

A Message to China.

Sent to
PRESIDENT
OF
CHINA

Dec. 29, 1913
J.K. Robb left
Tak Hing for PEKING

A MESSAGE TO CHINA.

THE
TEACHINGS OF THE BIBLE
CONCERNING
THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT
PRESENTED FOR THE CONSIDERATION
OF
THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

" . . . And these also from the land of Sinim."

ISAIAH 49: 12.

Prepared by the Rev. W. J. McKnight, Syracuse, N.Y., U.S.A., lecturer
representing the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America
in her effort to commend the Christian Principles of civil
government to all nations; and issued
under the direction of

The Rev. W. J. Coleman, D.D., Pittsburgh, Penna., U.S.A., chairman
of the Committee appointed yearly by the Synod of the
Reformed Presbyterian Church of North
America to take these matters
in charge.

A MESSAGE TO CHINA.

THE
TEACHINGS OF THE BIBLE
CONCERNING
THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT
PRESENTED FOR THE CONSIDERATION
OF
THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

" . . . And these also from the land of Sinim."

ISAIAH 49: 12.

Prepared by the Rev. W. J. McKnight, Syracuse, N.Y., U.S.A., lecturer
representing the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America
in her effort to commend the Christian Principles of civil
government to all nations; and issued
under the direction of

The Rev. W. J. Coleman, D.D., Pittsburgh, Penna., U.S.A., chairman
of the Committee appointed yearly by the Synod of the
Reformed Presbyterian Church of North
America to take these matters
in charge.

A MESSAGE TO CHINA.

TO THE HONORABLE AND WORTHY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF CHINA, TOGETHER WITH ALL WHO MAY BE ASSOCIATED WITH HIM IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS OF THE NATION, WE, ON BEHALF OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF NORTH AMERICA, ARE HAPPY TO TENDER OUR CORDIAL GREETINGS AND CONGRATULATIONS.

The Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America is not slow to recognize what a crown of honor rests upon the brows of the men who have been entrusted with the affairs of state in a nation that was white with age when the pyramids were young. We know that where our country estimates years by centuries, your nation counts them by millenniums. And yet for the time being our lines have fallen out together, and we, as humble followers of Jesus Christ our Lord, who has taught us to love your people as we love our own, wish to reach out across the seas and grasp your hand in fellowship and true affection, in the hope that our mutual friendship may result in many spiritual blessings, which shall be both yours and ours, through all succeeding ages. We are profoundly interested in your new enterprise of civil government. We pray that your progress may be continuous and steady, that your success may be uninterrupted, and that your advancement may always be along the paths of righteousness and peace. And so, in order that your new government may be built on what we firmly believe to be the only immutable rock of civic life—the rock against which the angriest billows of arrogance and greed and

selfishness and vice can but lash themselves into foam—we beg leave to bring before you, for your earnest consideration, some of the priceless teachings of the Word of the Only Begotten and Well-beloved Son of God, who was the “Ancient of Days” through uncounted eternities before the Empire of China had come into being.

That the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America has in time past been the friend of China is a matter of history. How often has our indignation been aroused when we have been considering the injustice which Chinamen have suffered at the hands of our government! We always have regarded the Chinese Restriction laws of our land as a blot on our national honor. And we always will. And we did what we could to have them repealed, or so amended as to accord with the principles of justice and the instincts of humanity. Time after time the Synod, the highest court of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, has taken action with regard to these laws. It would not, perhaps, be out of place in this connection to quote some of the resolutions by which we have sought to relieve the situation. They speak for themselves. Take the resolutions of the Synod of 1899, for example.

“Whereas, the Chinese Restriction laws of our country are not only unjust in principle and oppressive in their execution, but also detrimental to the cause of missions in China as well as to the evangelization of the Chinese in the United States;

And, whereas, it is the duty of the Church to teach civil rulers their duty to strangers in our land;

Therefore, resolved, First, that the officers of our two Boards of Missions be appointed a Committee to prepare a memorial to the next Congress of the United States in behalf of the Chinese in our country, asking said Congress to repeal all Chinese Restriction laws that do injustice to that people.

Resolved, Second, that said Committee be authorized to send at least two of their own number as a delegation to Washington early in the sessions of Congress to urge the petition before the Committee that may have charge of the memorial.”

Or, again, take the action of the Synod of 1901.

“The Committee to whom was referred the paper concerning the exclusion of the Chinese would respectfully report: That while we do not see any immediate opportunity of pressing the matter before Congress, yet for the sake of bearing a consistent testimony against a great and crying wrong, and arousing the public mind with reference to it, we recommend that Synod adopt the paper presented by Mr. Chesnut.

We further submit a petition to the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress, praying the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, and urge all our pastors to transcribe it, and have it signed in their congregations and vicinity so far as there may be opportunity.

THE RESOLUTIONS.

Whereas, there exists an unjust legal discrimination in the United States against the Chinese, and inasmuch as the Rev. N. R. Johnston, an honored father and constituent member of this Court, deeply interested in the Home Mission work among the Chinamen on the Pacific Coast and throughout the land, is now engaged with others in a movement to arouse a public sentiment among the Christian people and others of this land, and through them to influence the Congress of the United States by petition or memorial, to make such changes in or amendment to the Chinese Restriction Act as will afford to the Chinese the same rights, privileges and immunities as are accorded to people of other nations, and agreeably to the Divine law which says, “Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country; for I am the Lord your God” (Lev. 24:22);

Therefore, resolved, First, that this Synod is in hearty sympathy with any and all persons who by proper means seek the repeal or amendment of all existing laws and treaties by which the Chinese are deprived of their just rights, and stands ready (as in the case of the red man and black man) to co-operate with others in securing from our country just treatment to these unoffending people coming from a distant land to our shores.

Resolved, Second, that this Synod directs Sessions of congregations at any meeting thereof to take the vote or sense of such assemblage in reference to the amendment of the present laws and treaties unjustly bearing and trespassing upon the Chinese, and that the result thereof, comprising the number of such persons as are favorable to the change be certified on the petition hereafter referred to, under signature of Chairman and Secretary, or Moderator and Clerk of such congregation.

Resolved, Third, that the memorials or petitions to be furnished or formulated for the purpose, shall, when the congregational vote shall have been certified thereon, be forwarded to any one of the following persons, namely, Rev. N. R. Johnston ; Rev. A. J. McFarland, Kansas City ; Dr. J. C. McCandless Chicago ; Rev. D. McAllister, Pittsburg ; and Rev. J. M. Foster, Boston, who shall be a Committee to do what they can, during the coming year, for the cause of these strangers within our gates, and to arrange among themselves as to the time and manner of presenting the memorial to Congress.

THE PETITION.

To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress Assembled :

We, citizens of the United States, do humbly memorialize and petition your Honorable bodies to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, for the following among many reasons :

I. This Act contradicts God's original creative plan, when He endowed all men with the natural and inalienable right to life, the enjoyment of liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof" (Psalm 24 : 1).

II. It makes an invidious and cruel exception of the Chinese, while the people of every other nation are permitted to enter, travel or make their homes in our land. What wrong has the Chinaman done us, that we should discriminate so unkindly against him ?

III. The just law of retribution would prevent the merchant of this country from going to China to trade, or the Christian minister from going there to preach the Gospel, for Confucius himself has said, "Do nothing to another that you would not be willing that he should do to you."

IV. While we readily admit that there should be exceptions made in our immigration laws as with reference to paupers, persons afflicted with infectious diseases, anarchists, and all who are enemies to our government, we feel it to be exceedingly unjust and wrong to discriminate against the people of any one nation alone."

In these deliverances, and there are many more to the same effect, we are sure you will be able to discern an ardent desire on the part of the Reformed Presbyterian Church to bring the government of the United States to deal fairly and uprightly with the people of China. As a Church we were glad when the United States succeeded in persuading the Powers that the dismemberment of China could not be regarded as the ideal solution of the problems of the East.

Whenever our nation has wronged the Chinaman, we have lamented. Whenever it has stretched out its hand in the interests of righteousness, we have rejoiced. And now it is in the same spirit of love and with the same sincere concern for your nation's welfare and perpetuity that we wish to lay before you individually, and, if the circumstances will permit, in your legislative Assembly, what we, after prolonged study and careful thought, have come to regard as the vital underlying principles of all wholesome civic life—principles against which the ravages of time can but fret themselves in vain, and which, if laid hold upon by China with her 400,000,000 of people, will, as we believe, make the nation's life

"The symbol of immensity,

A firmament reflected in a sea,"—

a firmament, a rich starry sky of limitless achievement, reflected in the calm quiet depths of moral rectitude, where the tempestuous billows of human depravity shall have become placid because of the presence of Him in whom all principles of truth come to a living centre, even the Lord Jesus Christ, the Sovereign Ruler of the universe, who marshals the hosts of heaven and the inhabitants of the earth to do His will, and holds as in the palm of His hand the waters of the sea. In your own national anthem you have been accustomed to sing,

"Very high are the Heavens.

Ceaselessly roll the waves of the sea."

These lines, to our Western way of thinking, are strangely picturesque—beautiful, but sad. They seem to epitomize the history of all peoples, so long as they have been strangers to the love of Jesus Christ. In them our imagination detects the elements of a certain widely current concept of the world—the Heavens so far away stretching themselves out in the distance in one vast blue dome of eternal peace, altogether unaffected by the restless oceans of humanity

toiling, struggling, wrangling here below, now borne along on the rising tides of victory, now submerged in the vortex of defeat, yet ever moving onward toward the darksome caverns of a common death, where triumph and defeat are swallowed up alike in the nethermost abyss of timeless silence. And this would be the only vision possible for the human race, if the heavens had not deigned to reveal their treasures. But the heavens have not been silent. From behind their thin ethereal veil has come the cry: "Unto you, O men, I call; and My voice is to the sons of man" (Proverbs 8: 4). "Look unto Me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God" (Isaiah 45: 22). And they who have heard that cry and have turned to look, have seen, by the eye of faith, that yonder in those heavens—once so far away, yet now so near—there sits the Christ, the Son of God, upon a throne of glory—the Christ who in the fulness of time left the Father's home, and bowed the heavens and came down, and linked His life with ours, and shared the trials and the sorrows of humanity, and stilled the sea, and silenced the tumults of the people, and taught the nations of the earth that the Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, than the mighty breakers of the sea. This is He of whom we wish to speak. To His voice we would have you train your ear. His blessings make the poorest rich. His frown makes the richest poor. It is His claims which we wish to bring before you. It is His teachings which we would recommend to your consideration. He has been to us through all our history the chiefest among ten thousand, always altogether lovely, a very present help in trouble. And what He has been to us as a Church He will be to you as a nation, if you will only throw your portals open and take Him in. The critical moment, as it seems to us, has arrived. The living Christ, who ordained a life for China and arrayed its circumstances every one to the minutest, is standing at your gates. For Him it is that your nation has long been waiting, though perhaps it knew

it not. "Yet," as Dr. Sun Yat Sen so finely said at the tomb of Chu Yuan-chang, "Providence knows the appointed hour, and the moment comes at last." It is here. The Lord of Glory is knocking at your door. If you take Him in and live, His life, your Republic will become incorruptible and the millenniums yet to be will blossom with a larger hope.

All peoples have had some conception of a Divinity who directs the lives of men and nations. This conception was full-orbed and perfect at the outset. But as the centuries rolled on men began to forget God. They undertook to live without Him. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God, in many cases, gave them over to a mind without any discernible moral standard at all, and in all cases, without exception, He gave them over to a mind that was destitute of any adequate, or ideal, standard of morality. All nations, it is true, still possess some gleams of truth, but these gleams are nothing more than broken lights from a dateless noon-day behind the clouds. The Bible dispels the clouds and lets the sunlight through. It does not gather the broken lights from other sources, and bring them to a focus, and then send them forth again in a steady radiance to illuminate mankind. It is itself the source, the central sun. The men who have had it have had all the light all the time. True, it was written in many portions, and some of these were many centuries apart. But the first portion had all the light which the human race needed at the time. Enoch was as perfect in character as was Paul. And it was the light which Enoch had that made him perfect. And so the Bible has had all the light that was needed, for all the ages as they came. It is completed now, and is the perfect Guide for all men and nations. Through its pages the eternal, immortal, invisible, only wise God condescends to talk with men and show them what they ought to do. The Bible's ideals for men, in every realm of life, are unsurpassed and unsurpassable. As men and nations

succeed in measuring up with these ideals they will find themselves standing on the mountain tops of purity and power and peace. But it is not possible for any nation to ascend and occupy those tranquil heights without commanding the unchallenged admiration of the world. And thus it is that the Bible, as those who have known it best have always found, paves the way for the realization of the perfect ideal in every conceivable sphere of life and action.

Now, if these things are true, it becomes imperative on the part of those who are anxious to realize the highest ideals in civic life, as well as in other things, to inquire what this Book of books may have to say on the subject. And it has much to say. Its teachings are manifold and plain. It lays down the principle that all things begin with God, and that all things in order to succeed must keep in vital touch with God. In the rational world they must keep in conscious, loving, obedient touch with Him. Accordingly, in the sphere of civil government, where rationality of the highest type is needed every hour, the Bible is insistent in teaching that Divine authority lies back of all human authority, that Divine law lies back of all human law, and that all human authority and law must, therefore, if they would be found to be ideal, recognize in some becoming manner the source in which they had their first beginning and from which they issued forth. In other words, government, to be properly constituted, must stand in vital relationship with God,—with God the Father, with God the Son, with God the Holy Spirit. The Father is the source of all authority, therefore all nations should acknowledge Him. All this authority has been given to the Son, therefore all nations should acknowledge Him. How to enact laws which shall be in keeping with this authority and which shall serve to make it articulate and regulative in daily life has been set forth in the Bible through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, therefore all nations should acknowledge Him. And this they can do by taking the Book, which He has inspired, as

their Manual of Guidance in all matters that pertain to civic morality.

What, then, does this Book have to say on the subject? Is it possible to resolve its teachings into their primordial elements, so that the mind may be able to grasp them in their full significance? To answer these questions is not, as we think, a very difficult task. The great Biblical classic on the subject of civil government is the Second Psalm. This song portrays the truth in a sort of panorama. It falls naturally, as may be gathered at a glance, into four paragraphs. The first paragraph ends with the third verse, the language of the nations. The second ends with the sixth verse, the language of God the Father. The third is composed of the seventh, eighth and ninth verses, the language of the Son, whom the Father, as stated in the sixth verse, has declared to be King. The fourth, beginning with the tenth verse, is the language of the Holy Writer himself, as he personally calls upon the nations to be loyal to their appointed King. Let us, with the Psalmist, ascend in thought some lofty spiritual mountain top from which we may survey, as he surveyed, all the nations of the earth. As he looks out over the nations he exclaims in uncontrollable surprise, "Why!! Do the nations rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against His anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." He can scarcely believe his own eyes, his own ears, his own mind. That kings and other rulers should band themselves together and plot against the God who in His infinite love has made it possible for the nations of the earth to realize the sublimest ideals of civic life is to his mind inexpressibly preposterous. And why should it not be so? The "cords" which God the Father and His Anointed Son have extended to the nations are such, and only such, as would lead them away from the dark mountains of iniquity out into the clear sunlight of

rectitude and truth. The "bands" which they have drawn around the nations are such, and only such, as would prevent them from stepping over the precipice into ultimate everlasting destruction. And yet the nations propose to cut the cords and wander aimlessly in the dark mountains, to break through the bands and step over the precipice. Is it any wonder that the Sweet Singer of Israel should be astonished? Why should nations break away from God?

But let us listen to him again as he talks, or rather thinks aloud, in a sort of soliloquy. "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall He speak to them in His wrath, and vex them in His sore displeasure." Here he stops, as if there were nothing more to say. He stands a moment in silence. Suddenly he hears a voice. This time it comes from the Great White Throne. It is the voice of God. He says, "Yet," that is, despite this uprising of the nations, "Yet have I set my king on my holy hill of Zion." This statement indicates that God the Father is the Sovereign of the universe, that He is the ultimate source of all authority, that it was He who advanced His Only Begotten Son to the throne and placed the sceptre in His hand. And so the Son Himself, in the days of His flesh, when He was about to ascend into the presence of the Father, said, "All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth" (Matthew 28:18). It was His, but it had been "given." It was His, but it came to Him by an act of delegation. The Father was, and is, and ever will be, supreme. The third section of the Psalm, which may be termed, not inaptly, the inaugural address of the King, expands the same thought and makes it even more emphatic. On assuming the throne the King Himself makes a declaration to the nations, and this is what He says, "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto Me, Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the nations for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession.

Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." The Son, therefore, came to the throne by the "decree" of the Father. The nations of the earth were to be His for the asking. He was to bring them into subjection to His will even though it should require a "rod of iron." That is to say that the Father had appointed Him to be a real ruler. His dominion was to extend "to the uttermost parts of the earth," and within the limits of this dominion He was to govern, not half-heartedly but absolutely. "For," as Isaiah says, "unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever." The "decree" of God the Father placed the actual governmental burdens of the whole world, for all time, upon the shoulder of the Lord Jesus Christ, His Only Begotten Son, the Prince of Peace. He reigns, whether men acknowledge Him or not. If nations will submit willingly, "blessed are all they that put their trust in Him." If they say, "Let us break the bands of Jehovah and His Anointed," they shall be dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel. For He is to reign in this world until all His enemies shall have been put under His feet, until the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdom, the one vast universal kingdom, of our Lord, the Father of all, and of His Anointed. "Then cometh the end, when He shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign, till He hath put all His enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. For, He put all things into subjection under His feet. But when He saith, All things are put into subjection, it is evident that He is excepted

who did subject all things unto Him. And when all things have been subjected unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subjected to Him that did subject all things unto Him, that God may be all in all" (1 Corinthians 15: 24-28).

To say the least, therefore, it is possible to ascertain what the Bible has to say on the subject of authority. It teaches in the plainest kind of terms that God the Father is the source and fountain of all authority, both in heaven and in earth, in the civil realm as well as in others; and it teaches just as plainly that He has designated His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, to be the ruler of nations.

Now the Lord Jesus Christ, of course, is not a King in any carnal sense. He is a spiritual King. He rules with an invisible hand. On this point He Himself laid special emphasis. In the eighteenth chapter of the Gospel of John, the thirty-third verse, we read that Pilate said to Jesus, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" Jesus, in His answer, said, "Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of Me?" As much as to say, "Pilate, are you asking this question from the Roman point of view, or from the Jewish point of view?" To be a king in the Roman sense of the term one would have to remain in the flesh and occupy a throne like Cæsar's. To be a king in the deeper Jewish sense one could occupy an invisible throne and wield a spiritual sceptre. To such a question Pilate's pride prompted a speedy and contemptuous reply. "Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered Thee unto me: what hast Thou done?" As much as to say, again, "I am no Jew. Your own nation and the chief priests are taking care of the Jewish side of the question. What I do I do as a Roman." Then, when the point of view was distinctly understood, "Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is My kingdom not from hence." That is to say that if Christ were claiming to be a

King in the Roman sense, His officers would need to fight to keep Him out of the hands of the Jews, for the Jews would put Him to death. But if He were put to death, He could not occupy a throne like the Emperor at Rome. His language makes it clear that He was not thinking of a temporal kingdom or of ruling in any carnal or worldly manner. Had such been the case, He would have had His servants fight to keep Him alive. Pilate was astonished at such a view. He had no conception of any kind of kingdom except a worldly kingdom, or of any kind of king except a man who could move about in royal robes, and eat and sleep, or watch the games in the amphitheatre, or lead an army. With no little amazement, therefore, he turns upon Jesus and asks Him again, "Art Thou a King then?" That is, Can you be a king in any other sense than the Roman sense? Is any other conception of kingship possible? Then Jesus replied, "Thou sayest that I am a King." In other words, "I am what you say; I am a King." In our country during the past year a good deal has been said about "the invisible government." By this expression men refer to the stealthy but substantial control of civic affairs by the corporations. Now the hand of the corporations at the throat of our government is unseen and intangible, but it is strangling the national morality none the less on that account; all the more, for being invisible it is the harder to grapple with. So also the government of the Lord Jesus Christ whom Paul (1 Timothy 1:17) calls "the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God," is an "invisible government," although its designs, of course, are essentially different from the designs of the corporations. It is always a government of purity and justice, and it proceeds on the basis of immaculate righteousness, but, being invisible, it is, like the other, all the harder to reckon with, all the more powerful because wholly unseen. An invisible King who is at the same time omniscient and omnipotent can realize his own purposes without the slightest variation or

shadow of turning. Would it not be well to be at one with such a King? Would it not be well to have Him as a constant Companion and a trusted Ally? As He is invisible, your enemies can never locate His invincible batteries. As He is your Friend, you can always depend on His help. The burden, therefore, of this message of ours to the great nation of China is, that the New Republic may be persuaded to make friends with the Invisible King—the King whom the Bible calls “the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords” (1 Timothy 6:15). He “is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist” (Colossians 1:15-17). Your Republic can make no mistake by entering into an alliance with the Creator and Lord of the universe.

We are told in the book of Proverbs that “a man that hath friends must show himself friendly: and there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother” (Proverbs 18:24). The friend that is spoken of is this Invisible King, the Lord Jesus Christ. But in order to gain the friendship and co-operation of such a King one would surely need to show oneself to be “friendly” toward Him. One of His most imperative requirements is that nations as well as individuals shall make a full, unequivocal, cordial recognition of His royal claims. To every man individually the message from heaven is, “Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths” (Proverbs 3:5-6). To the same effect, however, is the message to nations. Here we come back to the closing paragraph of the Second Psalm. “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. Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him.” Thus the writer of this Psalm is inspired by the Holy Spirit to call upon all the nations of the earth to acknowledge the Invisible King. “Kiss the Son,” says the Psalmist. Pay your homage to Him. To acknowledge Him is to be “blessed.” Not to acknowledge Him is to kindle His “wrath.” All nations, therefore, all kings and judges and rulers are under moral obligation to acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ as the Prince of the kings of the earth. And it is worth while to notice in this connection that in a Republic all the citizens become rulers or kings. Every citizen, therefore, in the performance of his civic duties, is distinctly enjoined to be loyal to the Invisible King, and is accordingly under obligation to see that his loyalty shall become articulate and make itself felt in the laws of his country.

At this point, however, we ought to be careful to be on our guard against any confusion of thought. No nation on earth has, or ever had, any right to compel its citizens to become Christians, or Mohammedans, or Buddhists; to become Roman Catholics, or Protestants, or Baptists, or Presbyterians. A profession of faith is of no value at all unless it is wholly voluntary. This the Bible always recognizes. It approaches men, not with the sword or the guillotine, but with invitations. “Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest” (Matthew 11:28). “And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely” (Revelation 22:17). The Bible invites men and nations to accept of Christ; it pleads with them; it implores them. Beyond that, however, it never goes. It warns, but it never hints at compulsion. And yet, while it is true that no government has any right to compel its subjects to make a profession of faith in Jesus Christ, every government has a right to make such a profession for itself.

A nation is a spiritual entity. It has the characteristics of a moral person. It has moral obligations. One of these is to acknowledge Christ, the Invisible King. It has no right to say to the citizen, "You shall become a Christian," but it has a right to say, "As for myself, I, in my organic national capacity, propose to become a Christian nation." And this it can do by making a proper recognition of Divine authority and law in its fundamental instrument of government. Then whoever may be inclined to take part in the civic affairs of such a nation and government will have freedom morally and legally to do so, and whoever may be disinclined will find no legal hindrance in his way in case he should choose to remain inactive or should desire to seek a change by orderly methods.

But how are the nations of the earth, with their kings and rulers and legislators and judges, to undertake to please this Invisible King? Here again the Bible speaks with no uncertainty. It claims to be itself the source of instruction for civil rulers in the performance of their official duties. The king was to be left in no doubt about what his manual of guidance was to be. "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: that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right hand, or to the left: to the end that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he, and his children, in the midst of Israel" (Deuteronomy 17: 18-20). When, therefore, the writer of the Second Psalm said, "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth," there could be no ambiguity. He was directing the nations of the earth to the only source of instruction for national life, namely, the Word of God.

That Book of books was to be by the side of the ruler, where he could get his hand on it, and he was to "read therein all the days of his life." It was to regulate his civic conduct and mould his national policies. In short, it was to furnish him with the one and only infallible standard of morality.

If, then, the nations of the world were to take the Bible as their Guide-book, they would in some suitable way acknowledge, governmentally, God the Father as the source of all authority.

They would acknowledge, governmentally, the Lord Jesus Christ, His Son, as the ruler of nations.

They would honor the Holy Spirit by taking the Word of God as their Manual of Guidance in the decision of all the moral issues that arise in civic life.

It was reported in the "London Times" of August 1st, 1912, that the President of the Republic of China had a few days before made a remark to this effect: "On reaching middle age I became firmly convinced that the Constitution of America and France accorded with the ideas of the Chinese sages." In this statement there is an intimation that the Constitution of the United States might, perhaps, in some respects, be chosen as a model. We, of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, would be profoundly pleased if we could recommend the Constitution of the United States as a document worthy in every way to be copied. Our judgment in such a case may not be wholly impartial, but we are inclined to regard it as one of the most admirable instruments of civil government that has ever been framed. From our point of view it would be hard to number its excellencies. We are reluctant to admit that it is in any wise defective. And yet, out of deference to the simple patent truth, we are obliged to acknowledge that it has been marred from the first by one most vitally serious imperfection; for our nation, we are sad to say, has not in this, its fundamental law, made any recognition whatsoever of God, of Christ, or of the Bible. Our forefathers were

Christians. Our Colonial Charters, our Colonial Compacts of government, our Colonial writings, are replete with references to the Christian religion. One citation here will suffice. In Rhode Island's Compact of government the religious element is clear and prominent: "We whose names are underwritten do hereby solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah, incorporate ourselves into a body politic; and, as He shall help, will submit our persons, lives and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords, and to all those perfect and absolute laws of His given to us in His Holy Word of truth to be judged and guided thereby." (Rhode Island Colony Records, Volume I., page 52.) Indeed, Justice Story, in his Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, has this to say, "Every American colony, from its foundation down to the revolution, . . . did openly, by the whole course of its institutions, support and sustain, in some form, the Christian religion." The sad thing to the Christian heart, in this statement of Justice Story's, is the truth contained in the phrase—"down to the revolution." For when our country had gained its independence, and "the revolution" was over, and the delegates from the thirteen original States had assembled in convention in Philadelphia, in 1787, to formulate our present Constitution, religious conceptions in political thought had almost vanished out of mind. On June 28th, 1787, about a month after the Convention had begun its sittings, Benjamin Franklin made a motion that all future meetings should be opened with prayer. In support of this motion he said, among other things, "In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for the Divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending Providence in our favor. To that kind Providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means

of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful Friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—THAT GOD GOVERNS IN THE AFFAIRS OF MEN. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writings, that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed, in this political building, no better than the builders of Babel." (His excellent remarks on the motion may be found in their entirety in Elliot's Debates, Volume V., pages 253, 254). He brought his remarks to a conclusion by saying, "I, therefore, beg leave to move that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in this service." This motion was lost by adjournment, and Mr. Franklin, in the manuscript copy of this address, which is still preserved among the archives of our country, went on to say, in an added note, "The convention, except three or four persons, thought prayers unnecessary." And in 1788, when the Constitution was completed, Dr. John Rodgers, the eminent chaplain of the Revolution, on meeting Alexander Hamilton, asked him how it came that the Convention had neglected to make any acknowledgement of Divine authority and law in such a fundamental document. Mr. Hamilton, in a jocular way—weirdly in keeping with the prevailing sentiment of the time, replied, "Indeed, Doctor, we forgot it."

In those earlier days, when our fathers wanted to incorporate themselves into a body politic, they felt that they ought to do it "solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah." They felt that they ought to submit their "persons, lives

reminding the north and the south, day by day and night by night, of those infrangible religious and moral ties that should have bound them into a great, strong, undivided nation. But it is God alone, as this incomparable song assures us, who can secure the blessedness of such national unity. And He does it from Zion, the metropolis of pure and undefiled religion. "For there the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore." It is not by the hurtling hail of battle on the fields of death that the Lord brings about a "more perfect union." To perfect union in His way is to enter into life and peace, "even life for evermore."

According to the Preamble, again, "we, the people," without declaring any dependence on God or seeking His acquiescence and help, proposed, in 1787, to "establish justice." Yesterday, January 13, 1913, Judge Richard E. Burke, of Chicago, instructed the grand jury as follows: "It is my duty to call your attention to the prevalence of crime as wholly unnecessary. The citizen, even in his home, is unsafe. In our streets he is constantly alarmed. Auto bandits and highwaymen appear to have full sway. Their deeds from day to day become more desperate. Some drastic action should be taken to check, if possible, this utter disregard for law and order. The widest latitude is yours to restrain, if possible, further violations." That little phrase—"if possible"—has a portentous, not to say a fatal, significance. Has it come to this—that it is a question whether we can maintain justice in our cities? "We, the people," with firm unshaking confidence in our own ingenuity and sufficiency, undertook, in 1787, to "establish justice." Are we failing? At our Presidential election in November, 1912, more than three million voters registered their conviction that our courts can no longer be trusted to render justice to the people. That, when the last is said, is the meaning of the clamor for "referendum and recall." The people are dissatisfied. And why? "By Me," says the only wise God, "kings reign, and princes decree justice" (Proverbs 8 : 15).

To "establish justice" is, as we are coming to see, an impossibility apart from a Divine standard of righteousness. We are learning in this country that only as we keep in touch with God can we either "establish justice" or accomplish any of the other purposes named in the Preamble.

We cannot, apart from God, "insure domestic tranquillity." "He maketh peace in thy borders" (Psalm 147 : 14). We cannot, apart from God, "provide for the common defense." "God is our refuge and strength. . . . He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; He breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; He burneth the chariot in the fire" (Psalm 46 : 1 and 9). We cannot, apart from God, "promote the general welfare." "He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man: that He may bring forth food out of the earth" (Psalm 104 : 14). "The eyes of all wait upon Thee; and thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest thy hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing" (Psalm 145 : 15-16). We cannot, apart from God, "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. . . . If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8 : 32 and 36). These things, therefore, which "we, the people," propose to realize, are things which no one but God Himself can bring about. Consequently, we, as a nation, without acknowledging God or seeking help from Him, have set before ourselves the task of doing what only God Himself can do. As a nation we have said, "I will be like the Most High" (Isaiah 14 : 14). We have taken upon ourselves the functions that pertain to Almighty God. Surely such a course will not commend itself to any man who believes in any God at all. It would seem that even the common instincts of the human heart ought to teach men how unbecoming it is for a man, or a nation, to presume to sit in the seat of God.

Then there is one thing more in this Preamble. Besides ignoring the Divine authority and assuming the functions that appertain to God alone, the Preamble, as soon as the Constitution was ratified, made this Constitution the supreme underlying, fundamental law of the land. That, of course, rules out the Bible, which is the Word of God, as the final source of appeal in matters of national morality. Legally it is impossible to get back of the Constitution. It is itself the supreme law, the ultimate source of appeal. As such it robs the Bible of its rightful province in our civic life.

From a study of this Preamble, therefore, four things are apparent. It ignores God the Father as the source of all authority. It ignores the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations. It assumes for the people the powers and the functions that belong to God alone. And it retires the Bible from its rightful place in our national life as the only standard of civic morality.

It will not do for us to excuse ourselves on the ground that the Preamble simply says nothing about these matters. The trouble is that it says nothing about them precisely at the place where it ought to state them definitely. The fatal thing is that it leaves them out. A man who leaves God, Christ, and the Bible out of his life is not a Christian. It may be possible to say a thousand pleasant things about him, but whatever else he may or may not be, he is not a Christian. And a nation that leaves God, Christ and the Bible out of its intrinsic life is not a Christian nation. A nation is a moral being, a moral personality, and when a moral being wants to become a Christian, there is but one way to do it, and that is by professing faith in Christ. And the place where a nation must profess its faith in Christ, if it has any faith in Christ, is in its supreme and fundamental law. Failing in that it is not in any organic sense a Christian nation. There may be many millions of Christians in it, its institutions and customs may be prevailing Christian, Christian principles may have found their way into many of its

laws, but as a spiritual entity, a moral personality, a civic being, it is not Christian until by some definite authoritative declaration it acknowledges Christ, and puts itself into unison with His most holy mind and will. Not long ago the Government of Japan sent out a delegation to various countries to study the different religions. In their report they said that Christianity was the best religion, but that there were no Christian nations. They perceived distinctly enough that if the United States, for example, had been a Christian nation, the people would not have neglected, for so long a time, to register their conceptions of Christian civil government in their national Constitution.

Another vital defect in our national Constitution, from a Christian point of view, is its failure to require an appeal to God in the oath prescribed for the President. When the President takes the oath, he is to say, "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." He could swear by Jove or Juno, if he cared to, or by nothing at all. The Bible, however, leaves no option in the case. "He that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth" (Isaiah 65:16). "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve Him, and shalt swear by His name" (Deuteronomy 6:13). The Lord Jesus Christ Himself, when He was upon the earth, furnished us with an excellent illustration of the way in which the oath was to be taken. He was standing before the Sanhedrim, the highest court of the Jewish nation, on trial for His life. But we read that "Jesus held His peace." Then the high priest, the proper officer of the court, put Him under oath in the proper way, saying, "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God," and immediately Jesus answered him. (See Matthew 26:62-64). The oath, according to the teaching of the Bible, is to be administered in the great and dreadful name of the

Most High God. And when it is administered in this way, it has a solemnizing effect upon all who hear it—an effect which is wholly indescribable. Without an appeal to the name of the living God the oath becomes an empty form, a mere travesty. If an ordinary promise is all that is wanted, why not make it an ordinary promise and nothing more? To take an oath is a different matter, a distinctively religious matter, divinely provided for, and guarded with infinite care.

There is still another clause in the Constitution to which we wish to call your attention. It is the closing statement of Article VI. "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." But the Bible, on the other hand, says distinctly, "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God" (2 Samuel 23 : 3). Now it would be perfectly proper to say that no ecclesiastical test should ever be required. It would be altogether improper for a Christian nation to say that a man should belong to this or that Church before he could hold office. But the Constitution itself should be drawn up in such a way as to make it impossible for any man, no matter whether he might happen to be a church member or not, to get into any office without agreeing to exercise his official functions "in the fear of God." If the Constitution were itself a religious document, then the proper religious test would simply be an agreement to rule according to the Constitution. To make the matter plain let us indulge in two or three suppositions—suppositions which will serve to sum up, in a way, much of what has already been said.

Suppose that the Preamble of the United States Constitution should be changed to read in this way, "We, the people of the United States, acknowledging God the Father as the fountain of all authority, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, and the Bible as the ultimate source of appeal in all matters of civic morality, in order to incorporate ourselves into an organic Christian nation, and in order to

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

Suppose again that the oath to be taken by the President should be amended so as to read in this way, "I do solemnly swear, in the great and dreadful name of the Most High God, that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Suppose again that the religious test should be so modified as to read in this way, "No religious test, other than a sworn agreement to administer government according to this Constitution, shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Under such conditions a man, when he would come forward to take the oath of office, would not be asked any questions about his Church or even his religion. The Constitution would be before him. It would be a religious document. Its religion would be the Christian religion. If he could conscientiously agree to act as a magistrate under such a document and could conscientiously engage to carry out its provisions to the best of his ability, well and good. If not, then of course he would simply have to decline. But a magistrate who can conscientiously put himself under oath to perform the duties of his office according to the principles of the Christian religion will always, other things being equal, be a good magistrate, one who will labor to his utmost capacity to secure the welfare of all the people. After all the supreme question in any government is not, Who shall be able to get into office? but, Who will be likely to perform his official functions in such a way as to bring "peace on earth, and good will toward men?" Any man who will sincerely, by oath, bring himself formally into unison with God and into league with Jesus Christ and under moral

obligation to obey the truth as it has been revealed by the Holy Spirit in the Bible is a man who may safely be trusted with the reins of government in any land and under any conditions. He may be depended upon always to do the utmost that lies within his power for the good of his fellow men.

Many of our most careful thinkers, including eminent jurists and statesmen and clergymen and editors and professors of political philosophy, have from the very beginning lamented the fact that we have not buttressed our national life on the sanctions of the Christian religion. In 1788, when the various States were holding conventions to ratify the Constitution, the matter was frequently discussed. Luther Martin, Attorney General of the State of Maryland for thirty years, and delegate from that State to the Convention of 1787, said, in an address before the Legislature of Maryland, in January, 1788, "The part of the system, which provides that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States, was adopted by a great majority of the Convention, and without much debate. However, there were some members so unfashionable as to think that a belief of the existence of a Deity, and of a state of future rewards and punishments, would be some security for the good conduct of our rulers, and that, in a Christian country, it would be at least decent to hold out some distinction between the professors of Christianity and downright infidelity or paganism." Similar convictions were expressed by Mr. Singlerly and General Brooks and Colonel Jones in the Massachusetts convention, and by Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Abbott and Mr. Lancaster in the North Carolina convention. South Carolina, again, desired that the word "other" should be inserted between the words "no" and "religious" in the third section of Article VI. This would have given the oath at least a religious coloring, for it would have meant—no religious test OTHER THAN THE OATH shall ever be required.

(These statements may all be verified by a reference to Elliott's Debates, Volume I., pages 325, 385-386; II., pages 44-120; IV., pages 191, 199, 215).

All this is but to say that there were many vigorous protests at the time against the attempt to rear a great national government without the sanctions of the Christian religion. Earnest men who knew the human heart and had pondered well the lessons of history felt that we were building our house upon the sand, and they trembled for the future. Nor did this anxiety diminish as the years rolled on. On the contrary, it has increased, for the harvests of our national irreligion have been coming in all along our history, and are coming yet. The facts of our history have shown with what keenness of vision some of our greatest men anticipated the calamities into which our national repudiation of Divine authority and law would eventually lead us. Many of their gravest misgivings and forebodings have been vindicated and illuminated by the events of the past, and many of them are finding their vindication in most ominous ways at the present hour.

We beg leave, therefore, to place before you a few suggestive extracts from the writings of some of these men who have done so much, not only to call attention to, but to counteract, the evil effects of irreligion in our national life. As you read their words, you will perceive that their loyal patriotic hearts are always filled with sorrow as they write. They speak like men upon whose shoulders a great cause has laid a heavy burden. They love their country and long to lift it to a higher moral altitude. But the only way to do it, they are well aware, is to tell the truth. And their words, we feel persuaded, will abundantly repay whoever takes the time to read them with the care which their message seems to us to merit.

In 1789 the First Presbytery Eastward in Massachusetts and New Hampshire said, in an address sent to George Washington, "We should not have been alone in rejoicing

to have seen some explicit acknowledgment of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent, inserted somewhere in the Magna Charta of our country."

In 1793 Dr. John M. Mason, a prince in the pulpit and one of the greatest thinkers of his day, said, in a sermon on "Divine Judgments :"

"Let us appeal to the most interesting, important and solemn business in which we have been engaged since our national existence. One would imagine that no occasion of making a pointed and public acknowledgment of the Divine benignity could have presented itself so obviously as the framing of an instrument of government, which, in the nature of things, must be closely allied to our happiness or our ruin, and yet that very Constitution which the singular goodness of God enabled us to establish does not so much as recognize His being! Yes, my brethren, it is a lamentable truth; a truth at the mention of which, shame should crimson our faces, that, like Jeshurun of old, we have waxed fat and kicked. 'Of the Rock that begat us, we have been unmindful; we have forgotten His works, and the wonders that He hath shown us.'"

Then in a note to this sermon, he adds :

"While many, on various pretenses, have criminated the Federal Constitution, one objection has urged itself forcibly on the pious mind. That no notice whatever should be taken of that God who planteth a nation and plucketh it up at His pleasure, is an omission which no pretext whatever can palliate. Had such a momentous business been transacted by Mohammedans, they would have begun, 'In the name of God.' Even the savages whom we despise, setting a better example, would have paid some homage to the Great Spirit. But from the Constitution of the United States, it is impossible to ascertain what God we worship, or whether we own a God at all. It is a very insufficient apology to plead that the devotion which political institutions offer to the supreme Being is, in most cases, a matter of mere form; for the hypocrisy of one man, or set of men, is surely no excuse for the infidelity of another. Should the citizens of America be as irreligious as her Constitution, we will have reason to tremble, lest the Governor of the universe, who will not be treated with indignity by a people any more than by individuals, overturn from its foundations the fabric we have been rearing, and crush us to atoms in the wreck."

Again, in 1800, he said :

"The Federal Constitution makes no acknowledgment of that God who gave us our national existence, and saved us from anarchy and internal war. This neglect has excited in many of its best friends more alarm than all other difficulties."

In 1803, Dr. Samuel B. Wylie, long connected with the University of Pennsylvania, said :

"The Federal Constitution, or instrument of national union, does not even recognize the existence of God, the King of nations. In those civil deeds, though the immediate end may be the happiness of the Commonwealth, yet the ultimate end, as well in this as in everything we do, should be the glory of God. Ought not men, in the formation of their deeds, to consider their responsibility to the moral Governor and their obligation to acknowledge His authority? (Proverbs 3 :5.) "In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths." That a national deed, employed about the fundamental stipulations of magistracy as an ordinance of God, and the investiture of magistrates as His ministers, should nowhere recognize the existence of the Governor of the universe, is, to say nothing worse of it, truly lamentable. . . . Every official act of a governor of a province must have some specific stamp of his dependence upon the authority which appointed him—and shall a nation act as if independent of the God of the universe, and expect to be guiltless?"

In 1811, Dr. Samuel Austin, afterwards President of the University of Vermont, said :

"However sagaciously devised and balanced our national Constitution of government may be, in a mere political view, it has one capital defect which will issue inevitably in its destruction. It is entirely disconnected from Christianity. It is not founded on the Christian religion. Not a single word respecting God or religion is to be found in the original Constitution, save that an oath or affirmation is required of officers of government."

In 1812, Dr. Timothy Dwight, the President of Yale, said :

"Notwithstanding the prevalence of religion which I have described, the irreligion and the wickedness of our land are such as to furnish a most pitiful and melancholy prospect to a serious mind. We formed our Constitution without any acknowledgment of God, without any recognition of His mercies to us as a people, of His government, or even of His existence. The Convention, by which it was formed, never

asked, even once, His direction or His blessing upon their labors. Thus we commenced our national existence, under the present system, without God. I wish I could say that a disposition to render Him the reverence due to His great name, and the gratitude demanded by His innumerable mercies, had been more public, visible, uniform, and fervent."

Also, a little more than a year later, before the Senior Class :

"It is highly discreditable to us that we do not acknowledge God in our Constitution. . . . The corruption which is now rapidly extending in this country gives reason for apprehension that we are soon to suffer the punishment to which we have exposed ourselves."

In 1813, the Rev. Chauncey Lee, of Colebrook, Connecticut, preached a sermon on "The Government of God, the true Source and Standard of Human Government," in which he said :

"Let it, then, be received as an axiom in politics ; let it be engraven upon our hearts as with the point of a diamond, that RELIGION IS THE ONLY SURE FOUNDATION OF A FREE AND HAPPY GOVERNMENT. . . . With this truth blazing before us, can we pause and reflect for a moment, without mingled emotions of wonder and regret, that that public instrument which guarantees our political rights of freedom and independence—our Constitution of national government, framed by such an august, learned, and able body of men ; formally adopted by the solemn resolution of each State ; and justly admired and celebrated for its consummate political wisdom, has not the impress of RELIGION upon it, not the smallest recognition of the government or the being of God, or of the dependence and accountability of man. Be astonished, O earth !"

In 1815, on January 12, a national fast day, the Rev. Thomas Robins preached in East Windsor, Connecticut, and Dr. John B. Romeyn in the Cedar Street Presbyterian Church, New York City. We quote them in the order named.

"In our national capacity we have not acknowledged and served the God of heaven. The great evil of our country, in my view, has been that we have attempted to strike out a new path to national prosperity regardless of all the dictates of experience, and the testimony of the Word of God. We have been not a religious, but a political people. Our government was formed upon the principle of excluding all religious

principles and character. The country was universally pleased with this feature of the Constitution, believing that, unlike all other prosperous nations that have ever existed, we should rise to national greatness without any national religion. I speak not of individuals, for we doubt not that the Lord Jesus has His church in our land, which has enjoyed the rich blessings of His Holy Spirit. But in our collective national capacity we do not worship the God of heaven, we do not acknowledge His Son, we do not receive His Holy Word. I do not recommend the legal establishment of any particular denomination, but lament that our nation has not adopted some method of professing a humble acknowledgment of the Saviour of men, and of the religion of the Holy Scriptures."

"The particular point to which I refer is its defect in regard to religion. That I may not be misunderstood, I think it proper to state that the people of this country are avowedly a Christian people. . . . As a Christian people, the inhabitants of the United States have the right to regulate their own political compact, and no one can consistently object to such regulation. To no people has God given such an opportunity to govern themselves as He has to us. All our acts, therefore, must be considered the acts of our choice. This is peculiarly the case with the Federal Constitution. The United States adopted it deliberately of their own accord in time of peace, with no foreign power to compel them. Though it be thus the choice of a Christian people, in it are not recognized even the existence and government of God, much less the authority of His revealed Word.

I dislike and reprobate the modelling of churches by civil power, and the exclusive establishment of any particular denomination. Such establishments, I hope, will never take place in this country ; for I consider them a grievous evil. But I do not hesitate to say that propriety, reason, and the Word of God require from us, as a Christian people, two things : 1. The recognition of the existence and providence of God. 2. The acknowledgment of His revealed truth."

In 1819, on a day appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania as a day of humiliation, thanksgiving, and prayer, Dr. George Duffield, of Carlisle, in a sermon entitled, "Judgment and Mercy," took occasion to say :

"Undoubtedly it was a great sin to have forgotten God in such an important national instrument, and not to have acknowledged Him in that which forms the very nerves and sinews of the political body. He had led us through all the perils of the Revolutionary struggle, and had established us in peaceful and plentiful security, and then to have

been forgotten in the period of prosperity, certainly demanded His rebuke. Therefore hath the voice of His Providence proclaimed and even still it sounds in our ears: 'I did know thee in the wilderness, in the land of great drought. According to their pasture, so were they filled; they were filled, and their heart was exalted; therefore have they forgotten me. Therefore will I be unto them as a lion; as a leopard by the way will I observe them.' "

In 1820, Dr. James R. Willson, who was Chaplain for a time to the Legislature of New York, published a sermon on "The Subjection of Kings and Nations to Messiah," in which he says:

"In the United States the refusal to acknowledge God has probably been more explicit than it ever was in any other nation. Soon after we had obtained, through the beneficent providence of God, liberation from the dominion of a foreign power; soon after the most eminent displays of Jehovah's goodness to our land, the Convention elected to form articles of fundamental law for the Commonwealth, rejected the government of God, and with a degree of ingratitude, perhaps without parallel, formed a Constitution in which there was not the slightest hint of homage to the God of Heaven."

In 1845, Dr. D. X. Junkin published a book on "The Oath a Divine Ordinance, and an Element of the Social Constitution." Speaking in this work of the President's oath as prescribed in the Constitution, he says:

"In every oath the name of God should, in obedience to the Divine command, be interposed; and we look upon the designed omission of it as an attempt to exclude from civil affairs Him who is the 'Governor among the nations.' "

In 1848, Dr. Alexander H. Vinton preached a sermon before the Governor, the Honorable Council, and the Legislature of Massachusetts, in which he said:

"Forgetting or slighting the distinction between the source of authority and the power of appointment, the theory of the social compact seemed to alienate religion, and to stand alone, in perfect human sufficiency. It was NEGATIVELY atheistic, and it thus invited the practice of atheism. Now, if there be any such thing as the organic relation of a nation to the great Governor of the world; if God be, in any valid and available sense, the Ruler of nations, this omission to recognize Him, or to make much of Him, in the essential theory of

government, was a perfect, if not a fatal, oversight. . . . France adopted the principle to the extent of its most ruthless radicalism. The issue of the experiment is sufficiently notorious. Our own nation has made election, likewise, of the same theory, as the basis of its polity, though with a mitigation of its ferocity, and with conservative checks. But the great question is, are these checks sufficient? Is there not the same capacity for mischief in our modified system, as in its simpler forms? And what shall prevent the development of its political evil?"

In 1849, Dr. E. D. MacMaster, President of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in a sermon delivered on a national fast day, said:

"The men who planned the first colonies in this land and laid the foundations of these States, were men who feared God, and even in their political affairs, as in other things, were not ashamed to honor His Son. In the days, too, of our weakness and fear and perplexity, when struggling to throw off a foreign dominion, and to gain a place as an independent nation among the powers of the earth, the fathers of our country made in her name, an explicit, formal, and solemn appeal to God in the heavens, as the righteous Judge and Governor of nations, to own the justice of her cause and vindicate her rights. He heard and answered; gave victory to our arms, and independence to us as a nation, and peace in all our borders, and great prosperity and blessing to us as a people. But oh! how changed is all the scene since that! In the Constitution . . . there is not found the name of God."

In 1851 the "Mercersburg Review," in an article entitled, "Our National Religion," speaks of the religious defect in our Constitution with sincere regret:

"It would indeed seem as though the solemn vow, previously made in a season of trouble, had been wholly forgotten. The contrast, in this respect, between the Declaration of Independence and this Constitution, is humiliating and painful. The appeal made to the King of kings in the former, followed by ten thousand fervent supplications from an afflicted, struggling people, was not unavailing. But we look in vain in this great charter, in which that Declaration found its happy consummation, for a counterpart to that appeal. How shall this painful incongruity be reconciled!"

In 1859, Dr. J. H. M'Ilvaine, Professor of Political Science in the College of New Jersey, had an article in the

"Princeton Review" on "A Nation's Right to Worship God," in which he said :

"The Constitution of the United States has rigorously abstained from all recognition of or allusion to Christianity, or to the being of a God. What is called the oath of the President-elect is presented in these words : 'I do solemnly swear or affirm,' etc., in which the officer-elect is left free to swear by nothing at all, and thus to leave out not only all recognition of God, but therein also, the very essence of an oath. The practical effect, whether or not the original object of all this, is the neutrality of the government with respect to all religions, so that no possible governmental influence can be constitutionally exerted for or against any form of religious belief. This absolute neutrality in religion of the Constitution of the United States is admitted and defended by the commentators. Says one of them : 'There are reasons why the introduction of religion would have been unreasonable if not improper. The Constitution was intended exclusively for civil purposes. . . . The purity of religion is best preserved by keeping it separate from government.' For these and other reasons he adds : 'It was impossible to introduce into the Constitution even an expression of gratitude to the Almighty for the formation of the present government.' Such are the views of the commentators upon the Constitution of the United States, in which they manifest a cordial zeal for the purity of religion by keeping it separate from government ; but unfortunately they do not inform us what is to preserve the purity of government after it has become sequestered from religion—has thus solemnly excommunicated itself. It were devoutly to be wished that some eminent statish of that school would speak to this point."

These citations have all been taken from the writings of men who are scholarly, and representative, and intensely patriotic. Men who have occupied prominent positions in Yale, in the University of Pennsylvania, in the University of Vermont, in Miami University, in the College of New Jersey,—men of such standing speak with considerable authority, and their views, to say the least, are worthy of careful study. All the men from whom we have quoted were widely known in their day. They were keen men, far-seeing men, profound thinkers, thorough Christians. They were deeply concerned in all questions of practical civic righteousness, but they had in addition the insight to see, in advance of the event, that the morality of any nation

must eventually take its coloring from the nature of the philosophy which lies at the basis of its civic life. From the extracts made above five things will have impressed themselves, with more or less clearness, on the mind of every reader.

I. These men with one accord agree that the Constitution is the place where Divine authority and law ought to be acknowledged. Such a recognition ought to be "inserted somewhere in the Magna Charta of our country," says the Presbytery of Massachusetts. "One would imagine that no occasion of making a pointed and public acknowledgment of the Divine benignity could have presented itself so obviously as the framing of an instrument of government, which, in the nature of things, must be closely allied to our happiness or our ruin," says Dr. Mason. Another refers to the omission as "a capital defect." Another says, "Undoubtedly it was a great sin to have forgotten God in such an important national instrument, and not to have acknowledged Him in that which forms the very nerves and sinews of the political body." Indeed, this is the underlying thought in each and every extract. Manifestly the position of these men is that the Constitution of a country is the place where the people ought to enunciate and intrench the religion which is to furnish the standard for the nation's moral conduct. Then, when the officers agree to exercise the functions of government according to the Constitution, they agree at the same time to bring their official acts to the touchstone of morality provided for by the religion which the Constitution has already incorporated. And this, it would seem, is a rational view, and wholly defensible as a principle—no matter what the incorporated religion might happen to be. A fundamental law ought to specify some standard for moral conduct.

II. These men without exception are filled with sorrow and regret because the Constitution of the United States contains no recognition of the religion of Jesus Christ with its perfect code of morals. One says, "I wish I could say

that a disposition to render Him the reverence due His great name, and the gratitude demanded by His innumerable mercies, had been more public, visible, uniform, and fervent." Another says, "I lament that our nation has not adopted some method of professing a humble acknowledgment of the Saviour of men, and of the religion of the Holy Scriptures." Another says, "That a national deed, employed about the fundamental stipulations of magistracy as an ordinance of God, and the investiture of magistrates as His ministers, should nowhere recognize the existence of the Governor of the universe, is, to say nothing worse of it, truly lamentable." And still another speaks of it as a "lamentable truth" that the "very Constitution which the singular goodness of God enabled us to establish does not so much as recognize His being." The regret, so forcibly enunciated in these trenchant statements, takes its rise and derives its significance from the fact that this fundamental defect, which leaves the United States of America, in its organic capacity, without any religion whatsoever, leaves it also without any national standard of morality. These men all knew that a nation's life depends on the purity of its morals, and that no lofty moral conceptions can long exist, and no commendable system of ethics can hold its own, apart from the sanctions of pure and undefiled religion. Knowing this, they looked with heavy hearts upon the exclusion of religion from the document which in the nature of things was destined to regulate the policies of our national government.

III. These men, while they deplore the religious defect in the Constitution, are instinctively opposed to any union of church and state. "I do not recommend the legal establishment of any particular denomination," says Mr. Robins. Dr. Romeyn is still more explicit. He would look on such a union as a calamity. He says, "I dislike and reprobate the modelling of churches by civil power, and the exclusive establishment of any particular denomination. Such establishments, I hope, will never take place in this

country; for I consider them a grievous evil." Mr. Lee, again, emphasizes the fact that it is "religion"—not denominationalism nor ecclesiasticism, but Christianity—which he wishes to see intrenched in the Constitution. "Let it, then, be received as an axiom in politics," he says, "let it be engraven upon our hearts as with the point of a diamond, that RELIGION IS THE ONLY SURE FOUNDATION OF A FREE AND HAPPY GOVERNMENT." Religion, in fact, is something which, as these men perceive, lies back of both church and state. Here, let us suppose for example, is a community with a voting population of five hundred. The whole five hundred are members of the church. The whole five hundred are members of the state. Five of these men are chosen as the officers of the church. The same five are chosen as the officers of state. They convene on Monday morning, as a church court, to deliberate on ecclesiastical matters. Among other things they decide to purchase a lot and erect a new building. The property they want belongs to a woman in destitute circumstances. She must sell, and will have to take whatever they offer. They have her at their mercy and can get her property for \$300.00, although it is worth every cent of \$500.00. But the Bible is the fundamental law of the church, and the Bible says, "Thou shalt not steal," and furthermore, "Blessed is he that considereth the poor." Taking these things into account they conclude to give the woman \$500.00, the full value of her property. They meet again on Monday afternoon, as a civic council, to purchase a site for a town hall. They have to face, let us suppose, almost identically the same conditions as they had faced in the morning. The Bible, however, let us suppose again, is in this instance the fundamental law of the state. Would it not, then, require them to pursue practically the same course in the second case as in the first? And would that not be right? And would the mere fact that these officers, both in their civil and ecclesiastical capacities, were actuated by the law of

righteousness as found in the Word of God—would this fact constitute a union of the two organisms? Would the two organisms not remain intact, even though they should trace their authority back to the same origin, and should adopt the same standard of morality, and should even be composed of the same officers and members? The Divine authority and law lie back of the church. The Divine authority and law lie back of the state. Both organisms, therefore, each in a manner proper to itself, ought to acknowledge Divine authority and law. And this, so far from bringing about a union of church and state, would prevent it; for the Bible teaches that the two institutions are, and are to be, and ought to be, distinct. With these facts the men whose statements we are considering were perfectly familiar.

IV. These men call attention to the fact that from a religious point of view there was an entire change of front in political affairs in this country in 1787. Religion, at the outset, occupied quite a prominent place in the social and civic life of the colonies. As Dr. MacMaster puts it, "The men who planned the first colonies in this land and laid the foundations of these States were men who feared God, and even in their political affairs, as in other things, were not ashamed to honor His Son." The "Mercersburg Review" is still more explicit: "The contrast, in this respect, between the Declaration of Independence and this Constitution, is humiliating and painful. The appeal made to the King of kings in the former . . . was not unavailing. But we look in vain, in this great charter, in which that Declaration found its happy consummation, for a counterpart to that appeal." Had our forefathers made an acknowledgment of God in the Constitution, it would not, therefore, have been something new in history. Not to make it was the new thing. "The great evil of our country, in my view," says Mr. Robins, "has been that we have attempted to strike out a new path to national prosperity regardless of all the dictates of experience, and the testimony of the Word of

God." In 1787 the torch of religion in our organic civic life was, as a matter of fact, extinguished. From that day forward "we, the people of the United States," without declaring any dependence upon God, undertook to hold the helm and guide the ship of state, unassisted, past the reefs and through the storms of time. It was a bold experiment, a prodigious undertaking, an open rupture with the past. In 1787 our nation turned its face in a new direction, on a unknown sea, and the men who veered the course were conscious of the change.

V. Once more, these men, whose writings have been cited, are all solicitous about the outcome. Dr. Mason says, "Should the citizens of America be as irreligious as her Constitution, we will have reason to tremble, lest the Governor of the universe, who will not be treated with indignity by a people any more than by individuals, overturn from its foundations the fabric we have been rearing, and crush us to atoms in the wreck." This neglect to acknowledge God, in the Federal Constitution, he says again, "has excited in many of its best friends more alarm than all other difficulties." Dr. Wylie asks, "Shall a nation act as if independent of the God of the universe, and expect to be guiltless?" Dr. Austin goes so far as to say that this one capital defect in the Constitution "will issue inevitably in its destruction." President Dwight, even in 1813, said to his Senior Class, "The corruption which is now rapidly extending in this country gives reason for apprehension that we are soon to suffer the punishment to which we have exposed ourselves." Dr. Duffield fears that the judgments of God will overtake our nation; that God will be to us "as a lion," and "as a leopard by the way." And Dr. M'Ilvaine calls attention to the fact that the men who are zealous "for the purity of religion by keeping it separate from government" do not, unfortunately, "inform us what is to preserve the purity of government after it has become sequestered from religion." These men are anxious for the future.

They think they can discern disaster ahead. "The wreck" is sure to come. "The punishment to which we have exposed ourselves" will be meted out. The horizon from the outset is dark and lowering; the clouds are black with wrath; the tempest, though it tarry, will come at last in all its fury. So at least these men are prone to think. So they speak. So they feel.

But, it might be asked, had these men sufficient grounds for such misgivings? Had they any reason to be afraid? Were they not anticipating imaginary evils? Did history bear them out? Did the disasters come? What was it that they saw through their anxious eyes? Was it not a sculptured "lion?" Was it not a painted "leopard?" In 1861 the battle cry was heard. Before the war was over a million men had been sent to untimely graves. Death had entered a million homes. Ten million heads were bent in sorrow. A whole nation was bowed in grief. And why? The men themselves, who passed through the calamities of those dreadful years, have given us the answer, and the answer proves that the solicitude of the noble men of former days was not unwarranted. The battle of Bull Run was a dark event in the history of the United States. It aroused the nation from ocean to ocean. On the Sabbath following that disaster Dr. Horace Bushnell voiced the sentiments of all the North, when he said:

"It is a remarkable, but a very serious fact, not sufficiently noted, as far as my observation extends, that our grand Revolutionary fathers left us the legacy of this war in the ambiguities of thought and principle which they suffered in respect to the foundations of government itself. The real fact is that, without proposing it, or being distinctly conscious of it, they organized a government, such as we, at least, have understood to be without moral or religious ideas; in one view a merely man-made compact, which, without something further, which in fact was omitted or philosophically excluded, could never have more than a semblance of authority. More it has actually had, because our nation itself has been wiser and deeper, and closer to God, than our political doctrines; but we have been gradually wearing our nature down to

the level of our doctrines, crushing out, so to speak, the sentiments in it that took hold of authority, till at last, we have brought ourselves down as closely as may be to the dissolution of all nationality and all ties of order. . . . Proximately our whole difficulty is an issue forced by slavery; but if we go back to the deepest root of the trouble, we shall find that it comes of trying to maintain a government without moral ideas, and concentrate a loyal feeling around institutions that, as many reason, are only human compacts, entitled, of course, if that be all, to no feeling of authority, or even of respect. In all these schemings of theory by which we have been contriving to generate, or have generated, a government without going above humanity, we leave out all moral ideas, and take away all true forces necessary to government. Our merely terrene, almost subterranean, always godless fabric, becomes more and more exactly what we have taken it to be in our philosophy. . . . It might not be amiss, at some fit time, to insert in the Preamble of our Constitution a recognition of the fact that the authority of government, in every form, is derivable only from God; cutting off, in this manner, the false theories under which we have been so fatally demoralized."

After the battle of Bull Run President Lincoln proclaimed a national fast. We found, in the day of trouble, that we had to come back to the God whom we, in our national capacity, had presumed to forget. Our Constitution, with its practical atheism, was not equal to the emergency. We had to call upon the God for whose adorable Name our fundamental law could not so much as spare a place of honor. It was well for us in that dismal hour that the great Lincoln was a man who realized that nations are accountable to God. Under this conviction he dared, as the nation's President, to overstep the limits which the nation's irreligious Constitution had drawn around him. He bade the nation bow before the God whom the nation had ignored. And the nation bowed. The New York "Independent" gave expression to the prevailing convictions of the Christian people of our country, when, in its leading editorial, September 26, 1861, it said:

"The President calls upon us to-day, in sorrowful remembrance of our own faults and crimes as a nation, and as individuals, to humble ourselves before God, and to pray for His mercy. What, then, are the

faults and crimes which stand more immediately connected with our public calamities—the sins which as a people we are called upon to confess and forsake? Some are disposed to dwell almost exclusively upon that huge organic iniquity which has struck its roots so deeply into our national history, which spreads over so large a portion of our territory. . . . But the root of our iniquities and calamities lies deeper even than this; and fruitful in sins and judgments as slavery has been, it is itself more a product than the cause of our national iniquity. . . . Jehovah has a broader indictment against us than is represented by this one count, even with all its frightful specifications. That indictment reads, "Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers, children that are corruptors! they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward." To sum up the iniquity of this nation in one comprehensive charge, it is GODLESSNESS: not atheism in the philosophical sense of denying the existence of God, but that practical atheism which ignores the law and authority of God, and the requirements of religion in both public and private affairs: which leaves out of view the law of God as a rule of civil and social life, and the favor of God as an element of public prosperity.

The specifications under this indictment are such as the following: Dr. Bushnell, in his sermon on the Bull Run disaster, has made prominent the fact that from the beginning we have shown our godlessness as a nation, BY IGNORING THE NAME AND AUTHORITY OF GOD IN THE FRAME-WORK OF OUR POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS. Neither the name of God, nor any reference to His law, His government, or His providence, can be found in the Constitution of the United States. Even the oath of fidelity administered to the President has no recognition of God or of the sanctions of religion. The only allusion of a religious kind in the Constitution is the phrase, "Sundays excepted," in the ten days allowed the President for signing a bill: but this is because by usage in secular business Sunday is a *DIES NON*. The Constitution provides, as it should, against a religious establishment, religious tests, or any infringement upon the rights of conscience. But it does not even recognize the fact that it is an ordinance of God for the well-being of society that civil government shall exist; and that such government should be administered upon the principles of truth, justice, order and beneficence set forth in the moral government of God. "We, the people" made the Constitution, and "We, the people" have worshipped it as the mirror of our own wisdom and power. Not Pharaoh boasting: "My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself;" not Nebuchadnezzar, strutting upon his palace wall and saying, "Is not this great Babylon

that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?" was more vain-glorious and atheistic than we have been in boasting of the mechanism of our political institutions. . . . Failing to discriminate between LEGISLATING for a particular creed or form of religion, and RECOGNIZING the great foundation truth of all religion—the just authority of a Holy and Almighty God, we have set up ourselves, our concrete nationality, "We, the people," as the original source of all authority and power, and have worshipped the work of our own hands. From this atheistic error in our prime conceptions of government has arisen the atheistic habit of separating politics from religion; the voter must not carry his religious scruples to the political caucus, nor set them against the party nominations at the polls; the minister must not bring politics into the pulpit, though the legislature should license dramshops and brothels, though Sodom should be rebuilt by the Salt Lake of Utah, though man made in the image of God should be sold like a brute under the eaves of the national Capitol. Nay, in the very Senate chamber, when Senators are warned that a measure is unjust and against the law of God, it is sneeringly, scornfully answered, that there is no law higher than the Constitution. "We, the people," made that, and "We, the people," can make and unmake laws as we please. This godless habit of thought and action has taken possession of the public mind in all political institutions and affairs. But He that sitteth in the heavens is teaching us that we can hold our Constitution, our Union, our government, our nationality, only by His pleasure."

National calamities help to clarify the mind. When Almighty God lifted His naked hand in judgment on our nation during the time of the Civil War, our ablest thinkers saw that slavery—"huge organic iniquity" though it undoubtedly was—was not the sin that caused the trouble. They saw that slavery was but the "product" of our national "godlessness," that it was but the outcome of that "practical atheism which ignores the law and authority of God." They saw that it was on account of the "atheistic error in our prime conceptions of government" that "the atheistic habit of separating politics from religion" had arisen, and that, when politics had once become "sequestered from religion," there was nothing else in the world by which to preserve purity, equity, justice and moral rectitude in government.

They saw that a nation could not begin with false philosophical theories without gradually wearing its nature down to the level of its doctrines. And the horrors of the Civil War taught our nation—though it took our nation but a short time to forget the lesson—that when any people proposes to conduct its political affairs according to an atheistical programme and eventually wears its nature down to the level of such a programme, God will not long hold back the thunders of His wrath.

We can hardly estimate what the "atheistic error" of our Constitution has cost us. If the Constitution had made the Bible the ultimate source of appeal in governmental affairs, slavery, for one thing, would never have gained a legal footing in the United States of America. If slavery had never been legalized, there would have been no cause for the Civil War. The Civil War was the fruitage of atheism seated in our constitutional law. And how much that war has cost our nation! Says Woodrow Wilson, in his "History of the American People," "What had been spent to fight the fight out passed calculation. It had cost the country more than seven hundred men for every day of all the four long years of campaign and battle: four hundred killed or mortally wounded on the field, the rest dead of disease, exposure, accident or the slow pains of imprisonment. The federal government had spent thirty-four hundred million dollars upon the war,—nearly two and a half millions for every day it lasted. . . . The Confederacy had piled up a debt, upon its part, of nearly fourteen hundred millions, and had spent, besides, no man could say how much." The war had cost our country more than a million men in four years, and rather more than less than five billions of dollars. And it has cost us more than four billions of dollars in pensions since that time. And all this is but as nothing when compared with the broken homes, the aching hearts, the lonely lives, which the war has left our people as a heritage for more than half a century. But it was "our grand

Revolutionary fathers," after all, as Dr. Bushnell has so truly said, who "left us the legacy of this war in the ambiguities of thought and principle which they suffered in respect to the foundations of government itself."

Again, if the Constitution had made the Bible the ultimate source of appeal in governmental affairs in the United States, the Liquor Traffic would never have secured a legal foothold in our land. As it is now, however, the United States as an organic entity, a responsible moral agent, is a partner, is indeed the leading partner, in the liquor business. It receives, yearly, in revenues, about two hundred millions of dollars from this strangely irrational as well as hideously irrationalizing traffic—a traffic which degrades its victims below the dignity of a beast. In forty-nine years, from 1863 to the close of 1911, the United States took in, as we may say, over the national bar, five billion two hundred forty-five million nine hundred sixteen thousand forty-seven dollars! There is a certain inexpressible ghastliness in such figures when they are considered in connection with the fact that the sum they designate was gathered in by a nation from a traffic through which its own citizens have been, and are, and are bound to be, swept, year by year, by the hundreds of thousands, into drunkard's graves. In thirty-five years, 1876-1910, the people of the United States, by legal permission, spent thirty-five billion five hundred eighty-four million one hundred one thousand nine hundred seven dollars for drink. And our drink bill is steadily increasing. At present it exceeds two and a half billions annually. Our nation, in thirty-seven years, has expended over forty billions in the destruction of life and character.

It is hard to grasp the significance of such figures. Forty billions, in United States silver dollars, would make a pile sixty-three thousand miles high. Laid side by side to form a pavement, they would make a walk five feet wide around the globe at the equator. Re-arranged so as to be six inches wide they would form a silver ribbon long enough to reach

from the earth to the moon, and even then there would be over five hundred miles of surplusage at each end. The liquor traffic is draining our resources at the present time at the rate of twenty-six dollars a year for every man, woman and child in the United States. And to this must also be added the cost of maintaining penitentiaries and jails and asylums for the care of the system's victims, and the cost of prosecutions for crime, and the cost of property destroyed through drunkenness, and the waste of grain. Yet all this is but a mere trifle when compared with the wretchedness and want and wickedness which the business entails. It is a system that debauches manhood and ruins womanhood, and gnaws like an undying worm at the heart of our Republic. The trouble is that every man who becomes responsible for the administration of the government becomes by that fact a partner in the liquor traffic, and once a partner in that nefarious business he soon loses the inclination, if not the power, to perceive the nice distinctions between right and wrong. His moral nature becomes callous. And there is nothing in the world more infectious or more dangerous than obliquity in moral perception. It undermines the social fabric. Now the moral standard of the Bible, as all the world knows, would not permit the existence of the Liquor Traffic for a moment. What, then, shall be said of the United States government which has even framed its laws so that the national treasury shall be reimbursed by revenues gathered from the art of making drunkards? Could such a course of action ever meet with the approval of God? "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with Thee, which frameth mischief by a law?" (Psalm 94 : 20). "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong" (Jeremiah 22 : 13). "Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood, and establisheth a city by iniquity! Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink!" (Habakkuk 2 : 12 and 15). The Bible declares that a drunkard shall not "inherit the kingdom of heaven" (1

Corinthians 6 : 10). Is it supposable, then, that if the United States had adopted the Christian standard of morality at the outset, it would have pursued, deliberately and for more than a century, the best conceivable policy for barring its citizens out of the kingdom of Christ? "Our grand Revolutionary fathers," to go back to the words of Dr. Bushnell, "left us the legacy" of one of the most deplorable systems of iniquity under heaven "in the ambiguities of thought and principle which they suffered in respect to the foundations of government itself."

It would be easy to enumerate many other evils that are constantly flowing from the "atheistic error" which lies at the basis of our civic life. The people of the United States, to cite another example, are being robbed of more than two billions of dollars, every year, through the Stock Exchange. This is a case where the robber and the robbed are equally guilty, at least from one point of view. Both are gamblers. But if our nation's standard of morality were the Christian standard of morality, such a system could not exist for a month. The fact is, however, that this whole matter is regarded with comparative indifference. And this is but another illustration of the way in which the people of the United States have been gradually wearing their nature "down to the level" of their atheistical philosophy of civil government.

But worst of all, perhaps, is the almost universal corruption in politics. Our political philosophy from 1787 and onward has been that religion has, and ought to have, nothing to do with politics. And now we have come to the pass where to speak of a man as a politician is but a shrewd way of intimating that he ought to be in the penitentiary. In our country, nowadays, politics and dishonesty are never wholly dissociated in thought. A politician, in our way of thinking, is a sort of polished scoundrel. The politicians are robbing the people of the United States of millions upon millions every year. And the people, in a harmless way,

are protesting against their systematic thievery. We have reached the era of investigation. The politicians are investigating the politicians, and, for the most part, are getting more money for doing it than they are saving to the country by the process. Dishonesty is discountenanced, not so much because it is wrong, but because it is unbusiness-like. We have been studying economics in our colleges and universities, and we have come to see that by as much as the robber is enriched even by so much is the robbed impoverished. And so we are treated periodically to a more or less spirited, though none the less spasmodic, uprising on the part of the people against political chicanery—not because political chicanery and corruption are hateful in the sight of God, but rather because we are reluctant to bid adieu to our hard-earned money. Is there any morality in that? The doleful fact is that we have no national standard of morality. And we are learning to our sorrow that it is utter folly to expect a higher standard of morality on the part of our officers than we bound them to when we committed the affairs of state into their hands. There is an "atheistic error" in the constitutional law we bind them to, and so we have but little room to take exception to their conduct when we find them acquiring that "atheistic habit" which is but the logical outcome of the original error. The citizens of America, in the field of politics, are becoming, to use the words of Dr. Mason, "as irreligious as her Constitution." To sum the whole matter up in a word, we are beginning to realize that to ignore "the name and authority of God in the frame-work of our political institutions" is a fatal defect, a defect which is steadily and remorselessly working havoc at the foundations of our civic life. All government needs the sanctions of pure and undefiled religion.

But if these things are true, how does it come that the United States has not been "crushed to atoms in the wreck" long ago? The answer is that there are many millions of

Christians in the United States, and many millions more, who, while they have not made a profession of Christianity, are favorably disposed to the Christian faith. Their influence makes for righteousness in civil government. They long and pray and labor for purity in politics. The misfortune is that they have to fight against such fearful odds. Not only are the corrupt politicians arrayed against them, but these politicians, and such as are willing to consort with them, are able to use the Constitution as a sort of breastworks or fortification behind which to do their fighting. The Bible in the schools is the bulwark of American civilization. All genuine Christians in the United States, and millions, who, while not Christians, are friendly to the Christian religion, are anxious to have the Bible read in the schools. But those who are opposed to this custom—a custom, by the way, which has done much toward making the United States as great a nation as it is—are not slow to intrench themselves behind the Constitution. Judge Orton, in connection with a decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, prohibiting the reading of the Bible, without comment, in the public schools of that State, said of the schools, "They are Godless, and the educational department of the government is Godless in the same sense that the executive legislative and administrative departments are Godless. So long as our Constitution remains as it is, no one's religion can be taught in our public schools." Not long ago a few malcontents, in an obscure corner of Illinois, secured an injunction against the reading of the Bible in the schools of that great Commonwealth, simply because the Constitution of the United States was on the side of irreligion. The Christians of the State of Illinois were powerless. The Constitution is so constructed as to favor the forces of evil. Righteousness, prosperity and peace always follow wherever real genuine Christianity leads the way. It is Christianity that has made the United States what it is. If the Constitution of the United States were Christian, it would be an engine of power in the hands

of men whose absorbing aim is that moral rectitude shall characterize the whole of our national conduct. As it is, it is an engine of power on the other side. It ought to be Christian, so that the Christian citizens of the United States could use it for the realization of the highest ideals in the realm of civil government, and for the welfare of the world. And we feel, and we would like to persuade you to feel, that what our Constitution ought to be, yours ought to be. We are profoundly convinced that every government on earth ought to make the Bible the foundation of its civic life and in this way establish itself upon the sanctions of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, the invisible King. In fact, it is on account of this conviction that the members of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America decline, and have from the beginning declined, to take any part in the civil elections. We are persuaded that it is a sin of no small magnitude to cast the ballot for a candidate, when the first thing he will have to do, if elected, is to swear that he will perform his official duties upon a legal basis which rules God, Christ and the Bible out. We have been struggling unceasingly to have that vital defect remedied, and we consequently refuse to take part in putting men into office, when by their oath they must accept for the time, and agree to administer the government according to, the defective document AS IT IS. To swear to support a fundamental law which rules God, Christ and the Bible out of it is, in our judgment, altogether out of keeping with any very serious effort to put a proper recognition of God, Christ and the Bible into it. The fact, therefore, that our Constitution is morally and religiously defective not only gives the enemies of righteousness a strong vantage ground from which to work, but has the effect, as it seems to us, of compromising the position of the faithful Christian when he essays to enter the field of practical politics. We feel that we cannot be wholly loyal to Christ and at the same time agree to leave Him behind us in any department of life what-

soever, for our Lord Himself has said, "without me ye can do nothing" (John 15: 5). And so we feel constrained to urge all nations to acknowledge Christ in order that the forces of righteousness may always have the advantage in the war against wrong.

Our Church, then, is anxious that the Republic of China shall prove to be an illustrious success. We hope and pray that your permanent Constitution shall contain a full and unequivocal recognition of Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil affairs, a recognition of the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, and an acceptance of the Bible as furnishing the only perfect code of morals for national as well as for private life. We hope that your oath of office, when it shall have reached its final form, will make a proper appeal to the great and dreadful name of the Most High God. We hope that in this way your Constitution may be so constructed as to become itself a proper religious test for everyone who comes forward to take the oath of office and assume the functions of government. We hope that in case the Constitution of the United States should come under your observation and study as a model, its excellencies, which are manifold, may not blind you to the one "atheistic error" which so signally mars its moral beauty and its usefulness. In short, we hope that the Constitution of the United Republic of China shall be moulded in such a way as to become a stronghold which the noblest men of the nation may invariably make use of in the propagation of everything that is honorable and upright and ideal in the domain of civic life. And to this end our constant prayer shall be that "the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant" may "make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever."