

What Voting Under  
An Unchristian  
Constitution  
Involves

BY

REV. F. M. FOSTER, Ph. D.,  
New York City

Published by  
THE WITNESS COMMITTEE  
119 Federal Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa.

## What Voting Under an Unchristian Constitution Involves.

"They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not" (Hos. 8-4). In this Scripture, Israel is charged with the attempt to administer civil government without God. We bring down this Scripture to 1920, and insist that we are attempting to administer the government of the United States without God. Under such conditions many Christians refuse to exercise the right of franchise because:—

**First: Voting involves accepting a Constitution which does not recognize the King of Heaven and of earth, the Lord of the Universe of God.**

One of three positions may be maintained. First: That authority resides in the ruler—This was the theory of the persecutors—King Charles and King James, Second: That authority resides in the people. This is the theory of our Republic. Third: That authority comes from Almighty God. This is the teaching of Scripture. A created being is not a source, but a recipient. He is not to command, but to obey. He is not independent, but subordinate. The state is a moral person; subordinate, not supreme.

In holding to the "second," we have adopted a constitution in harmony with such view. In the preamble, if any place, such recognition of God would be found. But there is no reference to God in the preamble of the Constitution of the United States. It reads: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a

more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

In this there is no reference, near or remote, to Almighty God.

The body of the Constitution is equally silent as to the authority and overruling power of the Great King of heaven and of earth. He is dealt with as if He was not God, and the Lord of this nation.

That this interpretation of the Constitution is just is made clear by a treaty made with Tripoli, dated January 3, 1797, which reads: "The Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion, and has itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquillity of Mussulmans." (See United States Revised Statutes, Ed. of 1875, p. 756.) Though this treaty is not now in force, yet it shows the interpretation put upon the Constitution by leading men at that time.

When President Jefferson refused to appoint days of fasting and thanksgiving, he did so on the ground, as stated in a letter, 1808: "I consider the Government of the United States as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline or exercises."

That eminent journalist, Horace Greeley, in the issue of the "Tribune," March 7, 1865, said: "Almighty God is not the source of all authority and power in our Government; the people of the United States are such source."

Not many students of the Constitution will attempt to resist the interpretation which affirms that God and His authority are not recognized. To fail to acknowledge Him must be construed as rejection.

The Constitution of the Confederate States was much like our national Constitution, except in this one vital matter, it did not recognize the overruling authority of the United States. This our government declared to be rebellion, and put it down. Not to acknowledge the authority of Almighty God over us as a nation is a far more serious matter. "They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made prices, and I knew it not." That God will put down the rebellion in His dominions is without doubt.

The Christian citizen is confronted by these two: First:—The Lord Jesus Christ has revealed Himself as "The King of kings and Lord of lords," and commanded "in all thy ways acknowledge Him." Second:—The Constitution of our country refuses to acknowledge Christ as Lord. What is duty? Some believe that they cannot conscientiously participate in the affairs of the Government, and reluctantly, but in duty to the nation's rightful Ruler, decline to give allegiance by oath. This is the least they can do in fidelity to the Prince of the kings of the earth. But they steadfastly protest against this curtailment of their political privileges by this rejection of the authority of God in the nation. Political rights are divine, and to place their exercise upon conditions to which the Christian cannot subscribe is unlawful and unjust.

Second: Because to vote, one must swear that the People are the supreme authority

in this Nation. We have refused to say that God reigns; and to make our rejection of Him the more complete, we require all who vote to swear that the People's will takes precedence over the law and is made by the voter, or by his representative in office.

In despotisms, the will of one man is supreme. Experience has made the demonstration complete that no man is fit to be trusted with irresponsible power. Enlightened statesmanship has rejected the theory of "The divine right of kings." But is the goal of liberty reached when you pass on to the second, viz.: **The people are supreme?** True, this is better, as life in the United States is better than life in Turkey. But should even one hundred millions of people be trusted with irresponsible power? Is there not danger of the many, as well as of the individual ruler, becoming despotic? There is danger. We go further, and affirm that thirty millions of people, our own flesh and blood, were despotic, and less than sixty-five years ago held in bondage four millions of slaves. By commandment of the People, mails are carried and post-offices kept open on the Lord's Day. Who gave the People permission to issue such command in the domains of Almighty God, and despotically execute it, to the disfranchisement of men who fear Him? The Government discriminates against the God-fearing citizen, and will admit into the service of the post-office department, as postmasters, those only who will swear that they will violate the Fourth Commandment and open the office certain hours on the holy day. This is unfair, as it is a sin

against God! It discriminates against the religion of Jesus Christ, and viciously cuts into His-law. It puts a premium on ir-religion.

Where is the trouble? Where does the source of the difficulty lie? It is in the theory of our Government. **In attempting to separate Church and State, we have clothed "we, the people," with irresponsible power, and they have already shut out the conscientious Christian from the post-office department by prescribing an oath which is directly, clearly and specifically antagonistic to the Fourth Commandment. Many lines of business are already legalized on the Sabbath day and Amusements.**

Exalting the will of the people to be supreme law is demoralizing, vicious, destructive. **It is, in our nation, already subverting liberty and protecting some of the worst evils known to modern civilization.** It will lead to national decay and death. We would be guilty of lack of true patriotism, as well as fidelity to the truth of God, did we not cry out against it. "And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of His kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book, \* \* \* and he shall read therein all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of these statutes, to do them." (Deut. xvii-18, 19.) And if the ruler, and through him, the nation, refuses to be governed by divine law, two things are certain as the rising of to-morrow's sun—First, the government, not making the law of God supreme, cannot maintain itself against encroaching wickedness. Second, for the havoc which wickedness makes, God will hold the rulers, and the nation, respon-

sible. In this nation, we are demonstrating the "first"; and the "second," if we do not repent, will come quickly. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Take all the heads of the people and hang them up before the Lord against the sun, that the fierce anger of the Lord may be turned away from Israel." (Numbers xxv-4.)

If rulers knew, when they "establish iniquity by law," or countenance wrong, **"they would be hanged up before the Lord,"** Many now in office would run to cover; there would be more solemn consideration in accepting office; more conscientious effort to execute law. To sit in God's seat as a ruler, and then usurp the reins of government to crucify His law, is a proceeding, on the part of the ruler, and of the nation, **fraught with most disastrous results.** "The Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall He speak unto them in His wrath, and vex them in His sore displeasure." (Ps. ii-4, 5.)

More still, the Constitution not only exalts the will of the people as supreme, but **it requires the candidate to swear, as he is inducted into office, that the supreme law of the land is the will of the people;** as, also, he must swear that he will uphold laws which directly contradict the law of God. Article VI., second paragraph, says: "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land." When you make oath to the Constitution, you swear that the law which requires the mails to be carried, and the post-offices to be open on the Sabbath; or anything the majority decrees;

shall be the supreme law of the land. How can the Christian admit the principle, much less swear to it, in its practical application? It is believed that the Christian, loyal to Christ and to His righteous law, cannot make such oath. If he does, he becomes **particeps criminis** in wickedness which is fostered and protected by this Government. "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

Are not the principles of civil government laid down in the Word of God? Is it not true that **God's Law** is supreme in national affairs? "And it shall be when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein, all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them." No people will long enjoy national prosperity who en throne the will of the people as supreme. Such a nation will, more and more, curtail the liberties of God-fearing citizens by making laws which discriminate against them; shutting them out, by reason of their fidelity to the law of God, from participating in the honors and responsibilities of office.

Third: **To vote, you must swear that God's qualifications for office shall be set aside and rejected.**

That the Scriptures require religious qualifications in the officer is certain. "Moreover, thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness, and place such over them, to be rulers of thou-

sands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens." (Exodus xviii-31.) "The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." (2 Samuel xxiii-3.) "For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. \* \* \* **For he is the minister of God.**" (Romans xiii-3, 4.) These Scriptures suffice to teach that moral qualifications are required in the office-bearer. The fear of God is especially insisted upon. When our Constitution expressly states that "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States," the God-fearing citizen must stop and consider. Can he swear to that clause when God says **there shall be religious test**? How can he swear to that clause unless he denies his Lord? He who is Prince of the kings of the earth, the author of civil government, has laid down qualifications, and **men are not at liberty to set them aside.**

But we have dared to set aside this specific command; and, in the face of Almighty God, we have put in our Constitution, Article VI., this: "**No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.**"

God says there shall be religious test for office. Our nation says there shall not be. The issue is squarely joined, with flat refusal to obey.

A test for the meaning of this clause of the Constitution is at hand. When William H. Taft was nominated for President of the United States, it was everywhere published, and, so far as known, nowhere denied, that Mr. Taft was a Unitarian;

that he denied the deity of the Son of God, that His blood was shed as a sacrifice for sin. Mr. Taft was elected, notwithstanding his rejection of our Lord, who is Divine, and to whom has been given all power in heaven and in earth. The wrong was national and inconceivably great. A ruler was in office who not only would not "Kiss the Son" (Ps. 2-12), but who withstood Him to His face, answering, "He is not the Son of God!"

Also, Presiden Roosevelt, in open letter, uttered sarcastic condemnation of the citizen who would presume to judge of a candidate's qualifications by examining his Profession of Faith; and, with deep ex-coriation, informed Christian people that the Constitution asks not whether a candidate be Protestant, Catholic, Unitarian, Jew, or Infidel; and that with his beliefs, the Constitution has not a whit to do.

In President Taft's election; and in President Roosevelt's semi-official utterance, we have authoritative interpretation of the clause—"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust unde the United States." We see what the clause means. Knowing what it means, the Chistian is asked to accept it. He is asked to set his disapproval on the Scripture—"Such as fear God;" and to swear that this Scripture shall not be applied. **Can the Christian make such Oath?** Can he swear that God's command shall not be obeyed in the government of the United States? Will he answer with Pharaoh, "Who is the Lord that I should obey His voice?" Gathering on our little ant-hill, shall we pass edicts against heaven, and set limits to the authority and domain of the Almighty? "Have ye not

known? have ye not heard? hath it not been told you from the beginning? have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth? It is He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretched out the heavens as a curtain, and spעדeth them out as a tent to dwell in; that bringeth the prices to nothing; he maketh the judges of the earth as vanity." (Is. 40:21, 23.) Nebuchadnezzar tried to rule out God, and he was driven from men, to eat grass as oxen, till he knew that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men. "He hath on his vesture, and on the thigh, a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords." "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 his wrath is kindled but a little." (Ps. 2:10-12.)

We feel justly aggrieved at the Constitution of the United States. Our objections to it are based on the broad principles of right, and they are bedded deep in the Word of God. We cannot swear that "We, the people," are supreme in this nation; for God says **we are not**. We cannot swear that man's law takes precedence over the law of God; for God says it **does not**. We cannot swear that there shall be "no religious test as a qualification for office," for God says there **shall be**. We cannot swear that laws ordering mails to be carried on the Sabbath, shall be executed; for God says they shall **not be**.

The Constitution should be amended in some such way as this: "In the name of God, Amen! We, the people of the United

States, acknowledging the authority of Almighty God, and the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations; bowing to His law as supreme, and accepting the true Christian religion, do ordain, etc., etc." \* \* \* Then the Christian can answer allegiance and not deny his King.

It is objected that a refusal to vote on the part of Christians would leave the Government in control of the worst element. A Dutch cavalry officer sent with his regiment to execute a certain work, was remonstrated with at a certain point in the undertaking that if he proceeded further, blood would be shed. His reply was befitting a soldier: "My business is to obey orders, not troubling myself about consequences." The Christian in "obeying divine orders" can safely trust affairs to a God who has never abdicated His throne or His prerogatives as King, and who, strange as it may seem to you, is able to administer the affairs of the world without your help.