

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—NO. 4.

APRIL, MDCCCLXIII.

ARTICLE I.

THE WAR OF THE SOUTH VINDICATED.

“Whatsoever,” saith the divine oracle, “is not of faith,” that is, whatever we do, as moral and responsible beings, that is not based upon a well-grounded conviction of its rectitude, “is sin.” Where there is a faithful and enlightened conscience, it will regard such conduct, whether it involves commission of what is wrong, or failure to do what is right, with self-condemnation; and the result of such a state of mind must be doubt, irresolution, and imbecility.

It is all-important, therefore, not only to act right, but to *know* that we are doing so, in order to do and to dare, to endeavor and to endure, to perform and to persevere in doing, all that, as men, we can achieve. A mind conscious of its sincerity of purpose, and of the righteousness of its desired end—of having a good cause, and justifiable means for its accomplishment—is essential to success. This alone

VOL. XV., NO. IV—61

ing. That, unlike all other sciences, it will ever be able to force conviction upon the unwilling mind, can hardly be expected. This has been done, and can be done, by no system of truth, not even by Christianity itself.

ARTICLE IV.

RELIGION AND POLITICS.

That religion and politics should be separated, the one wholly divorced from the other, is a popular fallacy so assiduously cultivated by a certain interested party, and so widely disseminated, that it may be justly termed one of Lord Bacon's "idols;" that is, an erroneous impression universally received as a self-evident proposition, without investigation or contradiction. Of the many popular fallacies that are generally afloat in society, there is perhaps none that is deeper rooted or more damaging in its effects than the one just stated. How it originated, and became so deeply implanted in the popular mind, it may be rather difficult to explain. It is, however, a modern notion. The records of the past do not recognize that absolute divorcement between religion and politics required by the fallacy in question; not certainly in Adam's immediate family, until the wicked Cain drew off and set up for himself; not in the family of Noah; not in that of Abraham, or his descendants; or even amongst the ancient pagans. Priests and kings were at first identical. The father was both priest and king of his family. The Roman Emperor was at the same time the Pontifex Maximus. The fact is,

the separation of religion and politics, as a cardinal maxim in the foundation and superstructure of civil society, is of recent growth, the birth of modern infidelity.

Here, perhaps, we shall be met with the objection, at first blush potent and irrefragable, that Christ and his apostles taught that "His kingdom is not of this world." True; but at the same time they taught, with equal explicitness, that the "kingdoms of this world should become the kingdoms of the Lord." Christ's kingdom is not of this world, because the world has apostatized and become anti-Christ. And the design of His kingdom is to bring it back to its lawful and divine allegiance. Nothing is more clearly and repeatedly announced by Christ and his apostles, than that Christ's kingdom is *aggressive*, and will be satisfied with nothing less than the conquest and subjugation of the whole world. The clear and manifest idea, therefore, contained in the declaration that "Christ's kingdom is not of this world," is, not that Christianity takes no interest in, and exerts no influence over the civil and political well-being of its followers and professors, but that the principles that govern Christ's kingdom are not to be confounded with, nor conformed to the principles that govern a wicked and apostatized world. The notion, therefore, that religion and politics should have nothing to do with one another, is of recent date; the birth, doubtless, of that monstrous triumph of infidelity and atheism developed in the French revolution, when priests and high church dignitaries were forced to renounce Christianity, in order to save their lives.

Again, this injurious error has been artfully and insidiously instilled into the popular mind, under the odious names of "priest-craft," of "jesuitism," of the "union of Church and State," etc.; names and epithets which, in this country at least, carry with them the ideas of hypocrisy, ambition, avarice, and spiritual despotism. But the union of Church and State is a very different thing from the union of religion and politics, as we shall see in the sequel.

In the next place, and more especially, this error has grown in the popular mind from the fact that, owing to an inexcusable negligence, if not a criminal indifference, on the part of religious people, political power has been allowed to slip, for the most part, into the hands of wicked men. This, we are aware, is a bold assertion, and perhaps may be deemed by some imprudent and rash; and did we not know it to be true, we should not venture it. It is true, that amongst the governors, legislators, and politicians of the land, there are a few noble exceptions—men of piety, and of prayer, and of great moral worth; (what would our state and national assemblies be without such salt?) ornaments in the house of God, as well as in the councils of State. But the sad part of it is, that they are the rare exceptions, and not the rule! Who does not know (we challenge contradiction) that, taking our rulers and politicians as a body, they are not godly, but godless men?—that some are blasphemers, some are gamblers, some are drunkards, some adulterers, some sabbath-breakers, and alas! some are all these characters in one? Who would not, in these days, be laughed to scorn, who should require, as a *sine qua non* in a candidate for office, that he be a good man, a man of prayer, “trusting in the Lord with all his heart, and leaning not unto his own understanding”? Every intelligent reader knows what is here affirmed to be true. No wonder, therefore, that unreflecting people should conclude that there is no natural connexion between religion and politics, when the majority of our rulers, and the character of our legislative bodies, is a practical demonstration of the fact. And alas! no wonder that the decided *tendency* of legislation, in many parts of the land, should be to overthrow Christianity, by undermining its principles, setting at naught its precepts, degrading its ministers, and thwarting its benevolent and charitable designs.

This is evinced, in the first place, in the enactment, by our national assemblies, of such laws as set aside the

obligations and sanctity of the Sabbath day; laws which require a very large number of government officials—all connected with the post-offices and the transmission of the mails—to violate the fourth commandment of the decalogue, and therefore indirectly exclude from that important department of the public service, where more, perhaps, than in any other, the influence of an enlightened and tender conscience is needed, all who endeavor consistently and conscientiously to live up to the spirit and precepts of the Christian religion.

This anti-Christian tendency is apparent, in the next place, in the enactment, in some States, of such laws as, in open defiance of the often repeated utterances of the Bible, abolish capital punishment—a device by which the murderer is protected, to the detriment of society.

Again, the same infidel spirit is manifested in some sections of the country, and especially in some of the southwestern States, by such legislation as interferes with and perverts that holy and divine institution, established by the Creator himself, in the garden of Eden, on the morning of man's creation, MARRIAGE between man and woman, constituting them "one flesh," in indissoluble bonds. Marriage is not a human, but a divine institution, as sacred and as intimate as that existing between Christ and his Church, which is his "bride." And yet, the laws of the land, in some parts of the country, degrade it virtually into a copartnership relation, entered into from prudential and economical considerations, just as any other business relation or political alliance is formed, with separate, and often antagonistic rights; and which relation may be, like other copartnership concerns, dissolved almost at will. We do not now refer to such legislation as ignores entirely the very existence of the marriage relation, as well as the parental, amongst a large class of human beings in our midst; but to those laws known in common parlance as "Woman's laws;" laws designed, it would seem, for the express pur-

pose of encouraging vice, villainy, and imbecility, on the part of the husband, by taking away all incentives to honor and high-toned responsibility in maintaining his wife in a condition at least equal to that which she enjoyed when she became his wife, and enabling him to run his career of dissipation and recklessness, without endangering her pecuniary interests. Nay, more, it is a device by which he can, with the appearance of wealth, swindle his neighbor, and then shield himself from the consequences of such villainy behind the ægis of the "Woman's law."

Such legislation brutalizes the holy estate of wedlock, perverts its true intent, violates its nature, and blasts many of its sweetest enjoyments. In many instances, it transforms it from an Eden of bliss, as it was designed by the beneficent Creator, to a bed of brambles and a home of discord. Man is the natural lord and protector of the woman; so proclaimed by the laws of nature, as well as the ordinances of revealed religion. Woman, according to the laws of God, is the complement of the man, and her temporal being is merged into his. Whatever, therefore, degrades the man, of necessity degrades the woman. Whatever disparages the father's authority, as the head of the family, injures the children. Whatever tends to make a man effeminate, or a woman masculine, degrades both. This is effectually accomplished by the "Woman's laws." It takes the crown from the head of the man, and places it upon that of the woman. The woman becomes the protector, and man the protected. He eats at her table, is clothed with her bounty, rides in her carriage, and has a life interest in her estate, in consideration of his being the *overseer* of her property. She can even sue him at law, and recover damages for mismanagement or malfeasance. Is it possible to conceive of any thing more unnatural, humiliating, and degrading than such a perversion? If there be upon the face of the earth one object more contemptible and disgusting than any other, it is this reversing of the

sexes, when the husband and the father lives by the sufferance of wife. But our object at this time and place is not to depict the evil consequences of the "Woman's law," but to allude to them as an illustration of the anti-biblical legislation of certain portions of the country.

Still further, and more insidiously, this bitter antagonism against Christianity, as developed in legislation, is illustrated by disfranchising ministers of the Gospel; depriving them of some of their political rights. This is done in several of the States, by such constitutional enactments as disqualify and prohibit ministers of the Gospel from occupying posts of honor and trust in the councils and executive department of the State. The question is not whether the "ambassadors of Christ," whose proper business it is to preach the Gospel, should come down from their high vocation, and become mixed up with party politics. The impropriety of this we shall discuss fully in the sequel. But the question is simply whether ministers of the Gospel have the *right* to participate in the making and the administering of the laws of the land, provided their fellow-citizens see fit to elect them for that purpose? In some of the States this right is wrested from them, and the dangerous precedent is established of depriving by legal enactments a certain portion of the free citizens of the land of their political rights, on account of their chosen and lawful profession. We term this a *dangerous* precedent; for if a party, or a faction in power, may deprive ministers of the Gospel of their political rights, another party or faction in power may, in like manner, and with like authority, disfranchise physicians, or lawyers, or planters, or printers, or merchants, or mechanics. The principle is the same in both instances. It is plain, therefore, that reason and justice have not guided in such despotic enactments, but feeling, hatred to religion itself. Who can not see that such legislation is a deadly thrust at the very vitals of Christianity? A minister of the Gospel is made an alien; nay,

more, he is reduced to the same level, so far as his political rights are concerned, with the felon, the traitor, the convict, who has forfeited his rights by being convicted of crime! Those who stood around the cross of Christ, and wagged their heads, crying "Crucify him, crucify him," did not manifest a more vindictive and anti-Christian spirit than is manifested by such despotic legislation. To blaspheme, to break the Sabbath, to drink liquor, to gamble, to commit adultery, to lie, to swindle, does not disqualify a citizen for a seat in the legislature of the State; but to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ does! Is it possible to conceive of any thing more inconsistent with the declared principles of our republican government, unjust, tyrannical, and cruel, than such a barefaced assault upon the Christian religion, in the persons of its ministers. Is it, or ought it to be, praiseworthy to occupy posts of honor and trust in the government of the land; and does not that legislation which disqualifies a minister of the Gospel for occupying such posts, *degrade* him? And is not its natural tendency to deter high-toned young men of talents and moral worth from taking into serious consideration their duty to enter the ministry, if they are to be proscribed by the State for so doing? Has not every free-born citizen civil and political rights, and is it not his privilege, according to the principles of our national government, to participate in those State councils where those rights and immunities are protected and defended? And are not ministers of the Gospel free, and equal with others? And have they not property, and families, and rights, to be defended and protected, as well as others? Are they not liable to taxation, and amenable to the laws of the land, and shall they be excluded by law from all participation in the ordaining and regulating of those laws by which they and their families are taxed and governed? The great cardinal principle which was the corner-stone upon which the fair fabric of our once glorious government was reared, and for the maintenance of which

our fathers fought, and bled, and died, was that we should *not* be taxed and ruled without the right to participate in the taxing and ruling power. And yet ministers of the Gospel, and only they, of all the professions and avocations in life, are, in certain States, taxed and ruled, and held amenable to the laws, while, at the same time, their right to take part in the enactment and the execution of those laws is wrested from them! Is it not in the highest degree unjust, therefore, to say nothing of its inconsistency with the principles of a free government, to single them out from every other calling and pursuit in life, and place them in the same category, so far as these political rights are concerned, with felons, convicts, and slaves?

How perfectly sickening it is to listen to the silly pretexts and subterfuges by which the authors and advocates of such legislation attempt to disguise their real motives and impious designs. "Ministers of the Gospel," says one, "ought not to turn aside from their holy avocation, and become mixed up with secular politics, since they by so doing diminish their ghostly influence, and bring reproach upon their sacred calling," etc. Admit it: but because a few mis-named ministers of the Gospel are unfaithful to their sacred trust, or rather have mistaken their proper calling, is that any just reason why the whole profession should be disfranchised, proscribed, and stigmatized? If other professions, the legal, the medical, the mercantile, etc., should be held responsible for the inconsistency and misconduct of some of their members, and proscribed in like manner, we apprehend that we would have to look exclusively to the idle and loafing class who have no profession for our legislators and rulers! But why stop short with prohibiting ministers of the Gospel from engaging in politics and legislation? Why do not these zealots for the consistency and immaculateness of the clergy, pass laws prohibiting them from engaging in other secular pursuits, equally damaging to their clerical standing and ghostly influence,

such as trading, speculating, swapping horses, writing novels, etc.? If they have the right to prohibit ministers of the Gospel from participating in one kind of secular pursuits, they have in another. Why, therefore, do these self-constituted censors of the clergy restrict the prohibition to politics? Is it because politics are more contaminating than all other secular pursuits? This surely does not imply much in favor of the virtue and moral integrity of politicians. The fact is, when we take into consideration the source from which this pretended zeal for the purity of the clerical profession emanates—the moral character of the men, for the most part, by whom ministers of the Gospel are disfranchised of their political rights—the plea in question sounds precisely like “Satan reproving sin!” It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that such tyrannical legislation proceeds, not from a zeal for the honor of religion, but from hatred to Christianity, and a jealousy of its ministers.

To regulate the moral character and ecclesiastical standing of ministers of the Gospel, is a matter that belongs not to the State, but to the Church—not to legislative assemblies, but to ecclesiastical courts. If the State may look after the standing of the ministers of the Gospel, as such, they may, with the same propriety, look after their faith and their ecclesiastical polity, which is an interference with the liberty of conscience; it is the virtual union of Church and State; it is undisguised Erastianism, since the legislature has just as much power, in religious matters, to say you shall, as to say, you shall not, and to inflict *positive* as well as *negative* penalties; they have just as much right to say, you shall not preach without gown and bands, as to say, you shall not have a seat in the legislature. In this particular, therefore, the legislature sets itself up to be the head of the Church, and the expounder of Christian duty.

Another attempts to justify this legislative discrimination against the civil and political rights of ministers of the

Gospel, by the plea, that "ministers are at the same time *exempted* from the performance of certain civil and military duties, such as working on the public highways, sitting on juries, and rendering military service." True, ministers, being *public* servants, are exempted in these particulars, not as a favor to them, but because the performance of such duties would often interfere with the faithful discharge of their own proper functions as public servants, such as visiting the sick, burying the dead, comforting the distressed, and attending to the moral and spiritual wants of the people. This plea might, at first blush, possess some speciousness, if other classes and professions were not also exempted from the rendering of the same services from like considerations. The physician, the judge, the district attorney, the court clerks, and other county and state officers are all exempted. Why not, therefore, for the same reason, deprive them, as well as ministers, of a portion of their political rights, by excluding them from posts of honor and trust in the legislative and executive departments of State? If there were the slightest force in the specious plea, it would be as applicable to the one profession as the other.

But still another frankly avows, that he has no use for rude and ignorant talking parsons in legislative bodies; that such, by their priestly influence at home, bring about their own election, and then consume the time of the legislature in everlastingly talking about matters that they do not understand; therefore, he is in favor of getting rid of such annoyance by constitutional bars and restraints. This is commendable candor, to say the least of it, for which we have far more respect, than for the hypocritical pretexts and subterfuges which we have already exposed. But, whilst we respect the candor of the plea, we have infinite contempt for its logic. In the first place, what reason or justice is there in placing a ban upon a whole profession, distinguished for its talent, learning, piety, and great moral worth, simply because an unworthy member of it, once in

a while, happens to get into the legislature? Why disfranchise such men as the great Dr. John Witherspoon and Dr. James Wilson, the brightest ornaments of the Continental Congress, because now and then a "babbling parson" out-talks a babbling pettifogger, and is elected by a free people to represent them in the legislature? Nay, why not discriminate against the babbling pettifogger, as well as against the babbling parson? Why not also exclude the babbling gambler, and drunkard, and demagogue, irrespective of class or profession? A legislative body has just as much right to exclude one as the other. Why, then, discriminate only against the clerical order? It is not only unjust in fact, but it is utterly inconsistent with, nay, subversive of the cardinal principles of a free government; since it would be very easy to show that the pushing of the practice complained of would soon result in the overthrow of a republican government, and in the establishment, first of an oligarchy, and next of an iron despotism. It is clearly manifest, therefore, that all these pleas in extenuation of the disfranchisement of ministers of the Gospel, as is characteristic of the constitutions of many of the States, resolve themselves into a secret antipathy to religion itself, and a covert design to sap the foundations of Christianity, by stigmatizing and degrading its ministers.

This tendency in legislation is further manifest in some States, (Mississippi, for example,) by such enactments as blast the fruits, and thwart the benevolent designs of Christianity. If we blast the choice fruits of a tree, what use shall we have for the tree itself—"why cumbereth it the ground?" The great and distinguishing feature of Christianity is *charity*, benevolence, "good will to men." Destroy this characteristic of the Christian religion, and you rob it of its chief glory; you efface from it the lineaments of its divine author. This is actually done by the existing laws of Mississippi, (Revised Code, page 302,) where it is made contrary to law for a dying Christian to

“will, devise, or bequeath,” one dollar to any Christian charity whatsoever! The statute aforesaid is drawn up with consummate adroitness, so as to defeat the possibility of the dying Christian leaving any thing for the advancement of the Christian religion amongst men. Take, for illustration, the following as a sample of the manner in which the law in question is skilfully and elaborately framed. After guarding most carefully against the possibility of allowing any real estate being left by will for charitable purposes, the law proceeds: “Every legacy, gift, or bequest of money or personal property, or of any interest, benefit, or use therein, contained in any last will and testament, or codicil, in favor of any religious or ecclesiastical corporation, sole or aggregate, or any religious or ecclesiastical society, or to any religious denomination or association, either for its own use or benefit, or for the purpose of being given or appropriated to charitable uses, shall be null and void, and the distributees shall take the same, as though no such testamentary disposition had been made.”

Yes, an infidel may leave by will as much as his hatred to religion dictates, for the publication and circulation of the blasphemies of Tom Paine; but the benevolent Christian can not leave a dollar to publish and circulate the Bible, or a religious tract! An Atheist may leave his entire estate to establish an infidel college, to corrupt the minds of youths, and poison the fountains of all genuine morality; but one actuated by Christian benevolence dare not leave a farthing to establish schools and institutions of learning under the influence of religious societies, and the Gospel of Christ! If there be any more effectual way of destroying Christianity, and banishing it from the land, we do not know what it is.

The only plea urged in justification of this odious law is, that “men ought to give in their life-time.” True, men ought to give in their life-time, and all their life long, as God prospers them; but how often is it the case that it is

impossible to give all that they wish to give until life is ended. Here, for example, is an old man living on the interest of twenty thousand dollars. He can not give away that capital during his life-time, for that would reduce him to beggary. His great desire is, that this fund, at his death, may go to establish a professorship in a theological seminary, or to educate poor young men for the ministry, or to sustain self-sacrificing missionaries who are toiling to Christianize and civilize our frontier borders; but in the State of Mississippi this can not be done! The business of another man is such, that he can not withdraw from it the capital necessary to its successful continuance, nor can he know, it may be, what will be the residue of his estate until the business of the firm is wound up; yet, in the State of Mississippi, he dare not make any religious charity his residuary legatee! It is not necessary to discuss any further this anti-Christian enactment. It is highly unjust and discreditable, in whatever aspect it may be viewed. It is not only contrary to the spirit, but to the example, set us in the Bible. Did not David leave by will the magnificent legacy out of the proceeds of which the great temple of God was built? Were not the vast majority of all the charitable institutions of Christendom founded in the same way?

It has been shrewdly intimated, in order to reconcile protestant denominations to this insidious encroachment upon their dearest rights—the rights of conscience—that the “Religious Law” was aimed against the Roman Catholics! This is simply ridiculous, since the adherents of the Romish faith are, where the law exists, in an exceedingly small minority, in comparison with the entire population of the State; and it is perfectly certain that, from the force of circumstances, they will never increase in the State to any great extent. But this flimsy subterfuge does not help the matter in the least; it only makes it worse. It would imply that the authors of such proscriptive enactments were impelled by a low, narrow bigotry, as hostile to the princi-

ples of freedom as it is to the liberty of conscience. Is it not one of the great and distinguishing principles of our boasted government, that "the liberty of conscience" shall not be interfered with? And is it not another cardinal principle of republican liberty, that no sect of Christians shall be proscribed for their faith? Consequently, if this law was secretly aimed, as pretended, against the Catholics, then it is anti-republican and despotic. But if it was levelled against all Christians alike, which is the true state of the case, then it violates the great principle of the liberty of conscience; and not only liberty of conscience, but liberty of judgment, civil liberty itself; for has not a man a right to do as he pleases with his own honestly earned money, provided he does not interfere with the rights of his neighbor?

That which lay at the foundation of the ordaining of this odious law, the secret and impelling motive to its enactment and adoption, was the presumption, not that Christians would, of their own accord, bequeath too liberally of their goods for purposes of Christian benevolence, but that ministers of the Gospel would avail themselves of the influence which they might acquire over the minds of men *in extremis*, to induce them to *devote* an undue proportion of their estate for the benefit of the church and clergy. What is this but a covert stab at the character and moral influence of ministers of the Gospel? It is based on the presumption, either that they are not honest men, or that they are fanatics—that they are either knaves or fools! Its tendency, therefore, is to destroy confidence in the ministers of religion, than which there is not a more effectual way to dethrone Christianity in the minds of the people.

We have thus, at some length, illustrated the anti-Christian *tendency* of the legislation of different portions of our country, as a proof of the irreligious character of many of our rulers and law-makers. It is no marvel, therefore, in view of the foregoing facts and considerations, that unre-

flecting people should conclude that there was no natural connexion between religion and politics, whilst the moral character and work of so many of our politicians is a practical demonstration of the same.

Having now explained, in part, the origin of the popular fallacy that religion and politics should be divorced, the one having nothing to do with the other, we shall next proceed to show its falsity, and point out the injurious and dangerous results to which it legitimately leads.

It takes it for granted that man's true temporal interests and his eternal welfare are incongruous, or rather, that they are diametrically opposed; whereas, in truth, they are, in a certain sense, identical. "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." Politics are to religion what the body is to the soul. A sound body is essential to the facile and successful operations of a sound mind. There is an intimate relation between them. The health of the one is essential to the health of the other; and the disease of the one operates injuriously upon the other. Hence the interests of the one are, to a certain extent, the interests of the other. The same is true in relation to religion and politics. The one is, as it were, the soul, the other the body. Religion is the spiritual, and society the physical part of the State. So that there would be as much propriety in putting asunder the interests of the soul and body of an individual, as religion and politics in a State. The supposition that man's temporal and eternal interests are antagonistic, takes it for granted that man's nature is not in harmony with itself; that his constitution combines rival interests and adverse claims; that what is for the advantage of the body, that is, his personal welfare in his business and social relations, is to the disadvantage of the soul; and that man, as a whole, is composed of discordant, jarring elements; than which nothing can be farther from the truth, or more de-

rogatory to the goodness and wisdom of the Creator. On the contrary, God, in His beneficence, has so constituted man, and so circumstanced him in this world, that all his true interests, both temporal and eternal, run parallel one with the other; or rather flow in the same channel. There is not one interest pertaining exclusively to time, and another exclusively to eternity; but they are, if not identical, yet inseparable. "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things," (viz., true temporal interests,) "shall be added unto you." Time is no other than the beginning of eternity, as childhood is the beginning of life. As, therefore, we can not separate the true interests of childhood from those of mature life, no more can we separate the interests of this life from that which is to come. Eternity is time drawn out. If these views be correct, then it will be impossible to divorce religion and politics, except on the supposition that the latter (so called) do not contribute to the true interests of humanity. If by politics we are to understand that system of arts and devices—that chicanery and machination by which usurpers overthrow the liberties of the people—by which despots maintain their iron grasp upon the necks of their victims—by which tyrants absorb the blood and substance of their slaves—by which a corrupt party keeps in power, and fattens upon the government spoils—by which a faction swells its numbers and increases its power—and by which an ambitious and unprincipled demagogue blinds the people, seduces them from their own true interests, and inspires them with *furor* in favor of a party, irrespective of patriotic principles—if *this* be what is meant by politics, then, of course, true religion can have no fellowship whatever with it, any more than "righteousness with unrighteousness," or than "light with darkness," or than "Christ with Belial." But whilst we are constrained to admit that this is a fair description of what the world calls politics, yet it is a misnomer in fact, and deserves not so honorable an

appellation. The science of politics, properly so called, defines the theory and practice of legally controlling the business pursuits and social relations of society, so as to develop humanity as God made it; and consequently to produce the greatest amount of general well-being. When, therefore, we take into consideration the true nature of man as a physical, moral, intellectual, and religious being, it would be difficult to separate true religion and true politics, since the domain of each trenches upon the other; nay, they are, in a certain sense, almost identical, except that religion is more comprehensive than politics, the greater including the less. The moral law is the foundation of religion; the second table of the moral law, the foundation of politics. Politics are concerned about human relations; religion, about both divine and human. Politics look after the body; religion, after both soul and body. Politics inculcate love to our neighbor; religion, love to God and our neighbor. The grand design of politics is to develop the good and suppress the bad in humanity, to the advantage of the State. Religion does the same thing, to the advantage of the individual, the component element of the State. Strictly speaking, the State is but the individual multiplied. Or more properly, the State is the family enlarged. So that whatever is for the true interest of the individual or the family, becomes, *mutatis mutandis*, the true interest of the State. It follows, therefore, that if religion and business may be united in the individual, and religion and domestic government in the family, so, on the same principles, religion and politics should be united in the government of the State. The popular fallacy, therefore, which would dis sever religion from politics, would, on the same principles, divorce it from every pursuit, calling, and relation in life, except what is called "divine worship" in the sanctuary. This is wholly contrary to the teachings of the Bible, which clearly set forth the idea that religion is to be mixed up with all that we do, say, think,

and feel; "in that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD." So that whatever we do, "whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we are to do all to the glory of God." Nay, more, the Bible teaches that the principles of the world are to be changed and conformed to the principles of religion; and that the kingdoms of the world are to become the kingdoms of Christ; when kings and queens shall be "nursing fathers and nursing mothers" to the Church. This, surely, does not look as though politics were to be divorced from religion. It is the confident expectation of Christians, that the principles of Christianity, hitherto triumphant, will finally prevail over the whole world, and embrace the entire family of man. This glorious vision of the future is called, in homiletic language, the "*millenium*." Then, of course, there can be no separation between religion and politics. And if not *then*, there should not be *now*, since the principles that will characterize and predominate in the millennial state, are the very same that are at work now in bringing it about. It is a great mistake to suppose that one kind of principles will work in bringing about the millenium, and another kind will predominate during the millenium. This would be to imagine that like effects were not produced by like causes! Consequently, if religion and politics will be necessarily and legitimately united during the millennial state, they are, and must of necessity be, united in bringing it about.

The popular dogma that takes it for granted that religion and politics should be divorced, is owing in part to the mistaken supposition that there is an intrinsic incongruity between the two; that both are necessary; that both are right; and that both are opposed to one another; which is absurd. Two truths can not be opposed the one to the other; no more can two things that are intrinsically right. Wherever there is antagonism, there is error on one side or the other, or both. The reason why religion and exist-

ing politics are incongruous, is that politics are wrong, based upon unholy principles, and promulgated by unholy men. Hence, this being true, it would be exceedingly unbecoming for good men, and especially the professed "ambassadors of Christ," to "come down" and conform themselves to, and become mixed up with wicked, worldly politics. Nothing so much disparages the usefulness, and tarnishes the honor of a minister, or a professor of religion. So that if the question were whether ministers of the Gospel should participate in party politics, in the popular acceptation of that term, and turn the pulpit into a rostrum, and the house of God into an arena for the discussion of subjects purely political; or even whether private Christians should be mixed up with the clamorous zeal amongst the followers of partisan demagogues; (alas! as too many are;) then there could be no dispute on the subject; since there is not a more contemptible—perhaps it would be more appropriate to say *lamentable*—spectacle in the world, than to see a so-called minister of the Gospel, a professed "ambassador of the Lord Jesus Christ," "come down" from his "great work," don the garb of the politician, and participate in the rough-and-tumble conflict of contaminating party politics! Nay, is it not a just cause of grief to the true child of God, or even to one penetrated with a just sense of decency and good taste, to witness the ambassador of the court of heaven, clothed with a delegated character none other than that of the Lord Jesus Christ, participate with fervor in wordly affairs of any kind, whether civil or military? Would we not be horrified, nay, would not the very conception itself be blasphemous, to imagine the Lord Jesus Christ on earth, girt with sword, and sporting a military cap and feathers? Or even the pugnacious Peter, after he was imbued with the spirit and graces of an apostle, at the head of a band of soldiers, gallantly leading them to mortal conflict? How low the character of Saint Paul would instantly sink in the estimation of the world, could

we conceive of him in the Agora of Athens, making a furious speech on the subject of party politics! If, therefore, the question were whether ministers of the Gospel, and the meek and humble followers of Christ, should condescend from their exalted station, the highest and most revered in the world, and turn aside from their sacred calling to become followers of demagogues and participants in the devious ways and infamous practices of party politics, it would be idle, nay, ridiculous, to discuss it. And yet, with sadness unfeigned, and deep mortification, we are constrained to confess that there are not a few so-called ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ who have brought dishonor upon themselves and shame upon their profession, by bounding into the arena of secular politics, and engaging fiercely in party strife; whilst multitudes of the professed followers of Him "who strove not, neither was His voice heard in the streets," encouraged, if not emboldened, by the clerical examples, glory in being hangers-on of corrupt and unprincipled demagogues, coming at their beck and call, and bowing submissively to their every command! Let every such hybrid minister of the Gospel, every reverend, and honorable and reverend, and gallant "ambassador of Christ," be assured that they gain nothing worth having by their double and abnormal character. They lose the confidence of the good, and the respect of the bad. The wicked rabble, delighted more by their degradation than pleased with their partisanship, will huzza to their faces, and curse behind their backs! So that a minister of the Gospel, participating with zeal in secular and worldly affairs, scarcely ever fails to sink below the common level of the secular class with which he identifies himself. We earnestly hope that the time is not far distant, when provision will be made, in our branch of the Church, at least, for the voluntary or forcible demission of the holy office of the ministry, by all who give unmistakable evidence that they have mistaken their calling.

It is with sincere sorrow that we have felt constrained to make the foregoing remarks. We have not been insensible to a painful struggle going on in our own bosom between personal friendship on the one part, and a sense of duty on the other—tenderness for the feelings of some of our ministerial brethren, who have allowed themselves to be drawn into the great whirlpool of purely worldly affairs, and an uncompromising allegiance to Him whose “kingdom is not of this world.” But, however sorely tempted, we dare not expunge what has been written, in order to save the feelings of some of our excellent, but misguided brethren. “He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me.”

But whilst we inveigh most zealously and emphatically against ministers of the Gospel condescending to participate in party politics, and can not but regard the “ambassadors of Christ” as decidedly out of place, (except in some very rare instances,) seated in a legislative hall, or occupying a position other than that of chaplain in the army or navy, yet we are equally earnest in opposing the popular and injurious fallacy that would divorce religion from politics. It seems never to have come into the mind of the advocates of the false theory which we are combating, that Christianity is essentially aggressive in its nature—that its tendency is to impregnate all that belongs to humanity with its own principles—all worship, all science, all art, all legislation, all commerce, all business, all amusements, all pleasure, so that whatever we do, we shall do all for the glory of God: that it can make no compromise with the world; that it rejects with scorn a niche in the pantheon; that its avowed aim is to overthrow every institution of degenerate man that is not in harmony with itself; that its sceptre is destined to rule over all other sceptres, and its kingdom to swallow up all other kingdoms! Consequently Christianity, according to the teach-

ing of its founders, and the faith and hope of all its true disciples, is, in due time, to become the law of the whole world! Then, of course, there can be no disseverance between religion and politics.

But it is of the utmost importance to have correct views as to *how* Christianity is to achieve this glorious triumph, and as to the *manner* in which the Church and people of God are to exercise a controlling influence over politics, as over all other human pursuits and relations. It is not by being conformed to the world as it is, but by transforming the world to Christ; not by a union of Church and State in formal bands, any more than by a union of church and commerce, the church and manufactures, or church and law, or medicine, or any other calling or pursuit in life, but by transfusing the principles and spirit of the Gospel into politics, governing, law-making, and every other lawful employment of mankind. This accords with the explicit teachings of the Scriptures in delineating the NATURE and DESIGN of the organized Church of God, and the true MISSION of Christians in the world.

As to the *nature* of the Church, it is wholly and exclusively a divine institution. It is to represent, not the world, but God; it is to reflect, not the sentiments of earth, but of heaven; it is to be the exponent, not of unsanctified public opinion, but of the Bible; it is to derive its authority, not from human government, or the laws of man, but from the revealed laws of God. Consequently, the Church of God can, in no possible sense or degree, be a world-representative institution. It is intended by its Founder to be wholly separate and distinct from the world. The Church is the "Lamb's wife;" and as man and wife are declared by divine law to be one, as Christ and His Church are one, therefore it is impossible for the Church, as the pure and faithful bride of Christ, in any sense to represent the world. Christ is the "head;" the Church is the "body," and as the head and

its several members are one body, so Christ and His Church are one, and separated from the rudiments of the world; as the vine and its branches are in unity, so Christ and His disciples are indissoluble.

And what is true of the Church collectively, is equally and necessarily true of the Church in its constituent elements. Its duly qualified ministers and members are required to present themselves a "living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is their reasonable service," and not to be "conformed to this world, but to be transformed by the renewing of their mind, that they may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." The ministers and members of the Church can not, as such, be representative men, except as they represent God. Every true minister of the Church is an "ambassador of God," which is the most exalted office under heaven, because he represents not man, but God—not the governments of earth, but the court of heaven. And each and every member of the Church, however humble and obscure, represents God. Consequently, as the world lies in wickedness there can be no consistent fellowship between the Church and the world: "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world; therefore the world hateth you." It is clearly manifest, therefore, from these and like utterances of God's word, that it is impossible for the faithful and fearless "ambassador of God," and the consistent and persevering member of Christ's Church, to do their whole duty without coming in collision with and increasing the enmity of the world; "yea and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

We conclude, then, that the Church, whilst it may be encumbered with many errors and defects, which weaken its power and detract from its glory, yet in its essential

nature, it is wholly separate and distinct from the world; and that, consequently, for the Church to succumb to the world, to conform to its principles, or reflect in any degree its character, is not only without warrant from the word of God, but a perversion of its own intrinsic and essential nature.

In the next place, as to the DESIGN of setting up an organized Church, whilst it becomes incidentally a *fold* into which the people of God may be gathered for their individual instruction, comfort, and safety, yet it is mainly intended to be an *aggressive agency*. It is set up in the world to teach the world, to reform the world, and to bring the world back to its allegiance to God. It is to lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes, until the whole world shall be embraced within its pale. It is to be a city set on a hill, that can not be hid; a light upon a candlestick that giveth light to all that are in the house. True religion, vital godliness, is not designed to be locked up in the bosom, like a jewel in a casket, for the secret and isolated enjoyment of the individual; but it is to be a pungent, active, and self-diffusing principle, a "light," a "salt," a "leaven," a "grain of mustard seed," multiplying, increasing, diffusing itself until the whole world is evangelized.

It is evident, therefore, from the Scriptures, that the Church is aggressive in its design, and that the true mission of the people of God, both in their organized and individual capacity, is to enlighten the world, mould public sentiment in accordance with the word of God, and thus win the world to Christ.

As to the lawful instrumentalities of the Church in making the spiritual conquest of the world, we state in the outset that, "though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of

strong-holds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." The aggressive agencies of the Church are such as make conquest of the "thoughts," the "imaginings," the minds and souls of men, and not of their bodies.

The Bible in its various utterances proclaims the final triumph of the Gospel, and reason and providence corroborate the same; but, it is all important to guard against error as to *how* this glorious result is to be effected. We must not, in order to evade responsibility, and excuse ourselves for doing little or nothing, lean upon any other agency, or trust to any other instrumentality, than that pointed out in the Bible. We must not sit still and imagine that the world is to be converted by *miracle*, or by what may be termed marvellous and extraordinary providences. This is not only *error*, but pestiferous error; since it cripples the very means designed by God to accomplish this end, the active instrumentality of Christians. There is no doctrine more clearly taught in the word of God than that the Gospel is to be spread, and the world evangelized, by the instrumentality of Christians. Vain is the hope, and groundless the delusion of such as imagine that the world can be reclaimed to God by any or all the so-called civilizing agencies that have been and are influential in developing and cultivating mankind. Such may prove valuable helps, efficient handmaids of the Gospel, but are powerless in regenerating the *hearts* of sinful men, and bringing them into subjection to Christ. Nay, it is absurd to look to worldly institutions to remove sin, and to reform the moral evils that afflict fallen humanity. Worldly institutions, however much they may contribute to alleviate the mere physical ills that flesh is heir to, yet are unable to regenerate the world, and to bring it back to God. They, of

necessity, represent the world as it is, reflect the sentiment of the world, and are "of the earth, earthy;" consequently, as the stream can not rise higher than the fountain, nor a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit, the institutions of the world, even the wisest and the best, can not do more than represent the world; they are *sample* institutions; they reflect the world with all its evils. We have no warrant, therefore, either in Scripture, or reason, or the history of the past, for expecting the world to regenerate itself. Nor is this great consummation to be expected by miracle, in the strict sense of that word, except as God's glorious providence, and the operations of His Holy Spirit, in answer to the prayers and efforts of Christians, are a standing and a constant miracle; a miracle that is effective in encouraging and stimulating, instead of retarding Christian activity. In all the teaching, both of the Saviour and His apostles, the idea is prominently set forth that the kingdom of God is to be built up in the world by the people of God. They are commanded to "preach the Gospel to every creature." "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another." "For we are laborers together with God."

Since, therefore, it is TRUTH, and the MORAL INFLUENCE of Christians, (that is, the power they exert when acting in accordance with truth,) that is blessed by God to the conversion of sinners, and the reformation of the evils that are in the world, it follows that every one is not only bound, but encouraged to speak the TRUTH, and set the EXAMPLE in accordance with it, which God has promised to make efficacious in the advancement of His kingdom. Moral power is the most potent of all powers; it is a power not brutal, not physical, not natural, not intellectual merely, but it is a power whose ingredients are *faith* and *virtue*. It is truth, or that which is supposed to be truth, that constitutes the essence of moral power; and

when presented to the comprehension of others, is just as efficacious in the hands of one as another. This being true, it follows that every individual in the possession of truth, it matters not what his rank or station in life may be, possesses the essence of moral power; and consequently, must be held responsible for the use he makes of it; power goes with the truth. Here, then, is encouragement for the humblest Christian to speak the truth. Our vocation is that of *truth-telling*. The diffusion of truth is all that God requires of us towards advancing His kingdom in the world. If we will sow the seed, He will take care of it. "His word shall not return unto Him void."

Therefore we conclude, as the great province of the organized Church of God, and the great mission of its constituent membership, is to speak the truth—preach the Gospel, proclaim the law of God, "whether men will hear or whether they will forbear"—accompanied by a consistent walk and conversation; that this is the chief, if not the only instrumentality that the Spirit of God uses in the conversion of sinners and evangelizing the world.

It legitimately follows from what has been said, *first*, that the Church and people of God are responsible for the removal of the moral evils that are in the world, and for the final triumph of the Gospel; *second*, that this is to be effected, not by falling into the ways of the world, grasping the reins of government, and seizing the civil sceptre, but simply by proclaiming the truth—teaching kings and governors, rulers and the ruled, their duty—and, as the ambassadors of God, to speak with the authority of God; *third*, that they are not, from a carnal or timid policy, to *wait* until the popular sentiment becomes right in relation to the evils that are abroad, before they attempt to set it right. This would be to expect an end without the use of the appointed and appropriate means; to look for an effect, without the natural cause. No; the very design of the organized Church, as we have seen, is to teach the world, to

enlighten the world, and to mould public sentiment in accordance with the laws of God, and thus win the world to Christ. "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?" And *fourth*, this is to be effected in all popular governments, not by petitioning legislative bodies or executive departments, and thereby forcing legislation in advance of popular sentiment. This results in no good, but much evil, since, in popular governments like our own, legislative enactments, unless they reflect the sentiment of the people, are of no permanent force. Moreover, and more especially, for the organized Church of God, and the ambassadors of Christ, in their official capacity, to send up humble petitions to kings and governors, and legislative bodies, is inappropriate and degrading. God would not *petition* a king or a law-maker to do right; no more should His ambassadors. Jesus Christ did not humbly *request* the rulers of the earth to refrain from doing wrong; no more can His "bride," which is the Church. It is not the part or province of the ambassadors of God, or the Church of Christ in its organized capacity, to knock at the door of legislative bodies, and hand in their petitions, begging them to enact laws in accordance with the word of God, and to rescind such as are contrary to it. They might command despots, as the ancient prophets did, in the name of the Lord God; but, in popular governments, their whole and sole duty is with the *people*, who alone are the responsible sovereigns and law-makers—it is to tell them the truth, teach them, and thereby mould public sentiment, which is law, in accordance with the revealed word of God. Then legislation, and all other things pertaining to social relations, will come right of themselves, as a natural consequence. This moulding of public sentiment in accordance with righteousness, is the legitimate province of the Church and people of God; and is accomplished simply by TELLING THE TRUTH, the whole truth, plainly, fearlessly, boldly, kindly, earnestly, perseveringly; giving line upon line, and

precept upon precept, here a little and there a little; unflinchingly, unceasingly, until the strong-holds of error are undermined, and the bulwarks of wickedness are overthrown. Every one that has the truth is armed with moral power, and is bound to wield it. Every man is responsible for the trust committed to him, and there can be no possible justification, or even excuse, for his abusing this trust, burying his talent. The day of reckoning will surely come, when every one to whom has been committed the truth must give an account of his stewardship.

The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible, that the grand design of setting up an organized Church in the world, and the great mission of the Christian, is, by the zealous and active diffusion of light and knowledge, and moral and evangelical influences, to reform the world, and to bring it into complete subjection to Christ, until "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of the Lord." Consequently it is not only the privilege, but it is the duty of the Christian, whatever may be his standing, to endeavor, by all lawful means, to impregnate every profession, calling, and pursuit in life, with the principles of religion.

Few, perhaps, will deny the right and the obligations of the Christian to transfuse the principles of the Gospel into commerce, trade, and the business pursuits of life. They will grant that he may endeavor to Christianize literature, science, and art, because of the influence which they exert upon the minds and morals of men. Much more is it his duty to endeavor, with all his might, to evangelize politics, since there is nothing in the whole range of human pursuits that exerts half so powerful an influence upon popular sentiment. So tremendous is this influence, that the terms *unlawful* and *immoral* have become, in the minds of unreflecting people, synonymous! To pronounce an act contrary to law, is regarded by many as the same thing as pronouncing it morally wrong. Consequently, in the minds of multitudes, the standard of moral right and wrong is

not the table of the ten commandments, or the precepts of the Gospel, but the civil code. Is not this ascendancy of politics over the Gospel, in its influence upon the moral sentiments of men, a most startling consideration, well calculated to excite the fears, and arouse the listless energies of all Christians who will but seriously reflect on the danger? In our opinion, there is nothing, not even the solemn worship of the sanctuary, so potent in moulding the tastes, opinions, and characters of men, as politics; from the fact, in the first place, that but few wait on the sanctuary, in comparison with the multitudes that crowd the hustings; in the next place, the faithful dispensations of an evangelical pulpit are adverse to the natural taste of unregenerate men, whilst those of the stump and the forum are in harmony with it. In addition to this, governors, legislators, and such as are elected to posts of power and trust in the State, whatever may be their moral character, are, for the most part, men of energy and talent, combining in one both moral and political power: so that, even should they fail to convince the understanding, they can compel the action, even in matters the most adverse to Christian duty, (as illustrated in the case of the Mississippi religious law, already discussed in this article,) until obedience becomes the established custom. And the whole history of the race, in every age and clime, testifies to the fact, that *custom* soon becomes the test of right and wrong in the estimation of the populace. Indeed, there is no wickedness so vile that custom, sustained by legislative and political power, will not justify in the minds of the ignorant. Tremendous, therefore, is the moral influence of political power, because it can establish *custom*; and custom becomes the popular standard of moral conduct. Moreover, and especially, political power, in popular governments, is intensified by the fact that it is *delegated*; it emanates from the people, and therefore its reflex influence, in a moral point of view, is much greater than that which flows from a monarchy or a

despotism. Hence there is no influence on earth so potent in moulding the minds and characters of men for good or evil, as that emanating from political sources. Christianity has no greater enemy, or more efficient friend, than may be found in politics and legislation. In nothing is the antagonism between the Christian religion and the world more manifest; whilst, at the same time, there is nothing that exerts so fearful an influence upon human opinions and practice. This being true, it would be a monstrous conclusion to suppose that religion should not endeavor to transform into congeniality with itself that which may become, and of necessity must become, either its greatest friend or its most terrible enemy. Nay, Christianity, as a radiant light, as a pungent "salt," as a diffused "leaven," is, as we have seen, necessarily aggressive in its nature; its tendency is to impregnate all that belongs to humanity with its spirit and principles; consequently it is not left to the mere discretion of the Church and the people of God, whether they will endeavor to christianize politics or not; they are bound to the utmost extent of their ability, to cast the "leaven" into that fermenting mass, so as to impart to it its own properties, and transform it into an engine for the advancement of Christ's kingdom.

Since, therefore, politics, in legislation and government, is an engine of such fearful power, in its moral influence over the minds of men, it is of transcendent importance that they be thoroughly imbued with the principles and spirit of Christianity. But by *whom* is it to be done? Who is responsible for this great transformation? Surely we can not expect godless and wicked men to transfuse into politics the principles of the Gospel. This is a moral absurdity. It would be to expect a bitter fountain to send forth sweet waters; a corrupt tree to bring forth good fruit. The inference is plain, that this is to be done by religious people; they are bound to look with a jealous interest after politics and government, and

to use all their efforts to bring this mighty agency for good or evil into complete subjection to the Gospel.

Let it be granted, therefore, that it is not only the privilege, but the *right*; not only the right, but the bounden *duty*; of the Church and people of God, to do all that in them lies to exercise a controlling influence over the politics of the world.. It is their privilege, because the fact of being a Christian does in no possible manner or degree disqualify them for taking an active part in civil government. It is their *right*, because they, as free citizens, are a constituent part of the body politic, possessing the same interests and immunities in society with others. It is their *duty*, because they are divinely commissioned to evangelize the world, and therefore to bring all the agencies by which the opinions and characters of men are formed under the influence of Christianity. It only remains for us, in the further discussion of this subject, to investigate the manner in which Christians, in their organized and individual capacity, are to infuse into legislation and politics the holy principles and benign spirit of the Christian religion.

In the first place, it is very clear, from what has been said relative to the true nature and design of the organized Church, that, as such, it has no right or authority to administer civil government, or to participate in any respect whatever in purely secular affairs: that it is a depository of divine truth, from which religion and moral instruction only are to be dispensed: that the Church, as the peerless bride of Christ, is not allowed to petition kings and governors, and legislative bodies, to do right, and to refrain from doing wrong. This would be inappropriate and degrading. She may command, but not beg, in the name of the Lord God. The Church may not, in its organized capacity, engage in or even recommend, by way of deliverance, any worldly pursuit, calling, or enterprise whatever; not even the most philanthropic and civilizing, such as colonization, scientific discovery, asylums, nor even the

education of youth, except as one of the means of dispensing religious knowledge. All these enterprises are noble and praiseworthy, and may be engaged in by Christians, as the legitimate fruits of the benign and humanizing effects of Christianity upon their hearts; but they do not come properly within the province of the organized Church of God. But it is the prerogative and the duty of the Church, in its collective capacity, as the great depository of divine truth, and the great fortress of moral and religious influences, to *testify* in favor of virtue and against vice, and to make deliverances touching moral and religious truth and practice. When, therefore, the State trenches upon Christian morals, and politics invade the rightful domain of the Church, then it is not only the privilege, but the *duty* of the Church to lift up her voice on high, and in the name and by the authority of God, to proclaim the divine law on the subject. This will embrace a much wider field than many, without reflection, would imagine. It not only embraces the moral law, as contained in the decalogue, but the whole scope of Christian ethics, as promulgated in the New Testament. It includes the moral obligations growing out of the various relations of society; such as ruler and subject, husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant, friend and neighbor, pastor and people. In fact, the moral domain of the Church, in which it is altogether proper and right for her to make deliverances, includes a very large portion of the field embraced (whether rightfully or not we shall not now debate) by politics, so that it is both the right and the duty of the Church to watch with a jealous eye the encroachments of the State, and in her organized capacity to *testify* against all iniquitous legislation. Farther than this, she can not go; with less than this, she dare not rest satisfied. The Church of God, in its simplicity and purity, is, in a moral point of view, the highest and most authoritative institution in the world, and to it the

world must look for wisdom and guidance on all moral and religious subjects.

In the next place, ministers of the Gospel, as the ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ, are bound, equally with the organized Church, to dispense divine truth, and testify against sin and iniquity in every form and shape; with this difference, that the Church, from the necessity of the case, testifies at long intervals of time; and possibly one deliverance on any one subject, on the part of the Church collectively, is sufficient, as its utterance is intended to be a guide and authority, not only for the people, but mainly for the ministers; whilst the ambassadors of Christ, in imitation of the apostles and prophets of old, are bound to cry aloud and spare not, give line upon line, and precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, without intermission or cessation. As "watchmen upon the walls of Zion," they are bound to give the alarm, whenever they detect the approach of danger, and to repeat the alarm as long as the danger exists. It is the inexorable duty of the ambassador of Christ, faithfully and fearlessly to oppose iniquity in every disguise it may put on. Vicious politics, unrighteous legislation, come just as much within the purview of a minister's animadversion as vice any where else. Iniquity in "high places" must not be winked at, any more than iniquity in low places. It was the peculiar prerogative of the prophets of old to denounce judgments upon kings. In like manner, it is the inflexible duty of the ambassadors of Christ to tell the rulers of the earth their duty. When, therefore, politicians insidiously instill infidelity into legislation, and when they impinge upon the domain of Christian morals, or dare to interfere with the right of conscience, it is not only the privilege, but the duty of ministers of the Gospel, as faithful and fearless "watchmen unto the house of Israel," to expose the danger and to denounce the iniquity.

How sadly do ministers mistake, or rather consciously shrink from the discharge of their duty on these and kindred subjects! The fear of coming in collision with what he supposes (and often erroneously) to be public sentiment, and dread of incurring the enmity of some individual or family of standing in society, on whom, it may be, he is in part dependent for his bread, cause him, the ambassador of God, to cower before the face of a man. Alas! what a monstrous spectacle! What a hideous perversion, when those who claim to be clothed with the delegated authority of "the Son of God," bow to a vitiated public sentiment, or quail in the presence of a sinful mortal! What! is the profession of the holy ministry nothing but a bread-making calling, as we fear many regard it? and are preachers of the Gospel to regard themselves as representative men, reflecting public opinion, instead of opposing it, controlling it, moulding it, in accordance with the principles of Christianity? Let all such—and sad to tell, their number is multitudinous—reëxamine, in the light of the teaching of the Saviour and the practice of the apostles, their claims to be the ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ. Moral courage should be made an indispensable qualification in a candidate for the Gospel ministry. Let all timid and faint-hearted ministers of the Gospel remember that their sole duty consists in telling the truth; proclaiming the divine law; nothing more; nothing less: not in their own *name*, or by their own *authority*, but in the name and by the authority of the Lord God. The world is prone to regard the message from the pulpit as the message of the *man*. But see to it that they receive it as the message of God. Then your duty is done, God will take care of His word; it shall not return unto Him void. "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dis-

mayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest."

But whilst it is the duty of the organized Church of God, and of the ambassadors of Christ in their official capacity, to *testify* on all subjects pertaining to Christian faith and practice, and to proclaim the law of God in favor of virtue and against vice, in all the pursuits, callings, and relations in life, which of course includes politics and legislation wherever and whenever they overlap the province of Christian morals, yet the duty of the private Christian does not stop here. He is bound to regard with an active interest so mighty an agency for good or evil as politics, and see to it that it slips not into the exclusive control of wicked men. Here, in this particular, moral and religious people have committed a very grave error. They have slept whilst the enemy sowed the tares. They have stood silently and idly by, and have allowed this greatest of all merely human instrumentalities for effecting good or evil to pass without a struggle into the hands of men, the majority of whom make no pretension to vital godliness, nay, rather glory in the fact that they are not governed by the principles of Christianity; influenced in part by the fallacy, the futility of which we have already attempted to expose, and which their own conduct has not a little contributed towards establishing, and in part by the criminal disinclination, as contrary to the precepts of the Gospel as it is to the best interests of society, to enter the lists and lift the arm of antagonism against the railing opposition of irreligious men. Thus this tremendous power has, contrary to the design of the Gospel, been allowed to be usurped by men not only devoid of the spirit, but hostile to the principles of Christianity.

The Holy Scriptures teach explicitly that civil government is ordained by the authority of God: "For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of

God." "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto the governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do well." The fact, therefore, that civil government is "ordained of God," is evidence that it is not the intent of the Scriptures that it shall be administered by wicked men, but by God-fearing men. He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. "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." The injunction to pray for kings and all that are in authority implies that rulers are to be ministers of God for righteousness: they are to "judge not for man, but for the Lord." At the same time the Scriptures are equally explicit in warning against the elevation of bad men to power; "The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted." "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law." "As a roaring lion and a ranging bear, so is a wicked ruler over the poor people." "When the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn."

But why quote Scripture in proof, when the whole history of the past demonstrates the fact that the rule of wicked men never fails to result sooner or later in national misery and ruin? Nay, why even appeal to history, when the *a priori* deductions of reason itself will show that wicked men are not qualified to administer civil government in that way which will develop humanity in the line that the Creator designed it to be developed in, and result in the general diffusion of the greatest amount of human happiness? It will scarcely be denied by any one, that wicked men, in seeking political power are actuated by motives of ambition, avarice, or vanity. Their object is to promote self in some way or other. This being true, there would be just as much reason in expecting to gather grapes of

thorns, or figs of thistles, as in expecting the rule of such men to promote righteousness and the best interests of society. It is clearly absurd. Moreover, unregenerate men are, in the very nature of the case, disqualified for legislating and ruling in all respects for the benefit of every class of the community, from the fact that they are incapable of knowing all of the wants, and appreciating the rights of the regenerated, as such; for "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned;" so that if they had the disposition, they have not the capacity, the spiritual endowment which will enable them to enter into and appreciate the rights of an enlightened and a tender conscience, and the privileges and pleasures of a regenerated heart. In some things, therefore, and they are the most important that belong to humanity, wicked men are no more capable of ruling for the best interests of religious people, than the blind man is to be the guide of the wayfaring. Consequently, it is unequal, it is improper, it is unjust, to elect men to legislate and rule for an entire community, who are incapable of appreciating all the wants, and discerning all the rights of a portion of that community. The inference is not only plain, but inevitable, that Christians can not, dare not, without violating their allegiance to Christ, and the law of true charity, vote for, or in any wise contribute towards the elevation of ungodly men to posts of political power and trust. It is, therefore, manifestly a sin, which never fails ultimately to bring with it its own punishment. To vote for or elevate bad men to public office, is not only to put men in power who, as we have seen, are incapable of ruling and legislating for the best interests of Christ's kingdom, but it is to arm wickedness, and to increase the power of ungodly men for evil. When a Christian elevates to office a fellow-man by his vote, he thereby delegates to him his own moral and political power. Fearful, therefore, is the

responsibility of arming bad men to do evil. It is every whit the same as though you did the evil yourself. In view of these facts, how is it possible for the sincere Christian, with the Bible in his hands, which gives explicit directions as to the character of the men who should be made rulers over the people, consistently with his fealty to Christ and His Church, to vote for other than good men? It is directly contrary to the principles of the Gospel; he can not do it with impunity.

But the obligations of the Christian, in relation to this very important subject, are not restricted to *negative* actions, they are also *positive*. He is not only to refrain from voting for bad men, but he is bound to do all that is legitimately within his power, to defeat their election, and to elevate good men, praying men, god-fearing men, in their places. In this particular, religious men have been very derelict in their duty. Many of them (alas! there are some exceptions) have not been *active* in elevating bad men to office. They have stood aloof, but they have stood idly and silently. Restrained by a weak timidity, or a criminal disinclination to encounter opposition, and under the impression that the popular current is so strongly set in favor of bad men and principles that it is in vain to attempt to arrest it, they do *nothing*, and congratulate themselves that they have not contributed towards the unhappy result. This, however, is a great and reprehensible mistake. They have, by their silence and acquiescence, contributed to intensify public opinion in favor of wrong, whilst, at the same time, they have discouraged and weakened whatever remaining inclination there was in the public mind to do right. They are, therefore, not innocent, but guilty, in the sight of God, of a grievous error. Idleness is not innocent. "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord against the mighty." "If the salt have lost his savor," etc.; "Every tree that bringeth not forth good

fruit," etc. One of the deplorable effects of this neglect of duty on the part of the sober, quiet, and religious part of the community is, in many parts of the country, to deter the right kind of men from offering themselves, or allowing their names to be brought forward as candidates for what was once esteemed high and honorable office. Consequently, this most potent of all human agencies for good or evil has, in too many instances, passed into the hands of incompetent and bad men. It is, therefore, not a matter of indifference, or of mere choice, whether the moral and Christian people will or will not take an active interest in politics. The responsibility and danger of neglecting it is too great. They are solemnly bound, by the precepts and spirit of Christianity, to have an opinion in relation to political matters, to express it, and to act according to it in voting and exerting their whole moral influence in favor of good and against bad men and principles. Let every moral, sober, order-loving, good man, adopt it as a maxim from which he can not be induced, either by love or temporal interest, in the slightest to swerve, that he will never cast his vote, nor lend his influence, in favor of a candidate for public office, who is not, in the first place, in all respects competent to discharge the duties of the office; and in the next, a good man, in the proper acceptation of that term; or, in the language of the Bible, who is not an "able man, such as fears God, a man of truth, hating covetousness." But suppose no such man becomes a candidate for office; but instead of such, there are two bad men, one, however, worse than the other; what, in that event, is the duty of the Christian? We answer: it will be his duty not to vote for either, and to make known his reason for his course. In this way, his influence would be cast decidedly against the evil; and it would not be long before there would be a visible accumulation of moral opposition, that would soon be felt, against the rule of bad men and principles. Suppose, for illustration, that a town or a county contains one

thousand voters, six hundred of whom, though they may not all be members of the Church, yet are in favor of infusing into the legislation of the country moral and Christian principles, and elevating only good men to office, and act accordingly; and that there are in that community two bad men, candidates for office; one or the other, it is true, will of necessity be elected; it may be, however, by receiving only a few over two hundred votes; what will be the effect? It will be that, although he is duly elected to office, yet he is manifestly *not* the choice of the people; he does not carry with him the moral power of the community; his moral influence for evil is crippled; whilst, at the same time, the real strength of the moral and religious element in the community will be developed, and ere long, good men can be induced to represent them in governmental affairs.

Let it be granted, therefore, that it is the prerogative of the organized and visible Church of God, to *testify* against all iniquitous and unrighteous legislation: that it is the duty of the ambassadors of Christ to proclaim the law of God, and tell kings, and governors, and law-makers, their moral and Christian obligations: and that private Christians of every name, and good men, whether in the Church or out of it, are solemnly bound by their allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ to take an active interest in governmental affairs, and vigilantly guard against their being administered by other than "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness."

In conclusion, the patient reader of this article may agree in the abstract with every point made in it. He may pronounce them all right in a speculative point of view; "but the attempt to carry them out in actual practice," he objects, "would array all the wicked of the world in fierce antagonism against the Church." We answer, that there is not a doubt of it. There could be no greater evidence of the truth of the sentiments contained in the

article. The most alarming symptom in relation to the state of the Church is to be found in the quiescent harmony, nay, the apparent amity, existing between the Church and the world! What has our Saviour taught us on this subject? What did the apostles inculcate? What is the confirmation of history until the Church became worldly? The pure Church of Christ has no greater enemy than the time-serving spirit, "the conferring with flesh and blood," existing within its own pale! "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?" "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword." "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution." But from which has the Church of Christ to apprehend the greater danger, from the fierce opposition of the world, caused by the zealous and consistent discharge of duty on the part of its members, or from a state of tolerance on the part of the world, induced by the conformity of Christians to its ways and principles? The answer is plain. The efficiency of the Church of Christ does not consist in numbers, but in purity; not in worldly wealth, but spirituality; not in magnificent and gorgeous array, that captivates the eye of the vulgar, but in consistency of character and conduct. Therefore, let not the followers of Christ "confer with flesh and blood," but go forward in the fearless discharge of their great mission, which is to disseminate divine truth, and afford a demonstration of its power in their daily walk and conversation. This done, their duty is done. God is competent to take care of his own method of evangelizing the world. "So shall my word be, that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

The portrait of the late Rev. Dr. Thornwell, which we had hoped to send with the present number, is not yet finished, but we confidently expect that it will be ready for distribution with the January number.

We appeal again to our subscribers to whom we sent bills for arrearages in the last number.

We thank those who have remitted to us the respective amounts of their bills, but we are sorry to add that not more than one in five of all thus appealed to have made any response.

We ask attention once more to the statement before made, that during the last year our receipts were not sufficient to pay the expenses of publication, by several hundred dollars. And although our terms call for payment in advance, we have not yet received enough on Vol. XV. to pay for the two numbers issued, by several hundred dollars. Will our subscribers suffer this to continue to be the case? Or will they not rather aid us by making vigorous efforts to increase our subscription list, as well as by forwarding to us, as soon as possible, payment of arrearages, and of the amount due for the present volume?