntarily "took on a phase of decided asceticism" until later in life. Gandhi, although he made an early pledge of vegetarianism to please his mother, was indulged in his early teens by parents who made him a bridegroom as a child in India. In his later teens Gandhi enjoyed a materially comfortable student life in London. Tolstoy, for his part, lived his youth in the pampered social circles of the Russian aristocracy.
of religion, and held a profound regard for the moral potential of humankind. Their religious similarities, though not the result of mutual influence, laid the groundwork upon which meaningful communication across cultural lines could build, and out of which non-resistance and nonviolence ideology could evolve.

Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi agreed about the kindred nature, the redeemability, and the potential for goodness of humankind. It was Ballou's belief that, "Man is naturally a religious being and also a responsible moral agent." 42 Tolstoy believed that unchanging moral laws were engraved in each person's heart. And Gandhi, also, had great respect for each person's approach to realization of God. Each arrived independently at a perspective of religious universalism.

Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi also shared a religious reverence for truth. All three found religion not abstract, but immediate and personal. Although the methods they used varied, all three held to a rigorous personal method of disclosing and adhering to the truth as they saw it. Their diverse approaches to religiously-inspired truth had in common both an individual, experiential element, and a component of social commitment. By endorsing non-violence as a boundary within which individuals could adhere to personal truths while avoiding harm to others, Adin Ballou and his "spiritual heirs" were seeking "freedom for individual righteousness." 43

Whether or not Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi were correct in their thinking about theology and humanity, their ability to influence each other owed much to a commonality of religious perspective. The web of underlying religious similarities

---

created a net within which their communication, although brief, lent uncommon strength to the nonresistance/nonviolence teachings they endorsed.

Although brief, the two episodes of correspondence--Ballou with Tolstoy and Tolstoy with Gandhi--had important results. The letters between them confirmed their ideological kinship across cultural and generational lines. In each case the meeting of minds resulted in a strengthened commitment to values, allowing one a death with greater hope, the other a life with greater purpose. Ballou, for example, might have died without hope, based on the dwindling numbers of American nonresistants; his correspondence with Tolstoy resulted in an awareness of a small but devout group of Russian nonresistants for whom Ballou prayed daily at the close of his years. Likewise, Tolstoy might have died without hope (some scholars believe he did) but for his last long letter to Gandhi on the subject of non-violence. Thus, there is evidence to suggest that the correspondence was both mutually influential and mutually beneficial. In each case, the communication had an immediacy and depth which allowed these three men to live life--or leave life--each with a clearer sense of his own life-goals and purposes.

Their common religious orientation in each case inspired teachings of peace, harmlessness, and practical equality. The above discussion has made clear that Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi communicated to one another about nonresistance/nonviolence ideology in the context of similar religious perspectives. The overlapping nature of their beliefs was underlined by common social commitments. Their communication helped to consolidate--and, in the younger party, to activate--common concerns for community, interfaith spirituality, charity, education, and educational reform.

Ballou, Tolstoy and Gandhi each attempted to give shape to essentially theoretical religious values through the practical application of such values to the context of deliberately created community. Tolstoy applied his values in the most
informal way possible, through the small school he started and through his associations with those of his own domain who worked the land. At Hopedale, Ballou pursued explicitly stated and formally instituted religious community goals. He sought a chance for people to live in an atmosphere of simplicity and belonging, but with a sense of Christian good will and equitable social harmony. Gandhi also worked towards an explicitly stated vision of harmony, simplicity, and belonging. The sense of belonging achieved through collective endeavors at Gandhi's "Tolstoy Farm" was similar to that which Tolstoy achieved at Yasnaya Polyana through his sharing of camaraderie and physical labor with the peasants in his domain.

Ahmedabad in north India, the religious community Gandhi founded in 1915, encouraged interfaith spirituality by offering twice daily services, called *prarthana*, which "incorporated items from different major religions of the world."44 Similarly, Christian services at Hopedale were frequent and non-denominational. Although it is outside the scope of this study comparatively to examine the principles on which these two communities were founded, it is likely that such a study would reveal common philosophical models45 and attendant similarities in religious perspective, with an emphasis on interfaith communication.

Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi not only respected common philosophical models, but held in common certain social convictions. In combining personal obligation and social commitment, each extended charity beyond the family.

The Ballous, like other families of reformers, liberally offered hospitality to lecturers and travellers; later, Hopedale hosted innumerable ex-slaves, providing them a safe home, and (where applicable due to length of stay) an equal education. Tolstoy, together with the American Quakers, helped the Dukhobors--a persecuted

---


nonresistant Russian sect—relocate to Western Canada; and during the great Russian famines, Tolstoy and his family opened soup kitchens in stricken areas. In India, Gandhi's charity—too exhaustive to report on thoroughly here—was legendary. Just as he helped mine workers in South Africa he aided mill workers in his own country, where he also began a nationwide campaign for hygiene and worked on behalf of India's Untouchables.

Ballou, Tolstoy and Gandhi alike established schools which lifted barriers to co-education and set examples in removing barriers to equality of educational opportunity based on race, class, and religion respectively. As evidence that they shared a personal interest in educational reform, Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi each directly taught students in a school he himself established.

Although nonresistant views on education have been largely outside the scope of this study, about the time Ballou first addressed the issue of nonresistance relative to governments, Lucretia Mott had spoken before the New England Non-resistant Society on nonresistance relative to education. Although Amos Bronson Alcott was probably the NRS member who carried the ideals of nonresistant education the farthest, his school was neither long-lived nor popular. Ballou’s Hopedale School, under the direction of his daughter, Abigail Heywood, offered the kind of residential education program that abolitionists William Lloyd Garrison, Samuel J. May, and other prominent nonresistants desired for their sons and daughters. While living at Hopedale—whether for a brief stay on their way to Canada, or for longer periods—the sons and daughters of escaping slaves also could, and did, attend the Hopedale School. As a prototype of the Practical Christian Republic, the Hopedale School had high aims and objectives, and sought the moral, manual, and intellectual improvement of its charges.

Tolstoy’s school, called the Yasnaya Polyana School, gave considerable intellectual latitude to the boys and girls it attracted from the surrounding
countryside. In his book describing the school, Tolstoy says, 'We have no beginners... even the lowest class reads, solves problems, and studies the lives of saints...'

Tuition was free, and a healthy enthusiasm for learning was more important than family background for entrance into the school.

Gandhi likewise treated the boys and girls at the Tolstoy Farm school with equal respect whether they were Hindu, Muslim, Jewish, or Christian. Furthermore, Gandhi's educational plan for his nation, *Nai Talim*, was designed to restore India's self-sufficiency and integrity. Like the religious and progressive educational plans espoused by Ballou and Tolstoy respectively, Gandhi's system included intellectual, manual, and moral aspects, and sought to teach the whole person.

In conclusion, as educational reformers, Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi had practical experience in implementing co-education; favored universalism in education; held to an inclusive view of the faculties to be developed through education; and had high opinions of the potential for moral improvement through education. Their similarities in education stemmed from the fact that all three agreed about the kindred nature, the redeemability, and potential for goodness of humankind.

Thus Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi, each became a teacher, and later a religious figure. Each one then synthesized the attitude of the teacher and of the religious figure into his highest vocation as a teacher of peace. This process of self-

---


47 A disciplinary incident which leaves no doubt about whether co-education existed at the Tolstoy farm school is recorded in Gandhi's journal. When a few of the boy students acted with impropriety (in Gandhi's view; not defined) towards some of the girls, Gandhi's response-- which Gandhi claimed showed his "maternal" concern for all his students-- was to clip the hair of some of the girl students.
education and self-development was only possible because each man took his own experiences to heart as a source of life-long learning.

One of Ballou's biographers described Ballou as a young man who, "sought the benefit of every available classroom, formal or otherwise. His inclination toward questioning and scrutinizing would serve him well . . . as he sought a sound, meaningful faith and a pure theology." These efforts of Ballou's continued life-long; in fact, the story of Ballou's life, with all its dedication to social reform, can be read as a study in self-purification and in the perpetual purification of an evolving personal theology.

Perhaps what we are calling "influence" occurred precisely because of the quest for truth which Tolstoy and Gandhi had in common with Ballou, and a common engagement in lifelong personal moral learning. Not only from an intellectual, but from an ethical and moral perspective as well, Tolstoy similarly put the lessons of his life-experiences to good advantage. A soulful child, Tolstoy underwent a turbulent adolescence and young adulthood before emerging, in his later years, as a personage considered by many to be saint-like or even a saint. In a similar vein, Gandhi wrote of his life story as an account of his "Experiments with Truth," and claimed that if any two statements of his should contradict each other, the later one would be a closer approximation of the Truth. Each would likely have agreed that, "Whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth."

49 See previous (Gregory, Evolving Theology of Adin Ballou). Throughout his dissertation, Gregory develops the idea that Ballou consistently devoted his life to two related aims: discovering a pure theology, and developing a self worthy of the task of promoting the same.
50 Modern biographers of Tolstoy vary in their portrayals, but there is general agreement that, especially for a saint, Tolstoy's youth was hardly exemplary. His youth and young adulthood-- which included a tumultuous mix of sociability and isolation, exultation and despair were also scarred by thoughts of suicide and by debauchery, gambling, and war.
As an integral part of his own search for truth, each younger man actively availed himself of the experience of his elder. In modifying and assimilating his predecessor's nonresistant beliefs, he benefitted from one or two prior lifetimes of moral and spiritual experience. "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience."51 Fortunately, each was willing to learn not only from his own experience, but also from the example of a lifetime's effort in a similar direction.

Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi shared broad commitments which extended beyond the personal—commitments to non-harm, to an equitable social ethic, and to active nonviolence.52 Ballou expressed these principles in his restorationism, social concerns, and nonresistance. Not only Ballou, but Tolstoy—through his folk tales, his charitable acts, and his non-violence writings—expressed these same principles, as did Gandhi. For Gandhi, the related concepts from his own tradition were named *ahimsa* (equated with non-harm), and *sarvodaya* (equated with an equitable social ethic.) *Satyagraha* corresponds to active nonviolence.53

The relationship between the truth of a given situation and non-violence becomes intensely clear in the etymology of the word *satyagraha*, which denotes the behaviors of non-violence, but literally means "adherence to truth."54 The

52 The key concepts in the American Tradition of Non-violence— as discussed by Michael True—include non-harm, equitability in social ethics, and active nonviolence.
54 From a lecture given in February, 1993 at Antioch College by Ramesh Patel. According to Patel, the common association of *satyagraha* with the term 'truth force' is merely a frequently-used mistranslation; *agraha* literally means not force but *sticking to*, persisting in, or adhering; Patel substitutes *persistence on truth*, for the usual 'soul-force.' "Truth persistence" means *persistence* on truth. Exercise of such persistence gives incomparable strength. Truth-persistence also means this strength. . .Another term for this strength is 'the soul's strength.'" Patel, *Truth-persistence and Self-rule*, p. 15. 
Patel is preparing a translation, in progress, of the authorized rendition of Gandhi's philosophy, *Gandhi Vichar-Dohan* or *Quintessence of Gandhi's Thought* (Navajivan,
truths adhered to may be personal, social, religious, or a combination of these. Garrison and Ballou, for example, adhered to the truth that Americans are "All created equal" regardless of ancestry; Tolstoy, that Russians are "All created equal" regardless of class; and Gandhi, that Indians are equal to the task of self-government and are "All created equal" regardless of religion.

Although political and religious creeds often overlap, here we have focused not on political but on religious freedom. However, in the film on Gandhi’s life, the narrator states that Gandhi’s ideology owes much to the western legacy of political freedom. Often, Gandhi’s political ideas and ideals are said to have precedents in the West. Evidence amassed here suggests that the West’s religious freedom may also have provided an example for Gandhi, to whom religious freedom and religious intercultural acceptance were issues of consummate importance.

According to one historian, theological abolitionism was an embodiment of a broader antinomianism represented by nonresistance. If we accept that anti-slavery was a nonresistance issue, and recognize that distinct parallels exist between the goals of the American Anti-Slavery movement, the move to free the serfs in Russia, and the campaign for Indian home rule, the respective identifications of Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi with causes of freedom, equality, and independence can be seen as variations on a common vision. I contend that this shared vision was

---

55 Among American reformers, and particularly among Garrisonians, the Declaration of Independence—a political document—was at times read as a statement of faith. For example, Mott had to request that the American Anti-Slavery Society transpose two parts of a sentence in its charter—one, referring to the Bible, the other to the Declaration—so that the Society would not appear to hold the latter holier than the former. Although it was her first time addressing a secular mixed audience, her suggestion was approved. For details see Bacon, Valiant Friend, p.56.
57 Perry, Radical Abolitionism, p.223.
of a primarily religious nature, and that it harked back to Adin Ballou's appeal to people's consciences, "to reform themselves, and subsequently, reform the world for the coming of God's kingdom."\(^{58}\)

Scholars must now consider the possibility that history shows a movement of ideas from West to East not only in the *politics* of equality, but in egalitarian *religion* as well. The facts presented in this paper lead to the tentative conclusion that a certain portion of Gandhian ideology can be attributed to movements which grew out of the western legacy of *religious* freedom-- particularly from Christian pacifist nonresistant ideology. Christian pacifism was represented in this paper by American Adin Ballou, whose influence on Tolstoy is undisputed. Likewise, there is also no doubt that, during a formative period of his career, Tolstoy was an important influence on Gandhi. I submit that Gandhi's methods grew out of an egalitarian religious world view having antecedents in New England Nonresistance.

Ballou's exchange of letters with Tolstoy constituted an example of intercultural influence. The dialogue between these men occurred in the context of a broader picture of positive cultural interaction. Such intercultural exchanges, increasing in frequency since Ballou's time, bridge cultural boundaries and create an atmosphere of solidarity in which two-way learning can occur. With the peaceable acceptance of differences, common beliefs emerge, and values held in common are solidified. In the examples studied here, including Tolstoy's exchange of letters with Gandhi, intercultural communication seemed to encourage the transmission and reinforcement of values held in common.

I was encouraged in my thinking along these lines in a discussion I had with Soviet scholar Ruzanna Ilukhina, who visited the Yellow Springs Friends Meeting

---

as a guest speaker on January 23, 1994. 59 The phrase she gave for what we would call cultural exchange was 'vzaimnoe vliyanie' which roughly translates into English as "mutual influence" or "inter-influence." In Ilukhina's estimate, Ballou's influence on Tolstoy is an early chapter in the complex interinfluence of Soviet and American Peace Activism, which has has a long and distinguished history. 60

This chapter initially looked at letters between Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi, noting expressions of mutual approval and disapproval; next, it asked what features of Ballou's personal beliefs and experiences resembled the convictions and life-experiences of Tolstoy and Gandhi. The autobiographies, diaries, confessions, and journals cited here, provide evidence of concerns held in common and a suggested channel of influence. Common concerns were prevalent in a variety of areas, including education, charitable activity, and social reform, but most notably in nonresistance and nonviolence. The letters treated these common concerns in the areas of nonresistance and non-violence openly, airing differences and, in areas of concurrence, resolutely strengthening, subtly refining, and absolutely reinforcing each other's beliefs.61 Their assembled non-violence writings differentiate and clarify the concepts each used in areas of nonresistance and nonviolence where mutual influence was strongest. Thus primary evidence from the lives, letters, and other works of these three men as reviewed here supports the notion that Ballou had an influence on Tolstoy and, in turn, on Gandhi. This suggests that modern

59 Ilukhina is a historian who has for years taught at Moscow University and been affiliated with Moscow's National Institute for General History. She has written the only book on the history of the League of Nations to appear in Russian (1982), and another on the history of non-violence in the former Soviet Union. In the collaborative effort of American and Russian scholars published March, 1994 on ideas of peace from antiquity to 1945, Ilukhina has also served as co-editor.

61 Ballou and Tolstoy wrote directly to each other, as did Tolstoy and Gandhi. For citations of the written correspondence between Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi, see page 95-100 and 109 of this text.
historians have grounds to say that Adin Ballou was a forerunner of 20th century active non-violence.

Taking the writings on non-violence of each one of these three men separately, each author conveys an original philosophy or system of belief. Taken together, these voluminous works, addressed to a general audience, offer an extended comparison and contrast of the concepts present in their collective thinking. Along this path--from New England to Russia to South Africa to India--their collective thinking, which matured through over a century of time, followed a transatlantic path from West to East.

The ideas which passed between Ballou, Tolstoy, and Gandhi were electrifying, galvanizing, and distinctly religious. In this case, the history of religious ideas shows a zigzag path of influence from West to East which is evident in the lives, letters, and works of the three. If Tolstoy bridged the ideas that passed between Ballou and Gandhi, then perhaps it is true that only after the close of his life, far from his native soil, did the editor of the Practical Christian first have his works read in a truly practical way.62

To establish an understanding of Adin Ballou's contribution to concepts and methods of nonviolence, we have here looked at various kinds of information--Ballou's life and times, his letters, evidence of his importance to Tolstoy and Gandhi--to supplement the examination of the work, Christian Nonresistance.

Although Henry David Thoreau's "Civil Disobedience" (1849) and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail" (1963) are the most famous documents in the American tradition of Nonviolence, without Adin

62 Coincidentally, when in the introduction of Christian Non-Resistance, Ballou closed his "case and cause" to a future time, he stated his expectation that "half a century hence" his ideas might be read more meaningfully. This was indeed the case, because about 50 years later (from 1846, 1896) Gandhi was actually in prison in South Africa reading The Kingdom of God is Within You. Not only was Gandhi therefore reading Tolstoy's synopsis of Ballou's nonviolent catechism; he was reading these ideas in such a way that they would revolutionize his own--and the world's--nonviolence thinking.
Ballou's "Christian Nonresistance in All Its Important Bearings," (1846), would we have the other two?63

Perhaps not. Tolstoy was a conduit for key concepts which he passed from his American nonresistant predecessor, Ballou, to the obscure and struggling Hindu barrister in South Africa who was to be his protégé, Gandhi. Without Gandhi's example, it is unlikely that King would have proceeded as he did. Thus the American tradition of non-violence has long existed in a relationship of inter-influence with the teachings of the global non-violence community. Adin Ballou, overlooked at home and in his own times, is seen historically within the global tradition as an originator and a dynamic moving force.

---

63 True, More Justice Seekers, p. 172.
APPENDIX A

Standard of Practical Christianity

"We are Christians. Our creed is the New Testament. Our religion is love. Our only law is the will of God. Our grand object is the restoration of man, especially the most fallen and friendless. Our immediate concern is the promotion of useful knowledge, moral improvement, and Christian perfection. We recognize no spiritual father but God; no master but Christ. We belong to that kingdom of 'righteousness, peace, and joy' which is 'not of this world,' whose throne is holiness, whose sceptre [sic] is truth, whose greatness is humility, whose pre-eminence is service, whose patriotism is love of enemies, whose heroism is forbearance, whose glory is self-sacrifice, whose wealth is charity, whose triumphs are salvation. Therefore.

"We can make no earthly object our chief good; nor be governed by any motive but the love of right; nor compromise duty with worldly convenience; nor seek the preservation of our property, our reputation, our personal liberty, or our life by sacrificing conscience. We cannot live merely to eat, drink, sleep, display ourselves, acquire property, and be counted great in this world, but to do good. All that we are and have, with all that God shall ever bestow on us, we unreservedly dedicate to the cause of universal righteousness; expecting for ourselves, in the order of divine providence, only a comfortable subsistence until death, and in the world to come, eternal life.

"Placing unlimited confidence in our heavenly father, we distrust all other guidance and protection. We cannot be governed by the will of man, however solemnly and formally declared, nor put our trust in an arm of flesh. Hence we voluntarily withdraw from all interference with the governments of this world. We can take no part in politics, the administration, or the defence of those governments; either by voting at their polls, holding their offices, aiding in the execution of their legal vengeance, fighting under their banners, claiming their protection against violence, seeking redress in their courts, petitioning their legislatures to enact penal laws, or obeying their unjust requirements. Neither can we participate in any rebellion, insurrection, sedition, riot, conspiracy, or plot against any of those governments; nor resist any of their ordinances by physical force; nor do anything unbecoming a peaceable submission to the existing powers; --but will . . . conform to all innocent laws and usages, enjoy all righteous privileges, abstain from all civil commotions, freely
express our opinion of govern-

penalties we may for conscience' sake incur. We cannot employ carnal

weapons nor any physical violence whatsoever to compel moral agents to
do right or to prevent their doing wrong—not even for the preservation
of our own lives. We cannot render evil for evil, railing for railing, wrath
for wrath, nor revenge insults and injuries. nor lay up grudges, nor be
overcome by evil, nor do otherwise than 'love our enemies, bless them that
curse us, do good to them that hate us, and pray for them that despitefully
use us and persecute us.'

"We cannot indulge the lust of dominion... nor cherish bigotry. We
cannot resent reproof, nor justify our faults, nor persist in a known wrong.
We cannot excommunicate, anathematize, or execute any apostate or
probate person otherwise than withdrawing our fellowship...

"We cannot be cruel, even to the beasts of the earth. We cannot be
inhuman, unmerciful, unjust, unkind, abusive, or injurious toward any
being of our race. We cannot be indifferent to the sufferings of distressed
humanity; nor treat the unfortunate with contempt. But we hold ourselves
bound to do good as we have opportunity unto all mankind, to feed the
hungry, clothe the naked... reform the vicious... and diffuse a general
charity.

"We cannot go with a multitude to do evil, nor take part with the
mighty against the feeble, nor excite enmity between the rich and the poor,
nor stand aloof from the friendless, nor court the great, nor despise the
small, nor be afraid of the terrible, nor take advantage of the timid, nor
show respect of persons, nor side with a friend in what is wrong, nor
oppose an enemy in what is right... We cannot surrender the right
of serving God according to the dictates of our own consciences, nor
interfere with others in their exercise of the same liberty.

"We hold it impossible to cherish a holy love for mankind without
abhorring sin. Therefore we can give no countenance, express or implied,
to any iniquity, vice, wrong, or evil, on the ground that the same is
established by law or is a source of pecuniary profit... but we hold
ourselves so much the more bound to testify, plainly, faithfully, and
fearlessly against such sins. Hence we declare our utter abhorrence of war,
slavery... and worldly ambition, in all their forms. We cannot partake in
these sins, nor apologize for them, nor remain neutral concerning them,
nor refrain from rebuking their various manifestations; but must ever
abstain from and oppose them.

"ADIN BALLOU, DAVID R. LAMSON, GEO. W. STACY, DANIEL S.
WHITNEY, WILLIAM H. FISH, Ministers; CHARLES GLADDING, WILLIAM W.
COOK, Laymen concurring.


*Bacon, Margaret H. Valiant Friend: The Life of Lucretia Mott.*


- "Gandhi on Spirituality, Religions, and Society" Patel, trans.
Mashruwala, Kishorlal G., auth. Unpublished translation of Quintessence of Gandhi's Thought to be Chapter 1 of Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi


The Kingdom of God is Within You. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1984.


