

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY
AND
PRINCETON REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. 18.—APRIL, 1876.

Art. I.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION.

By LYMAN H. ATWATER.

- 1.—*Church and State in the United States*, by JOSEPH. P. THOMPSON.
- 2.—*Two Lectures upon the Relations of Civil Law to Church Polity, Discipline, and Property*, by HON. WILLIAM STRONG, LL.D., Justice of the Supreme Court, U.S.
- 3.—*The Last Annual Message of the President of the U. S.*
- 4.—*The Political Expostulation of MR. GLADSTONE*, and the *Replies to it* of DR. NEWMAN and ARCHBISHOP MANNING.

THE question concerning the right relation of religion to civil government has for some years been rapidly coming to the foreground throughout Christendom, and is compelling attention even in heathendom. In proof of this it is only necessary to call to mind the fierce conflicts in Britain and Germany, headed by Gladstone and Bismarck on the one side, and the Roman Pontiff and his subordinate hierarchs on the other ; likewise, the contentions in our own country in regard to religion and sectarianism in State schools, the statutes for Sabbath observance, the taxation of church property, which have evoked an expression as explicit as it is unexampled, in the

last annual message of the President of the United States.

The following is President Grant's language on these subjects:

As the primary step, therefore, to our advancement in all that has marked our progress in the past century, I suggest for your earnest consideration, and most earnestly recommend it, that a constitutional amendment be submitted to the Legislatures of the several States for ratification, making it the duty of each of the several States to establish and forever maintain free public schools adequate to the education of all the children in the rudimentary branches within their respective limits, irrespective of sex, color, birthplace, or religion, forbidding the teaching in said schools of religious, atheistic, or pagan tenets, and prohibiting the granting of any school funds, or school taxes, or any part thereof, either by legislative, municipal, or other authority, for the benefit, or in aid, directly or indirectly, of any religious sect or denomination, or in aid, or for the benefit of, any other object of any nature or kind whatever . . . I would suggest the taxation of all property equally, whether church or corporation, exempting only the last resting place of the dead, and possibly, with proper restrictions, church edifices.

Recapitulating at the close of his message, he says, with marked solemnity :

As this will be the last annual message which I shall have the honor of transmitting to Congress before my successor is chosen, I will repeat or recapitulate the questions which I deem of vital importance to be legislated upon and settled at this session :

First.—That the States be required to afford the opportunity of good common school education to every child within their limits.

Second.—That no sectarian tenets shall ever be taught in any school supported in whole or in part by the State, nation, or by the proceeds of any tax levied upon any community ; make education compulsory so far as to deprive all persons who cannot read or write from becoming voters after the year 1890, disfranchising none, however, on the ground of illiteracy, who may be voters at the time this amendment takes effect.

Third.—Declare the church and State forever separate and distinct, but each free within their proper spheres, and that all church property shall bear its own proportion of taxation.

Fourth.—Drive out licensed immorality, such as polygamy and the importation of women for illegitimate purposes. To recur again to the Centennial year : it would seem as though now, as we are about to begin the second century of our national existence, would be a most fitting time for these reforms."

Scarcely less significant is the amendment to the national constitution proposed by the late Speaker, Mr. Blaine ; less sweeping than the President's proposed amendments, yet, viewed in connection with his known aspirations and sagacity, it is

quite indicative of a deep movement in the public mind which political aspirants cannot ignore. It reads: "No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by taxation in any State, for the support of public schools, or derived from any public fund therefor, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect, nor shall any money so raised ever be divided between religious sects or denominations."

These practical issues, which have been operative in local, and are thus coming to the front in our national, politics, cannot be solved without the light of the theoretical principles which underlie and control them, including, first, the normal relations of religion, especially the Christian religion, to civil government as such; and next, to our own special form of government. The topics thus brought under discussion are:

1. The extent to which the State ought to be controlled by religion, especially the Christian religion.

2. The extent to which it ought to aid, encourage, or support religion.

3. The extent to which its obligations in these respects are modified by the obligation to maintain liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment.

4. The extent of the State's rightful power over the church.

5. The relations of all these subjects to the divine authority and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures asserted by Christians; to the alleged infallibility of the Pope in interpreting and applying the Scriptures asserted by Papists, and to the tenets of Pagans, Deists, Infidels, and Atheists, who deny their divine authority; and, finally, the extent to which all these questions must depend upon the historic religious life and civilization of our own, or any nation for their adequate application.

Without promising to treat these questions in this precise order, since they largely so interlock that the discussion of any one may involve and dispose of others at the same time, we, nevertheless, judge it expedient at the threshold thus to bring the various points entering into the discussion distinctly before our readers. When they are disposed of, we shall be prepared to apply the result to such questions as the union of Church

and State, Sunday laws, laws prohibiting any forms of immorality and irreligion, religion or religious exercises of any sort in public schools, chaplaincies in Congress, the Army, and Navy, to civil laws maintaining the Christian institute of marriage and divorce, and forbidding polygamy and all forms of adultery, —in short, all legislation having a moral aim, or aim of conforming to the law of God.

Now, in regard to the first great question, how far civil government is, or ought to be, subject to the control of religion, it is safe to say, negatively, that it is not so in the same sense, or to the same extent, as the church, because the latter is exclusively a religious organization, constituted wholly for the purpose of teaching, maintaining, and exemplifying religion. In short, while the church and the State are divinely appointed organizations, and in their respective spheres alike indispensable to human welfare, they differ in that the church is supernatural in its origin and constitution, and has for its end man's eternal welfare; while the State is of the natural order, and has for its immediate end man's temporal and earthly well-being. Yet, though thus diverse, they are not conflicting, but mutually harmonious and auxiliary. For, first, whatever promotes man's eternal welfare, does thereby, in all normal conditions, tend to further his temporal well-being; what best fits him for heaven, best fits him for earth. The truest servant of God is himself the highest and happiest of men, and the best promoter of all that is good in and for men. "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and that which is to come."

Next, the State, in so far as it fulfils its proper function of securing the rights of men, the order of human society, and the temporal progress of the people, does so far forth, to say no more, furnish opportunity, facility, and encouragement to the church to pursue its own proper end with success, certainly without hindrance or molestation. The protection which the State gives to church property, the worship of Christian assemblies, and holy living, is of inestimable service to religion, as may readily be seen, if we think for a moment what are the fearful odds against religion when it is otherwise, as under the heathen emperors, or later intolerant and persecuting governments. Hence, if we may not look for rulers to be in any other

sense nursing fathers and nursing mothers to the church, we are required, at least, to pray for "king, and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." (1 Tim. ii: 2).

But, still further, in each of these spheres—the secular and religious—and in matters civil and ecclesiastical, in all things, we must obey God in respect to whatever he has commanded or ordained. We must obey our consciences, and this means that we must obey the clearly manifested will of God, whether evinced to us by the light of nature or of revelation. This cannot be gainsaid without abjuring our rational, moral, and accountable nature. It follows, that while the requirements of Scripture have vastly fewer points of direct and immediate contact with the State, as the great social organism for the temporal, than with the church, as the supernatural organism for man in relation to the divine and eternal, yet, within its sphere, as with man in all temporal and worldly relations, the ruler is bound to obey the commands of God in respect to all things which they touch. He may not, as a statesman, ruler, or voter, violate any precept of the decalogue—that comprehensive summary of eternal and immutable morality—any more than in any other capacity. This, though self evident on its face, is made to appear with great vividness and clearness in the paper entitled "Legislation on Moral Questions," presented by James Girdlestone, Esq., member of the incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom, to the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York in 1873. It was one of the essays contributed under the general head of "Christianity and Civil Government."* It impressed us when hearing, and now does on reading it, as one of the most outspoken and timely of the many valuable discussions brought before that body. He calls attention to the fact, that the whole second table of the law respects man in his social, including civil, relations, and that it is all necessary to any fulfilment of the original command, "increase and multiply," which can raise human society above the condition of mere herds of brutes, we might say, pandemonium itself. It guards the order of the family and proper training of

* See *Evangelical Alliance Conference*, 1873. Published by the Harpers. p. 535. It contains several able papers on this general topic by Presidents Woolsey, Hopkins, and others.

the race ; the sacredness of life and person, of chastity and marriage ; of the right to one's labor and its fruits ; of truth as against all falsehood ; while the last precept reaches the desires and covetings of the soul. These, indeed, cannot be the direct object of human cognizance or legislation, since " man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart ;" but still they are so far recognized as belonging to the essence of morality, even by human lawgivers, that they profess : 1. To enjoin only such actions as a right inward spirit would prompt ; 2. To forbid only what, if duly informed, it would forbid and refrain from ; 3. To punish as crimes only such as bear a presumption of ill-intent, which presumption the accused may rebut. Thus in murder the design not only to take life, but with " malice aforethought," or murderous intent, is essential not only to the moral, but the legal crime. Although the killing be proved, yet if it be proved to have been done for a lawful purpose, or without murderous intent, the crime of murder is disproved. So of theft : the taking of the property of another without his consent, if proved to have been done for a lawful purpose, is no longer theft.

Now, in regard to the second table, or the man-ward part, of the decalogue, there can be no question that it underlies and ought to control all human legislation in the various stations and relations to which it refers, insomuch that : 1. Lawgivers may never rightfully enjoin or positively sanction any violation of them ; 2. In all practicable ways consistent with their proper functions and prerogatives, they must enforce and promote their observance by visiting suitable penalties upon the transgressors of them. Indeed, the larger part of all civil statutes aim at the direct or indirect application and enforcement of them. And as to the common, in distinction from the statute law, it is but the unfolding and application of the principles of eternal justice, as embodied in the decalogue, to the progressive and ever varying conditions of mankind in civil society.

Now, if we pass to the other table, the God-ward part of the law, while it has nothing to do with any union of Church and State, or with enjoining the adoption or support of any sectarian form of religion by the State, yet, in perfect consistency with this, it forbids all worship or recognition of idols or false gods in place of the one living and true God, all worship or

recognition of images purporting to be the representatives or symbols of deity; all profanation of his name, whether by blasphemy, perjury, or the trifling and frivolous use of it; while it enjoins the sanctification of the Sabbath by a sacred rest from secular labor and occupation of the mind with the Divine Being, his worship and ordinances. Hence, the laws against profaneness and blasphemy have their foundation in the divine law and the enlightened Christian conscience. These gratuitous insults to God are not only an affront to pious souls, but a serious hindrance to the due honoring and worshiping of God by his people.

Still more is it necessary for the State to treat the Sabbath as a day of rest for its own officials, and for all the people, not only by making it a *dies non* for secular business and contracts, but by restraining that desecration of it which interferes with the due hallowing of it to the Lord by Christian people in becoming quiet, and in fit exercises of private and public worship. All this is incumbent on the State primarily and essentially, because God commands it. It is, indeed, expedient for man. It ensures the physical and mental relaxation, as well as the moral and spiritual culture, which are so requisite to his well-being; it marks that division of time, and secures that uniform day of rest from labor, which, however needful or useful they might appear by the light of natural reason, could never have been realized in the absence of an express divine command. Moreover, it is no less in its God-ward than its man-ward aspect, that man in every condition, private and public, is bound to observe it, and to remove all needless hindrances to the due observance of it by those who fear God. We cannot assent, therefore, to the doctrine, sometimes propounded from high sources, that human legislation should have nothing to do with the Sabbath in its God-ward aspect, whether as ordained by God, or as designed in its due observance to render him fit honor. No God-fearing legislator can ignore the obligation to observe it because God commands it, no matter what may seem the effect of its observance on the physical and mental condition of man. This is undoubtedly beneficent. But, irrespective of this, man is bound always and everywhere to observe it (works of necessity and mercy aside), because it is God's day, and its observance is divinely commanded. It is quite certain,

withal, that no mere consideration of its benefits to man, aside of God's command, ever can suffice to secure its observance. All else is mere matter of human calculation, obvious to some, obscure to the multitude, morally and religiously binding on none. And, therefore, men cannot set up or sanction idolatry, or image worship, or profaneness, or Sabbath breaking, as a collective political body, as legislators or voters, any more than in their individual capacity, without rebellion against God. They may not be warranted to punish or forcibly restrain idolatry or false worship on the part of others, out of respect to liberty of conscience, but they cannot enact or sanction these enormities themselves, nor can they, acting as a State, even out of respect to scruples of conscience, real or alleged, permit irreligion or false religion to interfere with or prevent the full discharge by all of whatever duties they owe to God and man, including the full exercise of the true religion, without disobedience to God.

In another aspect, as we shall soon show, the binding force of the other parts of the decalogue already considered is largely due to the explicit declaration of them in the Bible. But that regarding the Sabbath has this peculiarity, that, as to the designation of every seventh day to be kept holy to the Lord, this is a positive element in the command, undiscoverable by natural conscience, and made known wholly by supernatural revelation. The duty and advantage of setting apart some undefined portion of time for respite from secular labor, and occupation with divine things, are indeed discernible with more or less clearness by natural reason and conscience. Hence, the observance, or non-observance, of the Sabbath in every sphere of human action, private and public, is an act of obedience, or disobedience, to the revealed will of God. And here there can be no neutrality for the individual or the State. We must treat it as a sacred day by rest from ordinary labor; or as a secular day, by not abstaining from it. Ruler and people must herein obey or disobey the Word of God. Can a man as a legislator, or magistrate, disobey God any more than as a private citizen? The question answers itself, not only for every Christian, but for every man having a conscience. How then can government maintain that entire neutrality for which some contend, relative to religion and Christianity? For the State to set aside

or ignore the Sabbath, is as plainly an anti-Christian and infidel demonstration by the government, as enthroning the Goddess of Reason or a harlot in place of the true God by the State is to espouse beastly atheism or sensualism. It is only beginning what was for a time carried to its logical issue in the French Revolution, in the abolition of all the divisions and nomenclature of time which bore any vestige or trace of the Christian era—a monstrosity which not even the most apostate nation historically Christian, and in the heart of Christendom, could long endure, and toward which the most advanced American skepticism will not dare to take so slight a step as to ask the erasure of “The year of our Lord,” or “Sunday Excepted,” from our national constitution, or, of the rule of Congress requiring the suspension of public business on Sundays.

It is a very common assumption, that natural morality furnishes all the principles required for right and necessary legislation, without any guidance from divine revelation, such as might show any national preference for the religion of the Bible. The most radical advocates of the entire divorce of the State from religion maintain that a sufficient warrant for the cessation of labor by the State and its officers on Sunday, is found in our natural sense of the need of a weekly holiday, irrespective of any express command of God to make it a holy-day. This class objects to all laws for de-secularizing the Sabbath, or guarding its sanctity, beyond the mere suspension of their own labors by legislative bodies, and whatever else may be necessary to make it like any other legal holiday. We deem what has already been said a sufficient refutation of this idea of natural morality being a sufficient guide as concerns the civil rulers’ duty touching the Sabbath. And the same in a good measure true as regards the relation of legislation to the entire moral law.

For although the law of God, as to its moral element, which includes the whole decalogue, except the positive designation of the time and day for the Sabbath, is inscribed on the natural conscience, “written on the heart,” (Rom. ii, 15,) yet, owing to the Fall, which has infected our whole moral nature with its corruption, the conscience itself becomes “defiled” and “seared,” so that its vision of moral truths and distinctions becomes, in various degrees, blurred and distorted wherever it is left to

itself, unguarded and uncorrected by the light of revelation. No nation is so imbruted as to have lost all sense of moral obligations and distinctions. But it cannot be denied that beyond the bounds of Christendom, moral standards are fearfully perverted, much more, indeed, in the application of moral principles than as respects the ultimate principles themselves. They call evil good and good evil ; put light for darkness, and darkness for light. And if the light within them be darkness, how great is that darkness. The moral code in heathen nations, while it shows a conscience not yet extinct, but only perverted, is in various respects shocking and atrocious. It is only the light of the Bible that restores fully to the view of men those principles of morality which, originally inscribed on the conscience, have been so obscured and distorted that only this divine light can, like heat upon invisible ink, bring them again to sight with unmistakable clearness and accuracy. Hence, the elevation of the morality of Christian above heathen nations, and of Protestant and Evangelical above Romish communities, is due to the explicit proclamation of the moral standard in the Word, by the authority and as the law of God, and the re-affirmation of it in the New Testament by our Saviour, who declares he came not to destroy but to fulfil it. This he does *eminenter*, not only by reiterating the law, but by bearing its curse for the sinners he saves from it, and supplying the gracious aid requisite to strengthen fallen man for the due observance of it. The morality, then, which lifts Christians above heathen societies and states, is not mere natural morality, as that is understood and exemplified by fallen man, without a supernatural revelation, but as it is clarified and adequately set forth and enforced by the Word of God. And this law, to the exclusion of whatever is contrary to it, is what the State and rulers are bound not to violate in their own actions and their requirements of others. Otherwise they rebel against God, and compel his faithful servants to disobey them as they would obey Him. For, when God and man come into conflict, we "ought to obey God rather than man." (Acts v : 29.)

This holds, too, with reference to the knowledge of God himself by the light of nature, and of revelation. The apostle teaches that there is in the "things that are made," *i. e.* the light of nature, ample evidence of "his eternal power and

god-head," sufficient to leave even the heathen "without excuse," not only for pure atheism, but for their erroneous and degrading conceptions of the Deity.

Our text-books of natural theology prove that this is so. Yet, while the heathen nations show that the idea of God cannot be eradicated from their minds, they nevertheless always so turn it into some form of pantheism, polytheism, fetichism, or idolatry, that they only retain the most dim and shadowy perversion of it. "That which may be known of God is indeed manifest in them, for he hath showed it unto them," yet they do not know it, because they "do not like to retain God in their knowledge." So their "foolish hearts are darkened." (See Romans, i: 19-25.) The true knowledge of God which exists among men is, therefore, confined to the Christian nations and comes from the Word of God. This is the real source of all the true, or at least adequate, actual knowledge of God among men. In His light we see light. It is in the Christian nations, and in the light of revealed theology, that all good systems of natural theology are constructed. The God therefore known to Christian nations is the God of the Bible. The morality known among them is the morality of the Bible. His revealed will, therefore, so far as applicable to the temporal sphere, with which civil government has to do, must control the proceedings of all rulers and all people who would not incur his displeasure. "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when yet his wrath is kindled but a little." (Psalm ii: 10-12.)

The impossibility of utterly divorcing civil government from religion, at least so far as all but infidels are concerned, is further apparent from its being the "ordinance of God." (Rom. xiii: 1-6.) From this, the apostle argues the obligation of being subject to it on the very logical ground, that whoso resisteth it "resisteth the ordinance of God;" and hence, that obedience to it is incumbent on us, not only from dread of its punishments, but as a matter of conscience; "not only for wrath, but for conscience sake." It is a no less necessary conclusion from these premises, that the government being, as to essence and institution, but not as to the mode of determin-

ing who shall bear rule, "an ordinance of God." those who administer it ought to conduct it in the fear and according to the will of God. So St. Paul teaches, that rulers "are not a terror to good works, but to the evil;" and St. Peter, that they are "sent for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do well." This is the true criterion of all righteous and salutary rule. It must repress evil and promote what is good. Now, where is the standard which determines what is morally good and morally evil? Surely nowhere else than in the word and law of God, binding the conscience, and thus controlling the conduct of men. So, by every line of proof and argument we are forced to the conclusion, that civil government, no less than individual men, must be conformed to the law of God at all points of contact with it. We do not say that it is to apply and enforce this law in that spiritual sphere which belongs to ecclesiastical polity. Far from it. But we say, that in the departments of the secular sphere to which it relates, it should, of right, be conformed to and maintain, certainly never violate, the law of God.

Coming now to the next great question, how far civil government ought to favor or cherish religion? we observe :

1. That it is perfectly consistent with the foregoing principles, and, if consistent with them, required by a due regard to the claims of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, that equal protection be shown to all, and special favor or support to none, of the religious denominations which profess to be founded or guided by the Sacred Scriptures. For all these avowedly make the law of God their moral standard, not only in matters of perfect, but of imperfect, obligation; not only in respect to outward acts, capable of being defined and enforced by human statutes and magistrates, but in regard to all the interior life of the soul, and indeterminate duties of every sort, which no human laws or tribunals can enforce. The only qualification, or exception, respects Jews and other Sabbatharians, who insist on observing the seventh instead of the first day of the week as the Lord's day. Of course, it is impossible to accommodate them as to the day adopted as the national day of rest. The day chosen must be that which is recognized as such by the great majority of the nation, and established in its historic life and usages. If others come to

dwell among us, believing in no Sabbath, or in a seventh-day Sabbath, they must submit to the conscience of the nation, not the conscience of the nation to them. There is no other alternative. The most that the dissentients can ask is free toleration in their own Sabbath, beliefs, and observances. So long as they do not molest the community in its own keeping and proper use of its true recognized Lord's day, this will be freely accorded them. If, under this drawback, they, attracted by still greater compensating advantages, choose to cast their lot among us, they are welcome, and have no cause of complaint.

2. The State cannot give support to the church by giving material support or aid to any one or all of its branches. Not the former, because all others would be justly aggrieved by being forced to pay taxes to support forms of worship, polity, or doctrine differing from that which they feel bound to support as most Scriptural and edifying in these respects. Not the latter, as this would compel all unbelievers to contribute for the support of what they do not believe in; while indiscriminate governmental support of all churches of every sect, would encourage the indefinite multiplication of small sectarian churches, at the public expense, which, without such a stimulus, already goes enormous and deplorable lengths. So all, including the Romanists, at least professedly, are agreed as to the complete severance of Church and State. And thus understood, *i. e.*, as to supporting any form of religious organization, civil government should be wholly severed from religion.

3. But this must be taken in a sense which does not prevent the government from providing competent religious instruction and public worship for those in its service, whom it cuts off from such privileges elsewhere. This calls for chaplaincies in the Army, Navy, and the training-schools for them, in public hospitals, prisons, and the like, where the only resource for religious instruction and other ministerial service is in the chaplaincies provided by the government. Certainly, the government must not deprive of the support and consolations of religion those in her exclusive service and control. To say this is the same as to say that the great body of her conscientious citizens and their children are disfranchised so far as the government service is concerned. As to selections for chaplain-

cies, they must be not wholly or chiefly from any one Christian denomination, where there are many, but with even impartiality from those which, on the whole, represent, as far as practicable, the religious character and sentiments of the mass of the people. In Roman Catholic countries, of course, they will be Roman Catholic priests, and any Protestants or others entering the public service, cannot complain of the authorities for putting them to this trial of their faith. So of Mahommedan countries. The most that Protestants can ask in such countries is, that they be tolerated and protected in exercising their religion without let or hindrance. On the other hand, in a nation like ours, in which Protestant Christianity, as held and maintained by the various branches of the Evangelical church, is actually the faith of the large majority of its people, and has been historically the formative force which has moulded its institutions and life, the government chaplaincies should be chiefly or wholly filled from among them. The claims of small seceding sects out of communion with them are too insignificant to be considered. And as to the Romanists, who have come in among us as a foreign importation, in some respects an unassimilated element, working in antagonism to the genius of our institutions inbreathed into them by Protestantism, they must take us as they find us. If they have full toleration and protection in the exercise of their own religion, they can claim no more. If not content with this, let them go where they can fare better, or where better privileges are accorded to the non-dominant religion of a people, say to Rome, Spain, Mexico, or Austria. As they are uncompromising, and consign to perdition all out of the Catholic Church, Protestants cannot admit them as spiritual guides for themselves or their children. To admit them to chaplaincies in the various departments of government service, is virtually to exclude Protestants—*i. e.*, the nation itself, historically considered, certainly a great majority of the people—from that service. This is asking a little too much; that a Protestant nation should visit upon Protestants an exclusion from all employment in its service, as a penalty for admitting Roman Catholics to a civil and religious liberty purchased by Protestant blood, and seldom if ever accorded to Protestants in Catholic countries. This need not, however, interfere with allowing Romish chaplains to regiments

of Romish soldiers in a Protestant country; or *vice versa*, Protestant chaplains to Protestant regiments in a Romish country, and so of all other governmental chaplaincies. All that we mean is this; when our government provides chaplains for Protestants in her service, even if mixed with Romanists, and there is no alternative but a Protestant or Romish chaplain, the Protestant is entitled to the preference, because we are, in the sense already set forth, a Protestant nation; as, *mutatis mutandis*, a similar preference would unquestionably be given to a Romish priest in a Romish country.

The obligation of the State to give no direct support to any form of religion should not prevent it,

4. From exempting church property from taxation. Into the general merits of this question we have now no space to enter. It is sufficient to refer to, without repeating, the arguments we advanced in a comparatively recent paper on this subject. (See this REVIEW for April, 1874.)

We also take pleasure in calling the attention of our readers to a series of articles, by Hon. George H. Andrews, recently published in the *New York Times*. For the limitations to this exemption we must also refer to our former article. We only desire to say, that the reasons for exemption from it are—first, that it is a gift for public purposes wholly unproductive to its givers and owners, and only capable of being maintained and made effectual for the same by a constant heavy outlay on the part of its proprietors; then, beyond all other property or agencies, it secures the great ends for which the State exists, viz.: that conformity to the moral law, the breach of which, in forms innumerable, necessitates the heaviest part of public expenditure and taxation. Still further, it enhances the value, the amount, and taxable productiveness of all other kinds of property. As Mr. Andrews says, property owners in neighborhoods or towns often incur the expense of building churches simply to make their property more marketable. They are, therefore, a gratuity to the public, unproductive to their owners, which cause a vastly greater accession to the public revenue than the amount of their own exemptions. So shallow is the allegation or implication often advanced, that religious people wish to shirk the burdens borne by others. On the other hand, the power of taxing church property would be fatal in its

effects on very many feeble Protestant congregations, especially incipient ones, struggling under a load of debt already crushing. How easy to tax them out of existence, to force them under the hammer into the hands of Romanists, especially where, as in some of our own towns and cities, the Romanists have the municipal government in their hands. Indeed, we have known Protestants, who have a mania for an all-embracing or all-devouring church unification, advocate taxation of church property as means of taxing to death small churches, and compelling them all to unite in a larger, even if against their conscientious convictions. Far sounder, and worthy of its author, too, are the closing words of the recent letter of Governor Dix to President Grant :

“I have always been of opinion that the several States should tax all secular property belonging to churches within their respective limits. Cemeteries are exempt by universal consent. I think church edifices should be, as I believe they always have been, in Christian communities. To tax them would seem like making the Creator and Sovereign Ruler of the universe pay tribute to us for allowing a part of his footstool to be used for the worship which is his due.”

In regard to this particular branch of the subject, Mr. Andrews, in the articles already referred to, quotes from Washington's Farewell Address, and from two of the greatest American jurists, what is so germane to the whole subject we have been discussing, that we place them here for permanent reference. Says Washington :

“It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends, with more or less force, to every form of free government.” [Then he tells the country what the source of this morality is in these explicit words:] “Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education upon minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles.”

And again he said : “Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firm props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume would not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert

the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion."

In regard to that clause of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibit the free use thereof," Chancellor Kent said: "Though the Constitution has discarded religious establishments [or a State Church], it does not forbid judicial cognizance of those offenses against religion and morality which have no reference to such establishments, but are punishable because they strike at the root of moral obligation and weaken the security of the social ties." The policy of the government, as indicated by this clause, is neither to repress nor establish religious organizations. Congress cannot confiscate the property of religious societies. Under this clause Congress did, in 1868, exempt church property in the territories from taxation, as held by one corporation, to the amount of \$50,000, and has since legislated in favor of church exemption in the District of Columbia.

Judge Rush, of Pennsylvania, in a charge to a Grand Jury in 1801, said: "Let politicians speculate and philosophers dogmatize on forms of government as long as they please, it remains an eternal truth, that the liberties of a country can be preserved only by the practice of religion and morality. Here, and here only, is the solid rock on which human glory and felicity can be permanently erected. Hence it is that the enlightened law-givers of every nation, whose views are limited by the interest and happiness of the people, have made dissemination of the principles of sobriety, industry, and virtue the object of unceasing study and labor."

In another charge he said: "A government like ours, floating on the precarious tide of public opinion, can be held securely by nothing else but the principles of religion, and if it once be driven from this anchor by the storms of irreligion and licentiousness, it will be quickly overwhelmed in the waves of popular fury and violence."

We have already indicated in part the limitations to which the religious obligations of the State are subjected in order to guard liberty of conscience. While it is to conform to the law of God in all its requirements and procedures, this is to be done, as far as possible, in such a manner as not to wound the consciences of those who either disown it, or give diverse interpretations of it. Rulers must, *as far as possible*, avoid commanding men to do that which their consciences forbid, or which they even erroneously regard as contrary to the divine command. While this is the general principle, it must, nevertheless, be so construed and limited as not, under the pretext of liberty, to foster and sanction licentiousness. If men say that they believe in free-love, polygamy, incest, or any other form of unchastity, and that to prohibit such practices infringes upon

their rights of conscience, they are entitled to hold such mere opinions without molestation. But when they demand liberty to practise them, the State cannot yield to such a demand without setting at naught the fifth and seventh commandments, undermining the family—the nursery of all good commonwealths—and committing virtual suicide.*

It is compelled to prohibit all forms of adultery, however they may take shelter under pretended liberty of conscience, alike by the law of God, and of self preservation. The same principle applies to obscene publications of every kind. Nor ought the State to grant unscriptural divorces. So of laws in restraint of vagrancy, idleness, mendicancy, all contrivances for living upon the earnings of other men instead of their own, whether by personal theft and robbery, or by agrarian and communistic pillage. Such laws must be put in force, no matter what pleas against them may be interposed in the name of liberty of conscience; otherwise, we undermine human society and annul the eighth commandment. So the law-giver must enforce the prohibition of false witness, given in the ninth commandment, by requiring the speaking of the truth in all judicial inquiries under the sanction of a solemn oath or affirmation, and under the pains and penalties of perjury; by the just punishment of slander and exacting reparation for its injuries; by enforcing all contracts, and compelling men to fulfil their promises—a principle so fundamental that our national constitution will not even permit the States to enact any law “impairing the obligation of contracts.” Nay, the government cannot, out of regard to any alleged rights of conscience, or whatever else, fail to enforce the obligation of truth between man and man without destroying the foundations of human society; and if the foundations be destroyed what shall the righteous do?

So of the sixth precept. It not only forbids murder, but

* Governor Emery, in his late message to the Territorial Legislature of Utah Territory, says of polygamy: “In meeting this question openly and fairly, I can but regard it as a crime prohibited by the laws of our country, and that does violence to the accepted principles of Christianity. The country at large recognizes it as a blot upon our civilization, and our national Congress has enacted laws for its punishment and to prevent its continuance.” As we have seen, President Grant recommended the expulsion of “licensed immorality,” particularly polygamy, and the prohibition of the “importation of women for illegitimate purposes.”

whatever is needlessly destructive of human life, while it enjoins whatever tends to its vigor and preservation. And hence, the State may not only enforce laws for vaccination and quarantine, but all other needful sanitary regulations. It may restrain the use of intoxicants and narcotics, and various other practices detrimental to the health and life of society, whatever objections may be made on the score of the rights of conscience. So it may compel its subjects to bear arms, that it may fulfil its function of defending the life and estate of its citizens, of being a terror to evil doers and a praise to them that do well. But we need say no more to caution the unwary against mistaking liberty for licentiousness, or supposing that there can be any real liberty unguarded by restraining law.

If the State may not transgress the fundamental principles of morals, religion, or Christianity, out of regard to the alleged conscientious scruples of any; the question then arises, how far the State may control the church, or, the church the State; in other words, what is the true relation and boundary between the temporal and spiritual power?

The general answer is, that, under God, each is supreme and independent of the other, within its own proper sphere. Neither may infringe upon the rightful province or prerogative of the other. Neither can compel the other to disobey God, nor its own conscience, up to the point where this conscience does not, by perversion, collide with the rights and duties of others, moral, religious, personal, and relative.

It is not then the province of the State, in any manner, to prescribe or determine the doctrines, order, or polity of the church, or to subject its proceedings, legislative and judicial, to its own review or control. It can only inquire into these things for one purpose. It has the duty of securing church property, like all other property, to its rightful owners. In cases of litigation respecting church property in any denomination, each party claiming on the ground that it does, while the other party does not, conform to the principles of that denomination, and hence, is the rightful owner of the property in dispute, courts must inquire what the doctrines of the denomination actually are, simply in order to determine the question of identity. But even here, when we come to the question, what is the supreme authority in regard to the proper expo-

sition and application of the doctrine and polity of any church, the decision of the supreme ecclesiastical court in that church is final. The State courts certainly cannot, unless in some very exceptional cases, review or reverse the decisions of the highest tribunals of any denomination without usurping their prerogative, and putting all religious liberty in jeopardy. Such was the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the famous Louisville Presbyterian Church case, appealed to it from the courts of Kentucky. It decided that the party adhering to the General Assembly was entitled to hold the property, because the Assembly was the supreme court of the church, and was the ultimate authority in the interpretation and application of its own doctrines, back of which the State could not go without lording it over the church. The same principle prevailed in the Cheney case in Chicago, in which the decision of the bishop, as to who remained within and who had separated themselves from the church, was declared to be ultimate, because he was, *quoad hoc*, the supreme authority, according to the constitution of that church, in interpreting and administering its doctrine and polity, and this, no matter how great the apparent hardship might be.

The recent decision by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in *Steed vs. M'Auley*, growing out of the singing of hymns pronounced unlawful by the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, seems to have deviated in some degree from the above principles, and to have rather followed the sympathies of the judges and the Christian public. The majority of the court, however, appear to have founded their decision in part on the ground, that the defendants "had not refused proper obedience to the Reformed Synod," and had remained "in due subordination to the authority of that body;" that, "so far as appears from the records of this case, they are members in full and regular standing in the Reformed Church, and as such, are entitled to all the rights, and are answerable to the lawful rules and regulations, of the General Synod."

But, after all, it is easy to see that the material and controlling reason of the majority of the court was, that they thought the action of the Synod summary, arbitrary, and without justifiable cause. There is no doubt, however, about the general

principle, as Judge Strong has abundantly shown, * whatever difficulties may sometimes arise in the application of it. And in this case the eminent jurists, Chief Justice Agnew, Methodist, and Justice Sharswood, Presbyterian elder, dissented, in agreement with the courts below, on the ground that "the Synod was the proper and only judge of its own members and their qualifications," and "the highest judge of its own order." It is, indeed, lamentable that the constitution of any church, Protestant or Catholic, should be such as to warrant the excommunication of Bishop Cheney for omitting a word or two in administering the baptismal service, for the purpose of explicitly removing a ritualistic element which his conscience condemned; or of such a man as George H. Stuart, because he sees fit to praise God in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs not of Rouse's, nor any other special version. But in this free land they can take refuge in other more liberal organizations, if worst comes to worst.

Exceptions aside, it involves consequences most dangerous to the independence, liberty, and purity of our churches, to transfer from their own supreme tribunals to the civil courts, the ultimate and authoritative exposition of their doctrine and order.

Of course, we can never submit to the interference of civil courts to stop or obstruct the judicial processes of ecclesiastical courts in enforcing their own discipline. Occasional attempts have been made to stop ecclesiastical trials by invoking the prohibitory injunctions of civil courts, but, so far as we know, without success, until the recent case in the Presbytery of San Francisco, which has been permanently enjoined, by Judge Wheeler, from prosecuting a minister who undertook to withdraw his membership, and thus get away from its jurisdiction pending the trial of his case. We cannot but hope that this extraordinary decision is largely due to some misapprehension or confusion in the judge's mind as to the facts. This might easily arise, as it appears that the accused, during the trial, sent to the Presbytery notice of his withdrawal from the Presbyterian ministry, upon which they, at first, owing to some uncertainty about the evidence,

* *Lectures on the Relation of Civil Government to the Church*, p. 39.

voted to erase his name from the roll. But, before doing it, or communicating the vote to him, they reconsidered their action, and proceeded to arraign him upon charges based upon common fame. Against the reconsideration, complaint was made to the Synod of the Pacific. The complaint was not sustained, and the action of the Presbytery, in refusing to consider Mr. Dawson (the accused) out of its jurisdiction, was affirmed by a vote of thirty-four to two.

The Judge says: "I am clearly satisfied, that when complaint is made to the civil tribunals of the proceedings of an ecclesiastical body, or other voluntary association, involving or trenching upon the civil rights of the complainant, though a member of such church or association, it is competent for the court to inquire into the jurisdiction of the association thus assuming its exercise. If this be not the case, then an ecclesiastical body has it always in its power to acquire jurisdiction by simply assuming it, thus placing itself entirely above and beyond the law of the land. The right of a member of any association, of any church, of any political party, or of any benevolent society, to resign and to cease such membership, is a right that is universally recognized."

But for the doctrine here laid down, the ultimate decision might have been charitably attributed to some misconception of the somewhat peculiar facts in the case. He asserts, however, that a church member or officer under process may withdraw in the midst of, or in contemplation of, such process, and thus escape. This effectually subverts all ecclesiastical discipline. He further says, that the civil courts may determine when such membership has ceased in the face of the decision of the highest tribunal of the church. This is rank Erastianism, and places the church under the feet of the State. It is in direct contravention of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the great Louisville Church case already alluded to, and we hope will not be allowed to rest till it is reversed by this, if not by some lower, tribunal.

If the State may not lord it over the church under color of protecting property and rights, neither may the church lord it over the State, or interfere with its proper functions, under color of upholding the true standard of morality and religion. We have seen that the State is an organization of moral beings, and, therefore, for ends, either moral or not inconsistent with morality; hence, that its action must be controlled by, and be in no manner inconsistent with, the moral

law,—*i. e.*, the law of God prescribed in his Word. Now, it cannot be denied that the church, through its ministry, is the great expounder of the Divine Word to men in every sphere of life and action, and this as respects both faith and morals. Magistrates, judges, and legislators, are no exception. These, like all other men in this sphere, as in every sphere, are bound to hear the Word of the Lord from the mouth of his duly appointed ministers, and to obtain what God-sent light and guidance may thus be conveyed to them from the Father of Lights. But this must be understood as subject to certain fundamental conditions, quite liable to be overlooked by those who have caught hasty and ill-defined glimpses of the truth in the case :

1. With reference to the truths and duties themselves, so to be taught by the church, through its pastors and teachers, to the State, in the persons of its rulers and officers.

2. With regard to the scope of the application of those principles thus inculcated to concrete facts and cases.

3. With regard to the ultimate arbiter or judge, whose decisions are to bind the conscience, whether of rulers or other men, as to what the Word of God declares and enjoins on this or other subjects.

1. As to principles of doctrine or duty inculcated by the church upon the State, rulers, or people, they are to be simply and purely those inculcated in the Word of God, neither more nor less. Thus, the duty of obedience to rulers, as powers ordained by God, is enjoined, but no particular form of government is prescribed, and, so far as appears, the obligation is complete with respect to any *de facto* government, monarchical, aristocratic, democratic, or mixed. Yet this does not forbid revolutionizing or reconstructing such *de facto* government, if it be intolerably oppressive, or refuse to adapt itself to the needs of a people who have outgrown it; nor does it teach any “divine right of kings” to bear rule, to the ruin or permanent injury of the people; nor does it teach that we are bound to obey rulers, or any superiors, when they command us to disobey God. Always and evermore we ought to obey God rather than men; otherwise, we abet rebellion against him. So the apostles certainly imply the possibility of Christian masters holding men

legally bound to their service, irrespective of their consent, without prejudice to church standing.

But they do *not* recognize as Christian any refusal to render unto such servants a compensation for their services, which is "just and equal;" any treatment which disregards marriage and family ties and obligations, or practises cruelty upon the slave; nor do they sanction, as Christian or moral, any slave-code which authorizes or permits such enormities, or makes a man a "chattel." A Scriptural proof that the relation of master and his involuntary servant is not necessarily and in all cases sinful, is no proof that the concrete system of slavery, as formerly legalized in the slave-codes of our Southern States, and now in various parts of the world, is not immoral and unchristian, though individual masters may be guiltless, and discharge the duties pertaining to the relation. In short, we are, from first to last, to "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Just this, no more.

2. A second and momentous limit to the teaching of moral and religious truth by the church to the State, lies in the range of the application of the truths so taught. In regard to what is moral or immoral, divinely commanded or prohibited, *per se*, rulers must be charged, like other men, not to violate, and, so far as they act in relation to it at all, always to conform to the law of God, and therein to seek the highest welfare of the people. But in carrying out these principles in the sphere of the State, which is the temporal, and requires measures bearing upon whole communities and nations, we come largely into the domain of things indifferent in themselves—those having moral character only as respects their tendencies to promote good or evil in society. Now, in regard to these tendencies, the broadest diversities of opinion often obtain in honest minds. They often divide political parties, and excite the fiercest strife. It is seldom wise or right for the pulpit to take sides on such things, for they are not the direct matter of Scriptural inculcation. Thus, there is no doubt that the sixth commandment requires proper sanitary improvements and regulations. But it would hardly be within the province of the pulpit to discuss the best methods of drainage or sewer construction. The eighth commandment requires the best legislation for the organization of industry and production of commod-

ities. Free trade and protective tariffs have an important influence in this direction; so, also have the systems of free and chartered banks, of general and special legislation. The best of men may well have very deep and earnest convictions on these subjects, and strive to incorporate them in legislation. But all this is hardly fit matter for pulpit discussion and inculcation. To undertake it is to embroil the church in common partisan politics, and tends much more to secularize the eternal, than to eternize the temporal.

But while this is so, we think it overstraining the principle to say that a church, court, or pulpit, may not exhort the people to take up arms in support of their government and nation, when and by whomsoever assailed, without thereby becoming obnoxious to the charge of espousing one theory of government in preference to another, or "chaining itself to Cæsar's car." The support given by the churches to the government in the late civil war was not declaring for or against any particular human theory of government. It was simply a countenance of the "powers that be, that are ordained of God," by whomsoever and on whatsoever pretext assailed, in maintaining the struggle for their own and the national existence; an encouragement of the people not to "resist the power," when summoning them to rally and sustain it in this struggle. It would be strange if some vehement and extreme language were not used on both sides in that great war of the age.

So our ministers and churches were very outspoken and vehement in encouraging the war of Independence. But they were not, therefore, propounding theories of the comparative merits of different forms of governments—kingly, aristocratic, republican, federal, or State-rights—but simply declaring that the time had come for this nation to be independent, and not to remain a mere colonial dependency; to be self-governed, not ruled by a trans-Atlantic sceptre. The idea that all deliverances by churches, as to the duty of the State, or of citizens, with reference to their duties to the State, are to be eschewed and put under the ban, on the ground that they are, forsooth, "political," is simply absurd. The truth is, "political" is a comprehensive, and, therefore, ambiguous term, including whatever refers to the body-politic, whether the principles of political philosophy and public law, the duties of Christian

citizenship, the moral and religious, as well as other issues that arise between political parties, no less than the small and often vile artifices of party politics. Ecclesiastical deliverances on any of these subjects are, in some sense, "political." But who will claim that the church is debarred from making deliverances on some of these matters because they are political? that it may not set forth the Scriptural doctrines respecting the duty of obedience to rulers, as an ordinance of God? or declare the Scriptural doctrine of marriage, divorce, adultery, and the duty of the State to sustain it? also to guard the sanctity of the Sabbath? to make laws for the repression of intemperance? to declare against the support of Romanism, or other sects, by the State in its public education, or in other respects? or that it is prohibited from taking ground on such subjects, because they happen to enter into living issues of political parties? or that thus it becomes secularized, or bedraggles itself in the slime and mire of vulgar party politics?

Suppose a multitude organize a rebellion against the government, on the ground that they have never consented to obey it, and all government acquires its authority from "the consent of the governed;" and suppose the church exhorts the people to sustain the government in that struggle for its own existence; is it, therefore, going beyond its province and making an illegitimate political deliverance about the dependence of government on the such "consent?" It has been well said, that for the church to bind itself by wire-drawn theories against proper deliverances on such subjects, when occasion requires, is to fetter itself with split hairs.

3. The next great question to be considered, is as to the arbiter to decide in case of conflicting interpretations of the teachings of Scripture touching the duties of ruler and subject, magistrate and citizen. This brings us at once to the great issue between Vatican infallibility, making the decisions of the Pope final and binding for every conscience, and the Protestant doctrine of private judgment, applicable alike to rulers and people, with reference to political and all other duties. According to this, while all must get what light they can from expositors, ministers, and other sources, yet, after all, they must judge for themselves what God requires of them in his Word, and, indeed, whether it is his Word as well; and for this judgment

they are responsible. Whatever any may teach about Christ, each one is held to a personal responsibility to answer for himself—"Whom say ye that I am?" (Luke ix: 20). Whatever any may say is the mind of God, be he pope, cardinal, bishop, or presbyter, all must "search the Scriptures whether these things be so" (John, v: 39; Acts, xvii: 11). "Every one of us must give account of himself to God" (Rom. xiv: 12). This is the doctrine of the right and duty of private judgment in regard to what the Bible requires of us in every sphere—personal and relative, private and public, man-ward and God-ward. If parties differ here, the only appeal is to the judgment-seat of Christ, before whom we must all appear.

The contrary doctrine of Papal infallibility, in itself and its relations to civil allegiance, so ably discussed by Mr. Gladstone in his *Political Expostulation* and other tracts, and in the counter tracts of Dr. Newman and Archbishop Manning, it is, of course, impossible to discuss here. We can barely advert to it. But it is becoming a power, not only in European but in American politics, and cannot be wholly ignored. To it the gravest political as well as other differences between Papists and Protestants are undoubtedly due. It is simply the assumption that the Pope—speaking *ex-cathedra*—is infallible in all matters of faith and morals, and that it is his prerogative to define the sphere of each; consequently, that when he speaks *ex-cathedra*, all parties, including the governments and potentates of the earth and their subjects, are bound thereby, and that thus they have no alternative but to believe and obey the Pope's commands, on pain of excommunication and perdition. This once admitted, he becomes logically the supreme authority to command, and has the sovereign power to govern rulers and subjects, so far as he sees fit to do so. We do not see that Mr. Gladstone's able antagonists, with all their polemical dexterity, have succeeded in parrying this portentous logical conclusion of the great Premier. It must, therefore, be accepted as the logical outcome of the doctrine. We hardly need say, that any attempted practical application of it in the political affairs of this country will only prove the fatuity of those who undertake it.

And yet, no doctrine, however false, can obtain the vast and enduring hold which this has had on the consciences of rulers and people, without containing at least some half-truth of which

it is a perversion, caricature, or exaggeration. Indeed, all greatly prevalent errors are but forms of some half-truth which gives them currency. There is a real, infallible knowledge of the great fundamentals of revealed truth vouchsafed, not to any external corporation, or visible organization, or the head thereof as such, but to every real Christian, and so to the whole people or invisible church of God, of whatever name, age, or nation. All such answer Christ's question, "Whom say ye that I am?" unhesitatingly and infallibly, "The Christ of God." They *know* in whom they have believed; that he is able to keep that which they commit to him. "They *know* the things that are freely given them of God," (1 Cor. ii: 12); that when the "earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved, they have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. v: 1); that no creature shall be able to separate them from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord (Rom. viii: 38-39). They have "an unction from the holy One, whereby they know all things"—*i. e.*, essentially "pertaining to life and godliness," and this not by a mere fallible opinion, but by a certain faith; for the "same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, you shall abide in him" (1 John ii: 20-27). Hence, it is safe to say that the doctrines of the Trinity in Unity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Human Apostasy, Corruption, and Spiritual Regeneration, the Judgment to Come, the Resurrection of the Body, and the Life Everlasting, in themselves, and in substance, if not in the definitions and expositions some give of them, are infallibly known by the whole church of God to be true through the sure teaching of his Word and Spirit. All real Christians know all this as being witnessed by the Word of God and not of men; that in teaching them, and exhorting men to believe and obey the gospel call, on pain of eternal perdition, they are not bidding them stake their eternity on cunningly devised fables, but on the sure testimony of God, attested not only by the seal of its own invidance, but the *semper, ubique, ab omnibus*.

But the infallible certainty of the believer's hope, and of the fundamental articles of the Catholic Christian faith, furnishes not the shadow of support to the doctrine of the sole and complete infallibility of the Pope, binding all Christians to receive his *dicta* throughout the whole domain of faith and morals as

divinely true and obligatory. Such a claim is the last extreme of mortal presumption, and the foundation of perfect ecclesiastical and civil despotism. It makes him the vice-gerent of the Almighty—nay, more, one that “sitteth in the temple of God and showeth himself that he is God” (1 Thess. ii: 4).

As the true church invisible is infallibly taught the fundamentals of saving truth, so there is, within a very narrow and elementary sphere, what has been called the “infallibility of the human mind.” This holds only with regard to those axioms and intuitions, which constitute the first principles, the base, the condition of all our knowledge and possibility of knowledge. Beyond the merest elements, and the further we go beyond them, the knowledge reached by our unaided natural faculties is liable to uncertainty and error. Nevertheless, we are always going forward in the correction of these errors, the removal of our ignorance, the enlargement of our knowledge. But how could this be possible, unless we had at least some certain and infallible elements of knowledge, by which to correct our errors? How could we detect optical illusions unless we had some sure knowledge, by touch or sight, or other faculties, by which to detect and measure them? How know the deviations from a straight line without some rule, some square, or plummet, by which to prove them? How, in a word, know the light without an eye to see it? How could we know the Bible to be from God without a power to discern the radiance—the self-evidence of divinity on its pages? Is there not infallible certainty in regard to much necessary and formal truth, as in mathematics and logic, much certain truth in physics, in relation to mind and morals, of which men are so infallibly sure that courts of justice do not hesitate to treat those as irresponsible maniacs, who disown certain first truths, the rejection of which is intellectual suicide? But in all these things other men are as infallible as the Pope of Rome. Besides, and it is a fair case for the *argumentum ad hominem*, if the Pope is infallible in his definitions of faith and morals, so as to bind the consciences of men, and men are bound to be governed by them, ought they to have anything less than the power of infallibly knowing this Papal infallibility, in order to be bound by it? There is, indeed, a certain narrow sphere of infallibility in the human mind as such. This differs from the Papists' claim

of infallibility, as a safety-lamp differs from the fires of the Inquisition.

The government, laws, and institutions of this country will never be conformed to the doctrine of Vatican infallibility without a struggle, at least as obstinate as our late war.

Two questions are often put, on which the foregoing discussion sheds some light, viz.: Is this a Christian nation? Is Christianity the law of the land? They are both answered by competent thinkers and writers, now in the affirmative, now in the negative, according to the stand-point from which they are interpreted. If the question, is this a Christian nation? be understood as meaning, are the majority of the people, *prima facie*, or by profession, spiritually regenerate? does the nation articulately profess Christianity in its political constitution? are a majority of the people leading exemplary Christian lives? we must answer no. But if it mean, is Christianity the faith of the great mass of the people, as contrasted with any form of paganism, infidelity, or atheism? is it the religion of the great mass of the people, who have any religion? is it the religion, whose rites and ministrations nearly all the people resort to at weddings, funerals, and other occasions, when they seek religious service? is it that which has moulded our national life, manners, institutions, and laws? is it that which is recognized by the nation, in Sabbaths, oaths, chaplains, public fasts and thanksgivings recommended from time to time by our rulers? the answer is, emphatically, this is a Christian, and less emphatically, but still really, a Protestant nation. In every proper sense of the term we are a Christian. not an infidel or heathen, nation.

In like manner, while it is to be admitted that Christianity is not the law of the land, in the sense that any of its articles are explicitly a part of our national constitution, or of most of our State constitutions, or are established by statutory enactment, yet it is still the law of the land in the sense: 1. That the common law of Great Britain, which largely rules and permeates our judicial proceedings, when not set aside by formal statute, finds its underlying and controlling principles in Christianity. 2. That our statute laws generally, if not professedly, aim to carry out the justice, equity, and charity of the Bible. 3. That, although jealousy of anything like a State church, or interference with

freedom of conscience has excluded the formal recognition of Christianity from some of our State constitutions, it has not from many of them. 4. That it is universally acknowledged that no legislation ought to be adopted hostile or contradictory to Christianity. Finally, that it is constantly recognized as a sufficient argument for proposed legislation, that it is demanded by, or in accord with, Christianity. An example of this kind we find in the preamble of a resolution, lately offered in the national House of Representatives, in regard to Cuba, as follows :

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That, in compliance with the will of the people, the precedents of history, the best established principles of international law, the precepts of Christian rule and morality, etc., etc.

The famous Girard will case has often been cited in evidence, that the United States Supreme Court and other tribunals do not recognize Christianity as the law of the land. But Judge Strong, in the lectures before quoted, very soundly says :

Throughout the whole argument, as well as in the opinion of the court, it appears to have been assumed that had the will been truly obnoxious to the objection urged against it, had it intended the establishment of an irreligious or infidel college, the devise might not have been a valid charity. That, indeed, was not the decision, but the case leans in that direction. And in two cases, at least, in the highest courts of two of the States, it has been more than intimated that a gift in trust for the support and propagation of irreligion and infidelity cannot be supported. I do not perceive how it could be, as a charity, entitled to the protection of the law of charities.* (P. 99.)

* The following being one of the six articles of the fundamental law enacted for the government of the North Western Territory, which comprises our present North Western States, lets in a flood of light upon the relation which the founders of our government recognized as existing between its common schools and religion. It is, therefore, quite in point with reference to what precedes and what follows. We find it in the *Herald and Presbyterian* of January 26 :

RELIGION, MORALITY, AND KNOWLEDGE BEING NECESSARY TO GOOD GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS AND THE MEANS OF EDUCATION SHALL FOREVER BE ENCOURAGED.

This, in connection with the Land Ordinance of 1785, setting apart Section 16 for school purposes, introduced the principle of "State support" of common schools. Prior to that time education throughout Christendom had been in the hands of the family or the church. This obligation thus imposed upon the State to "encourage schools as a means of education," was a "*new departure*."

The same is true of that organic declaration that "religion, morality, and knowledge are necessary to good government."

Both were a virtual pledge to all that the commonwealths arising upon that territory under that ordinance should be based upon those principles, and a timely notice to that effect to all comers.

The true intent would seem to be, that "religion, morality, and knowledge" were the corner-stones

Proceeding to apply those principles to questions of the day in regard to religion in the public schools, it is not now an open question which needs to be discussed here, whether good rudimentary education should be so provided at public expense, that all the children of the country may receive it gratuitously. It is, however, an open and important question, which we can touch only incidentally, if at all, how high a grade of education should be thus furnished, at public expense, to all. But the sole question now before us is, whether or how far religious teaching or exercises should have place in such schools, and especially, whether, thus supported out of the public funds, they should be allowed to come under the control of any religious denomination. On this subject we have, radically, three parties, the Protestant, the Romish, the non-religious—not necessarily as to character of those composing it, among whom are some eminently wise and pious men, but as to the exclusion of all religious teaching and exercises from the schools. This third party is composed of the skeptical, or non-religious, element in society, and such Christian people as, while they would intrinsically prefer prayer and the reading of the Bible, yet deem it wise to forego this for the sake of securing the coöperation of the skeptical class in maintaining our public school system intact, and free from Romish or other sectarian control. But we may as well say, *in limine*, that it seems to us alike wrong, illusory, and impracticable. Wrong, because morality of some sort, good, bad, or indifferent, must permeate the education, or normal development of the activities, of a rational and accountable being. As we have seen, all sound morality is rooted and grounded in religion, and not only so, the religion of the Bible. It is, therefore, illusory. A non-Christian, or non-Biblical, morality is an infidel or atheistic morality. There

of the structure, and that "schools" were to be employed to give value and permanence to this prescribed foundation.

The connection of "religion" with the "schools" is too intimate in the organic law to permit the entire abandonment of either.

The State must support or "encourage schools," and schools are manifestly a *means* to promote a more important *end*. That *end* is "religion, morality, and knowledge"—the equivalent of "*good government*."

Now, the proposition to banish the Bible from the schools is a blow at this *end*, really discards the *end*, so far as "religion and morality" are concerned; while the *means*—the schools—are maintained.

It is idle to urge that there can be "religion and morality" without the Bible. That was not the intention of the original parties to the compact.

is no neutrality here. He that is not for, is against. But the great mass of Christian people will not be content to have their children educated in such schools. The scheme, therefore, would lose more of Christian, than it would gain of infidel or irreligious support. It would, in short, repel more than it would attract. It is, therefore, impracticable, and all the more so, as it would combine against it the Romish and a sufficiently large portion of Protestant people to defeat it, and to overthrow any common-school system founded upon it. This scheme, then, may be left out of consideration.

The question is, therefore, narrowed down to that between the Romish, or sectarian, and what may be called the non-sectarian system of public schools, which yet are controlled by religion in the same sense as the State itself is, or ought to be—*i. e.*, by that Christian morality, that reading of portions of Scripture, and offering of simple Scriptural prayers, to which none can object who do not object to the Word of God itself.

And first, we will briefly consider the claims of the Romish, or sectarian, system of public schools. To this there are decisive objections:

1. It is a union of church and State, and exposed to all the objections to such a union, in either of its forms, whether with one church or denomination only, or with all indiscriminately. In the former case, it taxes all other denominations for the exclusive benefit and prestige of one, besides giving it the immense advantage of educating in its own way most children not educated at private expense. In the latter, it establishes as many small denominational schools as there are minute sects, which desire and claim them, and thus greatly encourages and aggravates sectarianism. In either case, it increases the burdens of all classes by means of taxation for schools in which the *minima* of sectarian religion are taught.

2. Denominational schools for elementary instruction are usually greatly inferior to the genuine public schools, both because they must often be too small to be furnished with competent teachers and the stimulus of large classes, and because they are liable to be too much devoted to teaching sectarian religious tenets to the comparative neglect of broad, general, elementary instruction. Without further detail of reasons, we are quite safe in concluding that this system will never be

adopted by the people of this country. It is only a covert way, in fact, of installing Romanism as a sort of State religion. For it would inure almost exclusively to the advantage of this sect, and prove a long stride in the series of contemplated steps, tending to make it, in fact, the religion of the State. The animus of Romanism, with reference to the government and people of this country, from time to time, avows itself, when bold enough to speak freely, to be in full accord with the logical consequences of the doctrine of Papal infallibility. This is nothing less than to rise to political supremacy, and to stamp out whatever stands in the way of its iron rule. The seizure of the control of the public schools is the first leap attempted in this proposed ascent to despotic power. The following, among hundreds of equivalent avowals, speak for themselves, and are a sufficient answer to those who accuse the earnest adversaries of Romish policy of kindling a fanatical and needless religious, or politico-religious, war. We take them from the *Herald* and *Presbyter* of January 20th :

The *Shepherd of the Valley*, the organ of the Archbishop of St. Louis, of the Roman Catholic Church, once said :

“ We acknowledge that the Roman Catholic Church is intolerant of control, but this intolerance is a logical and necessary sequence of her infallibility. She alone has the right to be intolerant, since she alone possesses truth. The church endures the heretics only in so far as she is compelled to do it ; but she has a deadly hatred for them, and makes use of every artifice for their annihilation. As soon as the Catholics here have attained a sufficient majority, religious freedom in the United States will have an end.

“ Heresy is a deadly sin which destroys the soul, and besides, an infectious disease, and because of this, all Christian princes have uprooted and cast out of their domains even the weakest fibres of heresy. If we neglect at the present moment the persecution of heretics, we repeat it boldly, it is for the sole reason that we are too weak to persecute.”

The *Herald* also quotes the *Catholic Review*, as saying, in an article on “ Romanism in America : ”

It seems to be merely a question of time, and that not very remote, when its numbers will preponderate over all other religious faiths. In view of this fact, it says : We can afford to wait this consummation of the glorious will of God, though to wait is hard ; and to endure assault while forbidden to strike back, especially when you know you are able to strike effectively, requires great forbearance. Catholics, we are told, don't want to engage in a fight, but if a fight is forced upon them, let their opponents beware. “ At any moment,” says the *Review*, “ if the Catholics of the United States move

as a body, they can decide any election. We know that they cannot, nor do they desire to, form a distinct political party; but they can make any such party triumphant or insure its defeat."

3. The only alternative, either right or practicable, therefore is the maintenance of free common schools, regulated by those principles of Christian morality which are the law of our social and civil life, admitting that use of the Bible, as a reading-book, and of simple forms of prayer in worship, which should offend none but infidels and atheists. These we cannot afford to have regulate our education. Now, there is no real difficulty for the consciences of those who have no ulterior end to serve by means of raising such difficulty. Every real difficulty can be obviated in two ways: 1. Let such selections be made from the Protestant and Douay versions of the Bible, as are not in conflict with either, for reading, and the Lord's prayer be used for worship. Whose conscience can be hurt, and whose rights, feelings, or interests will be thus invaded? 2. But if any cannot endure this, let their consciences be relieved by not requiring the attendance of their children during the religious exercises.* Now, to show that this is practicable, we quote, first, from two Presbyterian organs, likely to represent the strongest Protestant demand on this subject. Says the *Presbyterian*, of January 8:

In the Presbyterian Ministers' Meeting at Chicago, Ill., the Rev. Mr. Forsyth read a paper on the subject of the Bible in the public schools, taking the ground that, with the two conditions observed, of optional attendance and choice of version there is no reason for removing the Bible. It seems to us that the acceptance of this proposition would open a way to the settlement of the whole difficulty, unless the objections are to the Book itself, in any form or version. Objectors of this kind had better be disregarded.

The *Evangelist*, of the same week, in the course of an extended and well-considered article, says:

There is really no great practical difficulty about having some religious services in our schools, without the least degree of "sectarianism"—in any reasonable or historic sense of that word. There are portions of the Scripture the same in all the versions: there is the Lord's Prayer; there are the Ten Commandments, etc.

So much for Protestant, as represented in Presbyterian, de-

* This is according to the Code of Instruction in New York State.—*Thompson's Church and State in America.*, pp. 132-3. Who can be aggrieved by i

mands. Now let us attend to the conditions on which Father Hennessy, a Romish priest of Jersey City, offers to the Board of Education * there to turn over to it the Catholic schools under his charge, containing 600 children, he finding himself unable longer to conduct them without aid from the public funds. He offers to furnish instruction for these schools and bear their expenses at less than one-third of the ordinary cost of the public schools, on the following, among other conditions which have no religious bearing :

That no religious instruction shall be given in these schools except the reading of the Holy Bible in the morning and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer.

That the books now in use in the other schools may be used in these schools, at the expense of your honorable board, or, if the undersigned is permitted to retain the books already in these schools, he will agree to furnish them at his own expense.

That the undersigned, if appointed head of these schools, will serve without pay, subject in all cases to the authority of the superintendent of schools and your honorable board.

The undersigned, in making these propositions, is not aware that he is asking for anything that is contrary to the school laws as at present existing, or that is not within the legal competence of your honorable board.

He also offers to have his teachers subjected to the regular examination by the school board. The only matter that could not properly be conceded is, that he would retain the appointment of his teachers in his own hand. Of course, they must be Romanists, subject to his control. And this is the precise thing which the Romish priesthood always and everywhere demand, whatever else they may concede. But the point which we wish to emphasize is this: that he consents to have the religious exercises confined to "the reading of the Holy Bible in the morning, and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer." Really, need there be, unless the Romish priesthood factitiously raises it, any insuperable difficulty as to the religious exercises in schools satisfactory to both Catholics and Protestants? At all events, can any grievous burden be laid on the Catholic conscience in being taxed for the support of schools which furnish precisely the religious exercises for their children which one of their own respected priests has publicly marked out, without censure or reproof from his ecclesiastical superiors? How can such an edu-

cation be condemned as godless, and what grievance does it inflict on any Christian citizen? This will not, however, be accepted by the supreme Papal authorities. Cardinal McCloskey is reported to have said to a recent meeting of the New York Catholic Union: "Show your support of Catholic schools, stand firm to the great principle of Catholic education for Catholic youth, and God will bless you and give you a great reward hereafter." [Loud applause.]

The following is going the rounds of the press as we write :

DUBUQUE, IOWA, January 4.

Yesterday Father Ryan gave notice from his pulpit, in St. Patrick's Church, that he would withhold from all parishioners the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist, who persisted in sending their children to the public schools. He doubtless spoke from the authority of the Bishop, and the announcement has created considerable excitement.

It may also be suggested, that the difficulties of State education, arising from scruples of conscience in regard to religious teachings, are far more serious in respect to advanced than rudimentary education. Strictly considered, elementary secular education gives rather the forms and instruments, than the substance of knowledge; rather the means of attaining truth than the inculcation of any positive dogmas as truth. Learning to spell, read, write, to handle elementary arithmetic, grammar, is, *per se*, gaining more the means of acquiring knowledge, than any positive truths or principles. And so far as religion or religious dogmas are concerned, the same may be said of geography, astronomy, etc. But it is impossible to study history or literature to any extent without coming into contact with the most pronounced religious opinions, Christian and anti-Christian, Protestant, Romish, Greek, Armenian, not excluding the polemics also of minuter sects. Hence, the necessity of colliding with the earnest religious convictions of multitudes of people in such advanced education, is a reason for pursuing it elsewhere than in common schools supported by universal taxation. And on other grounds, in our judgment, it is both unjust and inexpedient to make very advanced education free to all at the public expense. It is enough to give all children a free elementary education. This is the extent of President Grant's recommendation. To go further is to unfit and indispose vast numbers for those situations of intelligent

manual labor which the best interests of society require to be filled, and still further to crowd the already overcrowded callings regarded as genteel, in which men and women live by their wits, rather than their hands improved by the mind ; and failing of this in lawful occupations, sink down to those which are unlawful, alike destructive to themselves and society. We are aware that these words may startle some who have not carefully observed and pondered the matter, but we are persuaded that the more they observe and ponder, the more of truth and soberness will they find in them.

We have thus reached what must dispose of any project like that proposed by President Grant, to enforce the exclusion from the public schools of the country of all "*religious*, atheistic, or pagan tenets." Such a measure, in our judgment, if practicable in the nature of things, is wholly beyond the proper functions of the national government, and an unwarrantable invasion of the proper liberties and franchises of the States and the people. It not only requires that the schools be in the most absolute sense non-religious, but that such schools be provided at public expense on a sufficient scale to supply education gratuitously to all the children. But it is in the nature of things impossible. There is no middle ground between religion, or religious principles of some sort, and atheism. Neutrality here is out of the question. Not to acknowledge God is to disown or ignore him. It is to be "without God in the world," and this is atheism. There is no evading this consequence.

Of course, if such a system were attempted, it could only apply to the most "rudimentary education," such as the President recommends, and this in respect to the mere forms or instruments of knowledge, rather than knowledge itself. It is conceivable, for example, that a mere writing-school might be severed from all direct relations with religion or atheism. So likewise of spelling. But it is not conceivable that children, in their early and susceptible years, can safely be kept several hours each day under constant discipline and teaching in various departments, from which all recognition of the fundamental principles of morals, grounded on religion, can safely be excluded. As to the objection, that this supposes giving a preference to moral and Christian tenets over the opposite, and is inconsistent with the equality of all religious creeds and tenets

before the law, it is enough to refer to what has already been said in regard to the relation of the Bible and the moral law to legislation. We are not an atheistic or heathen, we are a Christian and Protestant nation. The reasons urged for banishing the Bible and religion from common schools, if good for that, are good for a great deal more: for the utter expulsion of every vestige of whatever implies a belief in Christianity, the Bible, God, any religious truth, nay, the obligations of common morality, from our civil and political institutions. This is the logical, and will prove the inevitable, actual consequence of such a position. Nor is it to the purpose to allege that the expulsion or retention of the Bible and divine worship from or in the schools is of small moment; that all the religious knowledge and impressions thus conveyed are insignificant. It is not so. The simple prestige or degradation of the Bible and Christianity involved in keeping or banishing it, constantly held up before the youthful, and, indeed, the popular mind, is of immense importance. The argument which we have before given with reference to morality and legislation is well put in the following extract, which, we think, voices the average Christian mind of the country. The first is from Dr. Arthur Mitchell:

It is said that the expulsion of the Bible from the schools is *insignificant*. Somebody, evidently, thinks its *presence* there is not insignificant, or the good old book would not be selected from all our literature for this conspicuous disgrace. If it means nothing and amounts to nothing to have it in, why in the world are we witnessing such persistent efforts to get it out? It will not hurt the Bible to be expelled, but its expulsion will hurt Chicago.

Its removal is insisted on by others because, it is said, freedom of conscience demands it. Some do not believe in the Bible, and ought not, therefore, to be taxed for schools where it is read.

Then, for the same reason, expel it from our army and navy, from Congress, from the courts, dismiss all our chaplains, banish the Bible from our prisons and from all public asylums for the poor, the deaf, and the blind. Those who suppose that religious liberty calls for this may be good men; but their ideas are somewhat muddled.

The next is from the article already quoted from the *N. Y. Evangelist*:

The reasons urged for excluding all recognition of religion from our schools would lead, by inevitable logic, to the abolition of all Sunday laws; of all chaplaincies; of any religious observances in the army and the navy, and at West Point, etc.; of all public days of thanksgiving; of all oaths in courts

of justice; of every act or word which implies a recognition by the State of God, or religion, or a future life. The State must become atheistic.

The same reasons, resting, as they largely do, upon the supremacy of the individual conscience, likewise carry us into the sphere of morals, as well as of religion. A Mormon may be "conscientious" about his plurality of wives; a free lover about the laws of marriage; a communist about the right to property. What are we going to do about their "consciences?" We must either alter all our laws to suit them, or we must vote down their consciences by our consciences.

Of like purport is the deliverance which we find ascribed to Prof. Seelye, who is very high Congregational authority:

There are two dangers that beset us in this question of religion in the schools: one is letting it alone, and allowing education to slip into the hands of the Catholic priesthood; the other is taking away the Bible from the schools, and making them altogether secular. The first means delivering posterity, body and soul, into the hands of the Romish Church; the second means destruction to our system of education. He would avoid both dangers; and while he would yield neither to the Romish nor the secular theory of education, he would maintain, as stoutly as the Romanist, the need of religion in schools, and resist as positively as the secularist the domination of a church or a hierarchy.

But nowhere have we seen the true doctrine on this whole subject of the relation of religion to the government and its public schools better stated, than in the following extract from the late annual message of Governor Bedle of New Jersey:

Concerning the school question the Governor says: "Free schools are safeguards of the State and nation, and should be kept completely divorced from sectarian control or influence. It is a cardinal principle in our political economy, and fundamental in our system of government, that church and State must be kept perfectly separate, but mistaken notions arise, oftentimes, in applying the principle. We should never lose sight of the fact, that this is a land of Christian or Bible character and civilization, and that its teachings are the foundation of our virtue and social elevation. These, it is true, may and do assume different shapes in men's minds in considering their relations to God, thereby inducing such religious sects and associations for worship as may be deemed necessary or better for that purpose, according to belief, but the great undisputed, underlying doctrines of duty to God and man and individual virtue which make good citizens, are in the Bible, and to exclude it from being read in schools is a retrogression toward heathenism. The simple reading of the Bible in schools is not the teaching of sectarian or peculiar religious belief simply because it is used to establish religious creeds and forms. The schools should never be shut against the Bible. Our law is perfectly just. Its words are, "that it shall not be lawful for any teacher, trustee, or trustees, to introduce into, or have performed in, any school receiving its pro-

portion of the public money, any religious service, ceremony, or forms whatsoever, except reading the Bible and repeating the Lord's Prayer." This gives the Bible a fair chance in its influence upon civil character and duty to the Creator, while an exclusion of it is a terrible stride in making the State Godless. Also, for the good of society and citizenship, the State, in selecting the objects of taxation, can well afford to, and should, leave untouched by the Assessor, all edifices for religious worship, and the land upon which they stand, actually necessary for their convenient use, and so exclusively used."

While, however, we regret to be obliged to differ radically from the President's proposal, utterly to de-christianize, nay, to de-religionize, the schools, and especially the proposal to effect this result by a compulsory clause in our national constitution, we most cordially assent to his other proposition, to deny the privilege of voting to all who cannot read and write after the year 1890. Such a provision would every way work good, and not evil; it would at once discourage illiteracy, and elevate the qualifications of voters—a great desideratum.

As we survey the kind of population, civilization, and religion which overspreads our Rocky Mountain Territories and States, Mormonism and polygamy here, a threatened majority of "heathen Chinese" there, and in the regions acquired from Mexico, the degraded forms of Romanism, which have ruined republican institutions in Central and South America, saying nothing of barbarous Indian tribes, we confess it is a grave question, whether the safety of the nation does not require some constitutional or legislative provisions which shall guard against giving Mormonism, heathenism, barbarism, or the lowest style of Romanism, the control of the education, civilization, the social and political life of those vast regions, so soon to teem with peoples that are to enter in as constituent and formative elements of our national life. We certainly, at first, looked askance at the sweeping amendments proposed to secure unsectarian elementary education to all the children of the country, and we cannot sanction the proposition to make it wholly non-religious, for reasons already given; but it may turn out that the nation must take action to prevent—what have hitherto been only unassimilated warts and wens, which disfigure without destroying—the body-politic from developing into malignant cancers that shall eat out its vitals. So it has been necessary to exorcise slavery, which was rending and de-

stroying us. To what other alien elements our national salvation will require the application of some heroic remedies remains to be seen, and will soon task the minds of earnest Christians and patriots.

Art. II.—BENEFICIARY EDUCATION : HISTORICAL SKETCH.

By Rev. A. D. BARBER, Clarendon, Vt.

THE Education Boards and Societies of the church have of late been most unjustly and injuriously assailed. It has been asserted, with much confidence, as of a thing proved, that they tend to make, and do make, of the young men they aid, a set of mendicant weaklings and craven dependents. These aspersions have been embodied and earnestly presented in popular journals and magazines, and even by eminent ministers in the Church of Christ. Now, all this implies ignorance of the divine sanctions these societies have from the first received, and of the venerable history they have had ; also, want of sympathy with the excellent character of the young men assailed. Educational societies, charitable and beneficiary, are not a thing of yesterday, so that their principles and practice are unobserved, and their influence unknown ; nor have these young men lived in a corner. Both have been set on high. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world.

God, who, at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, and unto us, in these last days, by his Son, has not left the knowledge and practice of the revelation he has so graciously made to chance or any uncertainty. He has embodied in institutions, and put in permanent forms, means to preserve and perpetuate this revelation. In the patriarchal dispensation, the provision for this purpose was simplest and purest—the father being the