

OBJECTION VII. — “ THIS NATION ACKNOWLEDGES NO RELIGION, therefore is no more Christian, than Jewish, Mohammedan, or infidel.”

Ever since efforts were made in this country, to procure the repeal of the law authorizing and directing Sabbath mails, the opposers of that rest have been loud in their assertions, that this nation is no more Christian than Jewish, Mohammedan, or infidel, &c. From this sentiment, we beg leave to dissent. It is neither just nor safe.

But, has this nation no religion ? All civil governments, of any value to the people over whom they were exercised, have been founded on some religion ; and every government has been wise and salutary in proportion to the wisdom, the truth, and the benign influence of the religion upon which it was founded.

France, in modern days, attempted to re-model her government. She took it from the foundation of Christianity, but placed it upon the sand ; on no religious system whatever. This was effected by infidels and atheists—enemies of the Sabbath, and of the Christian religion ; like our opponents. History is full and ample in the records of her fall. The bloody waves of anarchy, dashing from boundary to boundary, soon washed away this foundation ; but not until many thousands of her best citizens had been overwhelmed in the awful flood.

To be ruled by wicked men, in a republican government, is unspeakably more to be dreaded, than to be under their control in monarchical governments,—just as a hundred devils, each having conflicting interests, and let loose upon a community, would be worse than one.

The government of these United States was founded on religion, and that religion is neither the Jewish, the Mohammedan, the pagan, the deist's, the infidel's, nor the atheist's ; but it is the *Christian religion*. The proof will be given hereafter. The genius of the government which we wished to form, required just such a religion as the Christian religion ; and no other could aid, either in the formation or maintenance of it. When formed, its success was to depend wholly upon the existence and predominance of its pure, holy, ennobling, and felicitating in-

fluences. In proportion as this influence should be counteracted, would the foundation of this government be undermined. Hence the necessity of doing nothing, *nationally*, contrary to this religion; but everything which would be calculated to insure the perpetuity of this holy alliance. Because, were we to abolish this religion, or suffer its influence to be weakened, it would destroy the government which was founded upon it, and untie every ligament which holds the community together. The government which the United States desired to construct was, in many of its features, new. Those who met to settle its principles, and organize it, it seems, from the history of the transaction, were men who felt their responsibilities, and their need of divine guidance. They felt the need of wisdom from the Christian's God; and were not ashamed to acknowledge this, and ask for it. The Christian religion, therefore, was the very thing they wanted. They were not afraid of it. It was their best friend, yea, the only friend on which they could safely rely.

At the time of the organization of this government, there were probably a few Jews in this nation. Whether there were any Mohammedans or pagans within the limits which composed the Union, is not material to our argument. There were a few infidels and deists. Suppose, in this crisis, a Jew had arisen in the Convention, and objected to the first article in the seventh section of the Constitution, because it recognized the Christian, instead of the Jewish Sabbath; and also, dated from the "*year of our Lord*." What would have been the answer? Surely, with the greatest unanimity, the response would have been: "We have chosen to pattern after the *Christian*, instead of the Jewish religion."

Suppose, again, a Mohammedan or Pagan had arisen, and objected to prayers being offered to *Almighty God*; to publishing and distributing the Bible, and to the requisition of oaths in courts of justice: what answer would have been given? With equal unanimity would the response have been, "With your religion for our model, we could never *form* such a government as is contemplated, much less could we *sustain* it. We must have the benign aid of the *Christian* religion, or we can never have a *republican* government." Suppose, again, an infidel, a

deist, or an atheist of the modern school, had arisen, and objected to all allusion to the Bible, or the Christian institutions, and even to the acknowledgment of a Supreme Being, asserting that this nation should recognize *no* religion; what would have been the answer in this case? Doubtless, it would have been—Sirs, you must be the *enemies* of the government we would establish. To form it without a Protector and Supporter, and to leave it to the uncertain freaks of popular caprice, would be bringing it into existence without a *possibility* that that existence could be either beneficial or prolonged. *The government could not have been formed on their plan.* That Convention, if they had complied with the wishes of these men, could never have framed such a government as the people wanted.

But a Sabbatarian rises and says—I believe in the Christian religion, and go all lengths with you in the thing you want, and in the methods of obtaining it, except one. I want the first article in the seventh section of the Constitution so altered, that it will recognize the seventh, instead of the first-day Sabbath. What would have been the reply in this case? Doubtless it would have been—We do not sit here to settle controversies between the different sects of the Christian religion. If *we* should comply with your wishes, the *people* would not. *They* call for the first-day Sabbath, and they *must have it.* It may be your misfortune to be in the minority in this particular. If it be *intolerable*, you must go where the objection does not exist; or stay among us, submitting to the will of the *people.*

But the government is formed, and these classes have accumulated upon our hands. Now, says the objector, shall we make laws forbidding the Jew, the Mohammedan, the infidel, the deist, the atheist, to express their sentiments, and to state their reasons for these sentiments? Surely not, any more than we did at first.

But the laws already adopted by the different States, and the Constitution of the United States, interfere more or less with the *practice* of all these religions. A man may not sacrifice himself to an imaginary deity. He may not take the name of God in vain. He may not commit infanticide. He may not break the Sabbath. He may not take away the life of an aged parent,

because he is aged. He may not suffer self-immolation. He may not have many wives. He may not worship many gods. He may not commit any of the unrighteous acts of Mohammedans. He may not ridicule and despise the Christian's Bible and the Christian's God—because the doing of any of these things, and of many others allowed by Jews, Mohammedans, pagans, infidels, deists, and atheists, or permitting them to be done, will greatly weaken the influence which the Christian religion has over the community, and necessarily weaken the pillars of our government. We are to-day as much bound to guard this government against any such encroachments, as our fathers were to guard against the admittance of any thing into the Constitution which would endanger our safety, or destroy our existence. Those who object to a Sabbath and the Christian religion, are continually making new and vigorous attempts to get these "objectionable things" out of our Constitution and State laws. They would alter the structure of our government. Not daring to attempt to strike out the Christian Sabbath at a blow, they have enacted a law compelling certain of our citizens, uniformly to desecrate its sacred hours. This they knew would ultimately, if continued, lead to its total abandonment. Perhaps the next attempt will be to do away oaths in courts of justice, &c. As one error leads to another, our course now is downward.

"No nation, either ancient or modern, (with the monitory exception of revolutionary France,) ever attempted to organize a government without recognizing some religion; and no government ever existed in a civilized nation which did not acknowledge itself bound by the religion of the nation over which it presided. In accordance with this principle, every Christian nation on the other side of the Atlantic considers Christianity as the very foundation of its political institutions.

"Great Britain, the nation from which we are descended, has engrafted her constitution and laws upon it; and acknowledged its authority paramount to all human enactments. In the case of the King vs. Walston, (Strange 834,) the Court of King's Bench would not suffer it to be *debated* whether defaming Christianity was not an offence punishable at common law: alleging that whatever struck at the root of the Christian religion, tended

to dissolve civil government. The Court of King's Bench said that Christianity was a part of the law of the land. The same doctrine was recognized by Lord Kenyon, in July, 1797, in the case of the King vs. Williams, for the publication of '*Paine's Age of Reason.*' "

But "our government," we are told, "is free from *religious tests and religious establishments*—and is not bound by one religion more than another." "It is truly the happiness and glory of our country that it has cast off the intolerance of a bigoted, narrow-minded priesthood, as well as the imperious claims of a regal master. But it by no means follows that it has so entirely repudiated Christianity, that the authority of Jehovah must not be acknowledged." We know infidels and deists claim this; and it seems that they would pull this nation down from that high eminence upon which Christianity has placed her, rather than have it appear that Christianity has had anything to do with her elevation. Therefore they ridicule the Christian's God and his ordinances, and cry, "Priestcraft and persecution," in order to induce weaker minds to reject the Christian religion. Thus, by degrees, they endeavor to accomplish the thing at which they have long been aiming. But they never will destroy the Christian religion. They may be the means of breaking us in pieces. They have already taught the people to contemn God, and disregard his claims—and the wicked bear rule. A day of darkness and dread is at hand. The nation which hates God, God will destroy and cast off. A nation of infidels and deists hates God, and we are rapidly becoming such a nation.

In the proceedings of that body which framed our Constitution, and in the several documents relating to our national organization, as well as the practice of many of our first Congresses, it will appear that this nation, at that time, recognized the God of the Bible as the true God, and as their and our God—the Christian religion as their and our religion; and the Christian Sabbath as their and our Sabbath.

There was to be sure no "union of Church and State," as there is in some parts of Europe. Let God be praised that there was not. If Jews, Mohammedans, pagans, infidels, and deists, chose to come among us and enjoy the blessings consequent on an ob-

servance of the Christian religion, rather than to stay among their own class, and share the unutterable calamities and degradation which are universal and indispensable accompaniments of their religion, let them come. So long as their actions and words did not militate against the Christian religion, and thereby endanger our political institutions, their persons and property would be protected. And by conforming to our wholesome laws, they might become as one of us.

The laws and the Constitution of this country never contemplated that a Mohammed, a Voltaire, or a Nerò, might come among us and insist on his right to a *change* in our laws, to meet his case, nor that we are bound to conform to them in opinion and practice, and thereby introduce a poison into our bosoms, which would inevitably produce national as well as moral death.

Now we say that those infidels, or others of like sentiment, who caused human blood in torrents to flow through the streets of France, have no right to come among us and do the deeds which infidels perpetrated there; *because* such acts would unavoidably produce the same results in this hitherto happy nation. Such sentiments and conduct would destroy us. It is time this people knew, that as certainly as we give the infidel and the deist the things for which they have long been contending, and which they loudly claim as their *right*, we shall soon become an infidel nation—worship the infidel's god, and share the infidel's "*glory*."

They now boldly say, "we have a right to profane your Sabbaths, because we do not believe in a Sabbath—and the atheist has a right to testify in your courts of justice, without swearing by your God, because he does not believe in any God—the laws of your country to the contrary notwithstanding." We deny the position taken by these men. They have no right so to act. God never gave them that right; nor should they have it, because, by the observance of the Christian Sabbath and the Christian religion, our prosperity and our government are to be perpetuated, and they cannot be by any other means. Their conduct, in corrupting the nation and bringing the God of the Bible into contempt, is against all divine, and should be against all human law. The framers of our Constitution and of our laws

would never have allowed such conduct. Then away with the notion that Jews, Mohammedans, pagans, infidels, deists, and atheists have a right to come among us and do the things (though agreeable to their religion,) which will assuredly, if allowed, overthrow this government! Those who hold such notions are not only enemies to the Christian religion, but to every civil government under heaven. They are the enemies of the human race; and it is much to be feared, that they are nearly prepared to act over in this country the scenes so shocking to humanity, which transpired in France not many years since.

These men have already made such advances, that they often declare there ought to be no law regulating moral conduct. "If a man's religion," say they, "would allow of polygamy, or promiscuous sexual intercourse, there should be no law forbidding it, at any time, or under any circumstances. Or, if a man chooses to throw his children into the Ganges—bury his parents alive—see wives burn on the funeral pile—worship devils, or 330,000,000 of gods, he should enjoy the privilege." But we deny the claim which is here made. For by such a course they not only destroy themselves, but multitudes of others.

"And as certainly as a nation turns aside from the path, and causes the Holy One of Israel to cease from before them; and as certainly as atheism, licentious morals, and the contempt of the Sabbath and of the gospel pervade the land, so certainly will the same sanguinary scenes be acted over again, which have desolated other nations that would not obey God." There is but one alternative before us: we must either give up our infidelity and deism, and acknowledge the Christian's God as the God of this nation, and give him that place which he claims, or he will dash us in pieces, "like a potter's vessel."

RELIGION RECOGNIZED BY THE CONSTITUTION.

Was the Christian religion common in this country in the days when our government was formed? Let Dr. Franklin answer the inquiry, as he did in 1751, when he was holding the office of Deputy Postmaster-General, and wrote for the information of those across the Atlantic, who had asked for it. He says:

"Serious religion, under its various denominations, is not only tolerated, but respected and practiced. *Atheism* is unknown—*infidelity* rare and secret; so that persons may live to a great age, in this country, without having their piety shocked by meeting with either an atheist or an infidel."

No one, it is presumed, will pretend to question the competency or the correctness of this witness. He must have *known* the extent of infidelity, *certainly, if one himself*, (as our objector claims,) and he doubtless spoke the truth.

In 1787, the National Convention "reported a Constitution for a general Government. This Constitution made a regard for the existence and attributes of God indispensable in every individual whom it entrusted with an office: for it bound them by the sanctity of an oath, or solemn affirmation, and assumed as its national designation of time, the era of a Being whom it was pleased to honor as 'Our Lord;' and moreover provided a *Sabbath* for the conscience of the President." The Constitution then recognized one Supreme Being, Jesus Christ, and the Christian Sabbath. What will the infidel, deist, atheist, Jew, Mohammedan, or pagan say to this? "Ah! that Constitution will *never* do—it does not sufficiently recognize *my* religious rights. Though it acknowledges *a* religion, it does not acknowledge *our* religion, but one which we hate with perfect hatred. *It will not do.*" But the *Constitution*, the remonstrances of these men to the contrary notwithstanding, was adopted.

Let us see further what religion this nation adopted and cherished when in her infancy.

"The Christian religion is founded on, and cherished by, the sacred volume, called the Old and New Testaments. Oaths, too, were then necessary, and the religious faith of the nation is their only bond. Bibles were wanted—the commerce with Great Britain 'was cut off—and they must be procured from some other source. Accordingly a committee of Congress was appointed, in 1777, to confer with the printers, with the view of striking off an edition of 30,000, at the expense of Congress. The committee finding the difficulty of obtaining types and paper so great, recommended Congress (the use of the Bible being so universal, and its importance so great) to direct the commit-

tee of commerce to import, at the expense of Congress 20,000 English Bibles, from Holland, Scotland, or elsewhere, into the different States of the Union ;' and the Congress ordered the importation. In 1780, when it was found, from the circumstances of the wars, an English Bible could not be imported, and no opinion could be formed how long the obstruction might continue, the Congress again resumed the consideration of printing the Bible, and the matter was referred to a committee of three. An individual was found who would undertake the work, and in 1782, Congress appointed a committee of three to attend to the edition contemplated by Robert Aikin, of Philadelphia. The committee 'having attended to the progress of the work, and engaged the assistance of the chaplains of Congress,'—whereupon it was 'Resolved, That the United States, in Congress assembled, *highly* approve the pious and laudable undertaking, as *subservient to the interests of religion*, [not Mohammedan, Jewish, infidel, deist, or pagan, but the Christian Religion,] and being satisfied of the care and accuracy in the execution of the work, *recommend* this edition of the Bible to the inhabitants of the United States.' What intolerance thus to aid in diffusing the *Bible*, instead of the Koran, or the Shaster, and grieving the consciences of [infidels,] deists, and atheists."

What do objectors now think about a majority of the framers of the Constitution being anti-christian ?

We know this is not the same body which framed the Constitution ; but many of the members of this body were members of the Convention. Both bodies possessed a similar spirit. Who can now doubt that this nation recognized the Christian religion as its religion ; and that those men who framed the Constitution, as well as those who helped to administer it for many years, believed in and cherished the Christian religion ?

FASTS.

In 1776, we find the late Governor Livingston obtaining leave and presenting a resolution to Congress for a national fast, which is in the following words : "That it becomes," &c. "Congress, therefore, *desirous* to have people of all ranks and degrees duly impressed with a solemn sense of God's superintending provi-

dence, and of their *duty* devoutly to rely, in all their lawful enterprises, on his aid and protection, do earnestly recommend that Friday, the 17th day of May next, be observed by the said Colonies, as a day of humiliation, fasting, and prayer; that we may, by a sincere repentance and amendment of life, through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, obtain his pardon: and if our unnatural enemies, continuing deaf to the voice of reason and humanity, are inflexibly bent on war, it may please the Lord of hosts, the God of armies, to animate our officers and soldiers; earnestly beseeching him to bless our civil rulers and the representatives of the people, preserve and strengthen their union," &c.

"The citizens respectfully received this official communication. The Divine Being heard, and, as they thought, blessed the government and nation on said day. Congress adjourned, and joined in the solemnities."

In the same year, Congress recommended another day of fasting and prayer, in the following words:

"Whereas, the war is likely to be carried to the greatest extremity; and whereas it *becomes all public bodies*, as well as private persons, to reverence the providence of God, and look up to him as the Supreme Disposer of all events, and the Arbiter of the fate of nations," &c.—at the same time "Resolved, That Congress be opened every morning at ten o'clock, *Sundays* excepted."

Surely a nation has nothing to fear from such "*anti-christian*" men as formed these two Congresses.

In February, 1778, another committee was appointed by Congress to prepare a recommendation to the people of the United States, to set apart a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer: April 22d was set apart for that purpose. The proclamation was more fully and humbly expressed than the former, but breathed the same spirit. Congress joined in it.

Another fast was observed by Congress, on the first Thursday of May, 1779, and bore the signature of "John Jay, at that time President of Congress." A part of it is as follows:

"The States are recommended to apply themselves to prayer, that God would be pleased to avert impending calamities, that

he would grant us his grace to repent of our sins, and amend our lives, according to his holy word ; * * * that he will diffuse useful knowledge, and extend the influence of *true religion*."

The religion of his "HOLY WORD," which forbids labor on Sunday : not the religion of the infidel, or Jew, or pagan.

In March, 1780, another committee was appointed for the same purpose, and the last Wednesday of April was set apart as the day. In 1781, another fast was ordered to be kept on Thursday, the 3d of May. In 1782, another was observed on the last Thursday of April ; and "early in 1783, the Divine Being, whom the Congress had so often nationally and officially honored, vouchsafed peace to the Union."

In each of these proclamations for a fast, the spirit of true Christianity is breathed, and Congress adjourned to join in supplications to the Christian's God, for his protection, forgiveness, and blessing ; confessing their sins, and humbling themselves on account of them. Congress also adjourned to unite in the religious services of Good Friday. Away with the objector's calumny ; it is as base and false as ever was uttered by the "accuser of the brethren." What would those Congresses have said to a proposition, at that period, to desecrate the *holy day* of God—to give the sanction of the *nation* to it ? They were good men, and the people were blessed. Would that our rulers could now be induced to engage in such acts of acknowledgment of their dependence on the Christian's God, and manifest such a disposition to sustain his laws.

There is other evidence to show that this nation recognized the Christian religion, and that the framers of the Constitution were not "anti-christian men."

THANKSGIVINGS.

Each year from 1777 to 1783 inclusive, we find Congress appointing days for national thanksgiving and prayer, which were duly observed. On motion of John Randolph, in 1781, October 24th, it was "Resolved, That Congress will, at 2 P. M., this day, go in procession to the Dutch Lutheran church, and return thanks to Almighty God, for"—&c.

In the proclamation for a day of thanksgiving, we find sen-

timents of piety expressed in the following and similar language:—

“That all the people assemble on that day to offer fervent supplications to the God of all grace, that he would incline our hearts, for the future, to keep all his laws, and that he would cause the knowledge of Christianity to spread all over the earth” —“above all, to praise him that he hath continued to us the light of the *blessed gospel*, and to supplicate him, that he would cause pure *religion* and virtue to flourish.”

It would seem that the wise and patriotic men of those times believed that the “blessed gospel,” not the Koran, nor the Shaster, but the Christian system, was better adapted to the wants of men than any other system; and their conduct shows that they did not entertain views congenial to the feelings of infidels and deists of our day. Had both lived at the same time, they would have been antipodes in sentiment and action. We see no lack of proof that the framers of our Constitution, and the men who first administered it, were not anti-christian, as our objectors would have us believe. It is perfectly evident that these men were not ashamed to own their accountability to God, and their dependence on him: nor were they ashamed or afraid to recognize the Christian religion, in their *national* capacity. They had discernment, fidelity, piety, and patriotism enough to prompt them to make a wise choice, when they laid down the Christian religion as the foundation of this government, instead of the Jewish, Mohammedan, pagan, infidel, or deistical religion. God be praised for the noble deed.

But it appears that many of the members of Congress, for the last twelve or fifteen years, have been ashamed to acknowledge God; and infidels have united with them to prove that we have no Sabbath, and that this nation knows no religion. She may, in her riches and pride, have *forgotten* her religion; but she *once* had a religion, and that was the *Christian*. She ought to have it still.

Infidels would have us believe that the Jew, the Mohammedan, and the pagan, have as much claim to legislation in favor of *their* religion, as Christians have a right to expect that Congress will *not* legislate *against* theirs. But these pleas are all

false—a mere subterfuge to rid themselves of all accountability to the laws of God and man.

CHAPLAINS.

There is one fact more, in connection with this point, from which we gather further testimony :

In 1776, the Congress of the United States, "Resolved, That a chaplain be appointed to each regiment in the continental army." In 1777, "Resolved, That chaplains be appointed to the hospitals." In 1788, Congress "earnestly recommended to the States and officers of the army, to discountenance profaneness and vice;" and solemnly, more than once, resolved that "true religion and good morals are the only solid foundations of public liberty and happiness,—solicited Christian ministers to preach at the funerals of deceased members." From the commencement of their sittings, Christian chaplains were appointed to open their sessions with prayer.

STATE LAWS.

The several States which own canals and railroads, should close them on Sunday ; and not corrupt the morals of their citizens, undermine our government, and sin against God, by permitting them to be used on that day. Every good citizen ought to remonstrate against such a practice. Infidels and deists, always ready to carp whenever anything is said or done to cross their path of blood, over the bodies and souls of men, have said—"Well, then, the Jew who will not work on Saturday, according to that doctrine, should call on the legislatures to make laws preventing work on Saturday." It has been clearly shown that this nation recognizes the Christian, instead of the Jewish religion. Moreover, we have never called on the States to make any law whatever, about *individual* or *corporate* property, though it might be proper to do so. The States should not run boats and cars, nor suffer them to be run, on the Lord's day, on *their* canals and railroads, putting the money thus earned into the treasury, because we are a Christian nation ; and such an act tends to destroy the Christian religion, and our government. The same may be said of national property. Neither the States

not the nation has a right to commit such a suicidal act. If we were an infidel or pagan nation, then, so far as *civil* law, and our religion were concerned, there would be no objection. But now they have no such right, civil or divine. By continuing the practice, they dishonor God, ruin men, and will, ere long, writhe under the displeasure of that Being who has said, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy."

Infidels say, our States have no right to legislate on religion. Our Sabbath laws ought to be repealed. In other words, we suppose they would be understood to say,—“If we choose to corrupt your youth, contaminate your morals, and destroy your religion, you have no right to make a law to prevent it, though our conduct would assuredly lead to that result. We have thrown off the government of God, because we do not believe there is any God; and now we would throw off the government of man; because we believe man would do better without any government. We hate the Christian religion, and we know how it can be destroyed; and if you let us alone, it shall be destroyed. You shall let us alone, because you have no right to make a law touching religion.”

“We would ask, is it rational to suppose that the government and nation, in 1776, were not Christian, and knew no religion?—when the United States, in Congress assembled; (though there were then Jews, and possibly a few deists,) yet officially promoted the circulation of the Old and New Testaments, bound themselves by the sanctity of an oath, on the Holy Volume; rejoiced, ‘above all’ in the possession of the Gospel of peace, attributed all national blessings to Almighty God; implored, and recommended the people to implore, his direction in their councils, and his forgiveness of their sins, through the merits of the Divine Redeemer; and measured our national existence by ‘the year of our Lord:’ when they urged the States to cherish ‘pure and undefiled religion,’ which the States never understood to be other than the Christian; when they carefully provided and paid Christian chaplains, of various denominations, that their armies, navies, and hospitals, might be supplied with Christian instruction and consolation; when they reverently waived national business on the Sabbath, while a Christian nation was en-

gaged in worshipping the Father of mercies; and even tenderly accommodated those denominations that would celebrate the crucifixion of the Redeemer? We shall see that the spirit of '76, on these subjects, was still alive in the administration of Washington. If, therefore, our government is no longer Christian, but Jewish, Mohammedan, pagan, or atheistical, it is incumbent on those who declare it anti-christian, 'to point out *when* and *how* the change was introduced.' " Under this head we have quoted largely from LOGIC and LAW.

Before closing the remarks on this point we add an extract from Rev. Evan Johns.

" Here, I would ask, are not the representatives of the people, with all their magistrates, chosen by the people, bound to devise and to carry into effect measures to aid them in the pursuit of happiness? Elected for this purpose, are not legislatures in duty bound to enact all the laws in their judgment adapted to answer the end of their appointment? Again, are not all our laws designed to prevent the ill-disposed from violating the rights of our fellow-citizens? Again, are not indecent exposures of human person, as well as other indecencies, punishable by law—punishable because injurious to morals? Are not certain things cognizable by law, under the name of nuisances, because they are found prejudicial to health? Is not the disturbance of public, social worship, at once a nuisance and an infringement of right? Who will deny, that the rumbling of a long string of wagons, the cracking of whips, and the blowing of horns, in front of a church, during public worship, is a dreadful nuisance? * * * Has any person the hardihood to deny that these sore evils may be legitimately prevented by laws adapted to the nature of each case? To give an affirmative answer to each of these questions, every candid person would feel himself impelled, when considering that facts have demonstrated, and, if cited, would again show clearly and fully that such is the constitution given by divine Providence to man and beasts of labor, as to make the rest of the Sabbath indispensable, to secure the greatest attainable portion of happiness. Who then will have the audacity to say, that the advocates of the Christian Sabbath are not authorized in their exertions to have it kept holy by the most

clearly evident moral principles ; or, which amounts to the same thing, by the divine Author of nature."

But whether the friends or advocates of the Sabbath touch this point or not, they "are most shamefully insulted and most vilely aspersed, by persons apparently determined to convince the world, that the tale of the frog and the ox is not fabulous." If public and outward acts of Sabbath desecration are not prohibited by government in State laws, such a day and such a government, especially if republican, cannot be sustained.

See also remarks already made in the PETITIONS to the twenty-fifth Congress, third session, 1837 and 1838, page 76-133.

OBJECTION VIII.—"WORKS OF PUBLIC UTILITY MAY BE DONE ON SUNDAY."

The objector often excuses his violation of the Sabbath by saying that the example of Christ justifies works of public utility on Sunday.

In all the examples Christ has given, relative to works, which are appropriate to the Sabbath, not one of them, we believe, relates to works, other than merciful. "Works of necessity and mercy," on which so much stress is often laid, is not Bible language. However high its authority, many are led astray by it. Christ taught by example and precept, that the sick might be healed, a horse might be watered, an animal in the ditch might be helped out on the Sabbath. He does not adduce instances of wasting grain, mouldering and bleaching hay, carrying the mail in "*cases of emergency*," traveling on journeys, running of boats, rail-cars and stages, &c. &c. None of these. The language of the law of the Sabbath is sufficiently explicit to convince the plainest man, that to do such works is a breach of that law. Christ's words in relation to this subject, were doubtless called forth by the over-righteous Scribes and Pharisees. They were even opposed to his healing a man whose right hand was withered. The disease was doubtless considered incurable by man ; and Jesus might never again pass that way. Jesus loved mercy, not sacrifice. No works which men consider as necessary, *aside* from mercy, were specified ; for by the law man was forbidden to