

body? We only touch upon this point, not intending here to discuss it at length; but suspect that we have given up ground to the infidel and deist which must be *retaken*, or they will not only ruin themselves, but their families and the world. *Man has no right to disobey God*, to the injury of his fellow men. If we allow him to do it, we nourish in our bosom an asp which will sting us to death.

There are two ways ordained by God of governing moral agents in this world. One is moral suasion—not only to persuade men to do *right*, but to endeavor to prevent them from doing wrong. But this *cannot prevent* them from doing wrong. The other is, physical force. This is only for those who are *determined*, notwithstanding moral suasion, to *do* wrong. This physical force *cannot*, nor is it intended to *make* a man love God, and be religious; but it *can* keep him from *doing* wicked acts—those things which God has forbidden him to do; and *this* God intends to have done. In a philanthropic and political point of view merely, we have a right, admitted by all good citizens, to forbid the doing of those things which injure society; but we may not have a right to command the doing of *all* those things which might be beneficial to society. The man is to have his *choice*, whether he will go to heaven or to hell; but he cannot have his choice, whether he may or may not do those things which will drag others along with him—he *may not* have his choice, whether he will block up the way to heaven, and condemn God, and labor to make others condemn him.

God had a moral and a civil or judicial code. Both were necessary in Moses' time; and for the same reasons, both are necessary in these times.

We should like to explain this point farther, but have, perhaps, already digressed too far from the main subject.

#### OBJECTION XIII.—“CHRISTIANS WISH TO UNITE CHURCH AND STATE.”

It has been alleged that *deists* secured to this nation its religious liberty; and it is also claimed by some, that *liberty* originated in the mind of a deist in this country.

Our belief has always been, that the first spark of religious

and republican liberty *emanated from the Bible*, and the influence of the Sabbath, and *through* the Puritans, before they left England. Some very important facts, on this point, may be gathered from the following extracts.

"In the days of the Commonwealth, \* \* \* on which side was found the inextinguishable love of liberty, and the great weight of solid English character, and morality, and pure religion? In the camp of the republicans, beyond a doubt; among the Puritans and Whigs, where the Sabbath was held most sacred, and the ministry of Christ honored, and the pure gospel preached uniformly with divine success. And what a contrast did this present to the camp of Charles I. and the court of Charles II. The Scottish malignant, and the English cavalier, the favorites of the Stuarts, united in their characters the grossest flattery of absolute monarchy and spiritual tyranny, with the most revolting irreligion, blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking, intemperance, reveling, and an utter contempt of even common decency."—*Brownlee*.

The following very pertinent remarks are from a sermon preached in New York city, in 1831, by Rev. HERMAN NORTON:

"UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE."

"*How this charge appears in this country at the present time.*—It is brought more particularly against the Presbyterians. They are said to be engaged in a conspiracy against this great republic, or are attempting to subvert the liberties of the people.

"On the other side of the Atlantic, the Presbyterians have never been charged with uniting Church and State. They have no connection with the civil government; do not believe in a union between civil and religious affairs; and *for this very reason*, have always been opposed by the sovereigns of Europe.

"That you may see that this is not mere assertion, without proof, I will bring forward the testimony of one, on this subject, who will not be considered very partial towards the Presbyterians. I refer to Hume, that notorious infidel. He declares that Queen Elizabeth opposed the Presbyterians, or Puritans, (for the Presbyterians are their descendants,) 'because of their attachment to civil liberty.' 'By them alone,' Hume says, 'the

precious spark of liberty had been kindled and was preserved ; and to them the English owe the whole freedom of their Constitution.'

"Hume also says, that James I. 'saw in the Presbyterians of Scotland a violent turn towards republicanism, and a *zealous attachment to civil liberty*;' and that James declared 'that there is no more agreement between *Presbyterianism and monarchy, than between God and the devil*.'

"He further asserts, that in the reign of Charles I., 'they were disgusted with the court, from their attachment to the *principles of civil liberty, which were essential to their party*.'

"Finally, Hume says, these Presbyterians 'shipped off to America, and founded a government, where they enjoyed all that liberty which they desired, but could not obtain in their own country.'

"But these people are now charged with *uniting Church and State*. They are said to be subverting the liberties of this country, while they adopt the same civil and religious creed which has kept alive the spark of liberty in Europe, infidels themselves being judges.

"Two charges, directly opposite to each other, brought against those who embrace the same views and sentiments of civil and religious liberty, cannot both be true. If the charges on the other side of the Atlantic are true, as kings and infidels affirm, then the allegation that Presbyterians in this country are subverting the liberties of the people, is the most ludicrous that was ever made by the tongue of mortal.

"But after all the noise which the cry of '*Church and State*' has made through the country, and all the prejudice which it has excited, it is a matter of fact, that *wicked* men have been *trying to unite Church and State*. The only way by which civil rulers and politicians have succeeded in condemning Christians in ages past, has been to interfere with their *religion*. They have enacted pernicious and outrageous laws, subverting the foundations of religious principle; they have armed these laws with the heaviest penalties, and required the people of God to obey them or suffer. The faithful servants of God have determined to obey God, rather than man. This has been called

obstinacy by the wicked, and has kindled the fire which has burnt up the bodies of the saints. Christians have always been the best subjects, as far as civil law has been concerned. They have always been prompt to obey. Even Louis the XIV., that bitter persecutor of Christians, said, that he had reason to applaud *their fidelity and zeal in his service*. They omitted no opportunity of giving him evidence of their loyalty, *'even beyond all that could be imagined'*, contributing in all things to the advantage of his affairs.' Yet after this, he ordered them to leave his kingdom in fifteen days, or turn Roman Catholics, or be put to death.

"It is only when rulers have made laws contrary to the laws of God, that Christians have refused to obey. This is the way which wicked men have devised to bring charges against the people of God. Look at the case of Daniel—Dan. vi. 4-5. 'Then the presidents and the princes sought to find occasion against Daniel concerning the kingdom; but they could find none occasion nor fault; forasmuch as he was faithful; neither was there any error or fault found in him. Then said these men, we shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except as we find it against him concerning the law of his God.'

"They could find fault with nothing but his *religion*. They discovered that Daniel prayed to the God of heaven three times a day. 'Now, let us have a law, that no man shall pray only to the King for thirty days.' The law was made; but Daniel would pray to his God, although contrary to law, and he was thrown into a den of lions.

"Look at the case of the three men mentioned in Daniel iii. They would not worship Nebuchadnezzar's image. So they were thrown into the burning fiery furnace.

"So in hundreds of instances since that time. So, we have reason to believe, it will be in time to come. Christians will be put to death for not submitting to the wicked laws of wicked men, who are thus trying to *unite church and state*."

We are not certain that there were not men, in this nation, who aided in making the laws relative to *Sabbath mails*, with the design of getting something against Christians, wherewith to accuse them or persecute them, if they would not quietly

consent to break the fourth commandment. But, whatever their views might have been, they have effectually shut out of the Postoffice Department, every *consistent*, conscientious believer in the Christian religion. Yet, when a man raises his voice, condemning that law, as against the law of God, unjust and unconstitutional, many wicked men in this land are ready to throw him "into the den of lions," and would gladly, it seems, annihilate at a blow, all distinction of days, so far as business or pleasure is concerned. This will never do. God will deal with this nation for this thing.

OBJECTION XIV.—"*WASHINGTON, FRANKLIN, and most of the other framers of our government were disbelievers in the Christian religion, or at least sceptical.*"

Infidels and deists say, the honest-hearted should be informed, that Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin, were not even believers in Christianity, or at least not orthodox believers. The same is said of the majority of those who framed the Constitution of these United States. No doubt, since "misery loves company," infidels and deists would gladly, if they could, unite not only such men with their ranks, but the prophets, apostles, and martyrs. But this they cannot do; and their assertions will not obtain credit without confirmation from other sources. That *all* the framers of the Constitution were devoted Christians, no one pretends. But it is not true that Washington was an infidel, nor that Franklin was at that time. Indeed, most of those who aided in framing and adopting that valuable instrument, were very far from being infidels, deists, or sceptics.

#### WASHINGTON.

"The father of his country was our first President. We had thought the Chief Magistrate was in some sense the representative of the nation. He certainly ought to know the 'spirit of the Constitution,' for he is sworn to support it. Washington entered on his office with such language as this: 'It would be peculiarly improper to omit, in this *first* official act, my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe—who presides in the councils of nations—and whose pro-