

BX8991  
C5

A REPORT OF THE

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP CONFERENCE,

DEVOTED TO THE CONSIDERATION OF

POLITICAL LOYALTY TO THE LORD JESUS CHRIST,

HELD IN THE

ALLEGHENY COVENANTER  
CHURCH.

CORNER OF SANDUSKY AND NORTH DIAMOND STREETS.

MONDAY AND TUESDAY

FEBRUARY 24TH AND 25TH, 1902.



BX8991

.C5

A REPORT OF THE  
CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP CONFERENCE,  
DEVOTED TO THE CONSIDERATION OF  
POLITICAL LOYALTY TO THE LORD JESUS CHRIST,  
HELD IN THE  
ALLEGHENY COVENANTER  
CHURCH,  
CORNER OF SANDUSKY AND NORTH DIAMOND STREETS.  
MONDAY AND TUESDAY  
FEBRUARY 24TH AND 25TH, 1902.

---

1902.  
PRESS OF JOHN C. PARK,  
ALLEGHENY, PA.

236371

BX8991  
.C5

INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

1-7-02

p  
a  
re  
w  
th  
Al

# Report of Christian Citizenship Conference.

---

This Conference, being devoted to the consideration of political loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ, gave special attention to the royal rights of Christ, the King, and to the duty of Nations and their Citizens to recognize His authority and obey His law. This discussion included an inquiry regarding the relation now sustained by our Nation, as an organic body, to the Divine King, as to the character of the Federal Constitution, which is the basis of our government, and as to the position which the loyal Christian should occupy with respect to this Constitution. As the right position is always the best one, the one strongest for good, the Citizen is called on to form and sustain the closest and most loyal relation to Christ in the faith that such consistency of Christian conduct will lead to the most blessed results for himself, his country, and his Divine Master.

The Conference, which may derive some distinction from the fact that it was the first one of its kind, was arranged for by the standing Committee on Testimony Bearing appointed by the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. This Committee, which is located in the vicinity of Pittsburg, Pa., consists of the Rev. W. J. Coleman of Allegheny, Chairman; Rev. R. J. Gault of New Alexandria, Rev. B. M. Sharp of McKeesport, Mr. Oliver Wylie, Hill St., Wilkinsburg, Secretary, and Mr. John T. Morton, Frick Building, Pittsburg, Treasurer. The time, place, title and general purpose of the Conference, were fixed by the Committee, and the duty of preparing the programme, securing speakers and advertising the meeting was assigned to the Chairman.

The programme as arranged for was carried out at the time and place appointed, the speakers, numbering twenty-four, were all present and all the sessions of the Conference were well attended. The money required to defray the expenses of the Conference, amounting to \$88.78, was subscribed before the meeting, so that no collection was taken for that purpose in the Conference.

The Students of the Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Allegheny started a movement to publish the proceedings of the Conference

and appointed a Committee consisting of one from each class, to see what could be done. After taking up a subscription among themselves, it was decided to see what the Conference would subscribe for this purpose, and one of their number was appointed to present the matter. The subscription which followed assured the publication of the report.

The Chairman of the Committee arranging for the Conference was selected to edit the report. It is understood in this report, as in all such publications, that each speaker is primarily responsible for the sentiments of his own address and that, in preparing it for the printer, he is at liberty to revise his spoken address in such a manner as he may think best.

Some of the addresses were given without manuscript and written out afterward. In a few cases the editor, in order to avoid repetition and secure variety, suggested that, in writing, a special emphasis be given to certain lines of thought. These circumstances may account for any differences which may be noted between the spoken and written addresses.

These addresses are earnestly commended to the careful and candid attention of all into whose hands they may come. They contain an appeal to the Christian conscience and to Christian faith, to the sincere patriot who looks at all the interests of our common country in the light of God's Word. These speakers all believe that the glory of Christ and the welfare of this Republic are not different and separate interests, but one and the same, and that therefore he who is most loyal to Christ, the unrecognized Desire of all Nations, is most loyal to the Nation itself. This belief is that which alone can make our Citizenship Christian. These speakers call us to alone can make our citizenship Christian. These speakers call us to Christian heroism and to patriotic self-sacrifice. With confidence in the intelligence, the candor and the loyal intention of our brethren in Christ, who are also our countrymen in this great land, we submit this appeal and this call, requesting for the principles herein presented, a thoughtful consideration.

## Monday Afternoon, February 24.

The Conference was called to order at 2:30 by Mr. J. C. Calderwood, of Pittsburg, who presided in the afternoon session. After the singing of the first Psalm and the reading of the 110th Psalm, Dr. R. C. Wylie led in prayer.

Dr. A. J. McFarland, the lecturer on Testimony Bearing, appointed by the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, preached the opening sermon on the theme:

### “Jesus Christ The Royal Savior, and Governor Among The Nations.”

Psalm 22; 27-28—“All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto ~~the~~ Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee. For the kingdom is the Lord's, and He is the Governor among the Nations.”

These verses furnish a clear and indisputable Scripture basis for the doctrine announced in the programme as the subject of the discussion.

This Psalm is beyond question Messianic.

It begins with the cry of anguish uttered by our suffering Saviour on the Cross, “My God! My God! why hast Thou forsaken me?” and ends with the equivalent of His expiring words of triumph. “It is finished.”—“He hath done this.”

Christ's three great offices as our Redeemer are, in this Psalm, set forth with distinctness and prominence. His sacrificial sufferings as our atoning High Priest are copiously and minutely presented in verses 1-22. His prophetic office, as to its spirit, and scope and aim, is clearly brought to view in verses 23-25. His kingly office as effecting and securing the glorious consummation of the Divine plan of redemption is presented in the closing verses of the Psalm. This grand outcome of Christ's work as Prophet and Priest will be no less than the conversion of the world to Him, for it is declared here that, “All the ends of the world shall remember and turn to the Lord, and all the kindreds of the Nations shall worship Him,” and the certainty of this outcome rests on the execution of his kingly office, “for the Kingdom is the Lord's, and He is the Governor among the Nations.”



As the time allotted to this discourse is limited, the theme to be considered could not be fully treated in all its branches and bearings. Nothing will be attempted beyond the giving of some reason and preparation for what is to follow in this Conference. With this in mind your attention is directed to :

#### I. SOME ADDITIONAL SCRIPTURE PROOFS

Scripture proofs of the doctrine that Christ as Mediator is King of Nations. From the abundant, varied and direct Scripture testimony these passages are selected:

Psalm 10-12—"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." "The Son" here is "the King upon the holy hill of Sion" in the sixth verse, the anointed Head of the Church, the Royal Saviour, against whom the nations of the world are, in the second verse, declared to be in rebellion. The divine demand upon these guilty nations is to cease their disloyalty to Christ, and willingly submit to His authority for His honor, and their own great good. That the injunction, "Kiss the Son," has this import, the action of Samuel, when he kissed Saul after anointing him king, makes clear. Before the anointing, Saul was an ordinary man, one of the common people, and the old Prophet outranked him, but he was anointed, and became king of the nation, he outranked Samuel, and the Prophet, as a subject of the king, gave him the kiss of allegiance.

Psalm 47: 1-9—Here Christ's authority over the nations is presented as a ground of praise, "For the Lord is a great King over all the earth. God reigneth over the heathen. God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet, the shields of the earth belong unto God. He is greatly exalted." That Christ is here called "God" is no valid objection to our application of this Psalm to Christ, for this title belongs to Him as Mediator, and is elsewhere used when the reference to Him is undoubted, as in Psalm 45; 6. "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever," and Jno. 1 : 1. "The word was God." Romans 9 : 5 "Christ, who is over all, God blessed forever." 1 Tim. 3 : 16 "God was manifested in the flesh."

Psalm 72 : 8-17 This is a Psalm showing the goodness and glory of Christ's Kingdom through the typical Kingdom of Solomon, "He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. All kings shall fall down before Him—all nations shall serve Him—all nations shall call Him blessed."

Psalm 110 : 1 "The Lord said unto my Lord sit Thou at my right hand until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool." This Scripture is spoken of Christ as appears in Math. 22 : 44, in Acts 2 : 34, and in Heb. 1 : 13. Here we see Christ on His throne, and the great work of subjugating His enemies inaugurated. Among these enemies are named "kings" whom "He would strike through in the day of His wrath." It is as "the Governor among the Nations" that Christ "speaks to rebellious

princes in wrath and vexes them in His sore displeasure." Christ the King of Nations, is "the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, that broke in pieces and consumed the mighty empires of the ancient times, and He it is, who by terrible things in righteousness as war, famine, pestilence, earthquake, fire, flood, storms, and other fearful and ruinous calamities, judges and vexes the guilty nations of the present time.

Dan.: 13-14 "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a Kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and His Kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." The "Son of Man" in this passage can be no other than Christ the Mediator. It is the same form of expression as is used in Rev. 1 : 13, and in Rev. 14 : 14, in which the reference is certainly to Christ.

In Rev. 1 : 5 Christ is declared to be "The Prince of the Kings of the earth."

In Rev. 11 : 15 The time is indicated when there would be great voices in heaven saying, "The Kingdom of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever." The four and twenty elders then worship Him saying, "We give Thee thanks O Lord God Almighty, because Thou hast taken to Thee thy great power and hast reigned."

In Rev. 17 : 14 It is declared that, "The ten kings shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them, for He is Lord of lords, and King of kings."

In Rev. 19 : 16 In a vision of surpassing sublimity, Christ is represented as going forth upon "a white horse" to "judge and make war." "On His head were many crowns." "He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, and His name is called the word of God." "And out of His mouth goeth a sharp sword that with it He should smite the nations, and He shall rule them with a rod of iron, and He treadeth the wine press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written, "King of kings and Lord of lords." Here the Royal Saviour is exhibited as making war upon the kings of earth who refuse to own His authority over them, and His right to do this is proclaimed in the splendid title emblazoned on His blood-red vesture.

**INFERENCE TESTIMONY.** As supporting this doctrine by plain and easy inference, these Scriptures are cited :

Math. 11 : 27 "All things are delivered unto me of my Father."

Math. 28 : 18 "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth."

Jno. 8 : 35 "The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into His hand."

John 5 : 22 "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father."

John 13 : 3 "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands."

1 Cor. 15 : 27 "For He hath put all things under Him. But when He saith all things are put under Him, it is manifest that He is excepted, who put all things under Him."

Eph. 1 : 10 "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times, He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth."

Eph. 1 : 20-22 "Which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the head over all things."

Phil. 2:9-11 "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Col. 1 : 16-18 "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. And He is the head of the body, the Church; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence."

Heb. 2 : 8 "For in that He put all in subjection under Him, He left nothing that is not put under Him."

These Scriptures proclaim in most positive and emphatic language the universality of Christ's Mediatorial dominion, and leave no reason for doubt as to His supremacy over the nations of the world. He is the Governor of the Nations because they are an important part of the "All things" that are put under His authority, as Mediatorial King, and because, it was predicted that "He should rule the nations," and that "nations should serve Him," and because nations are solemnly enjoined to publicly own His Royal Authority.

II THIS DOCTRINE HAS AN INDISPUTABLE RIGHT TO THE HIGH PLACE WE CLAIM FOR IT IN CHRISTIAN HEARTS AND CHURCH CREEDS. We hold it to be a doctrine not merely to be accepted coldly and indifferently, and then to be treated as a veritable non-essential, unworthy of ordinary regard, and denied any place as affecting the activities of life, or the motions of the spiritual nature. On the contrary, we claim that this doctrine is one to be ardently loved and constantly and carefully maintained. We hold that it ranks with the

essential doctrines of the Christian system of faith, that it should ever be cherished because of its beneficent influence on the individual life, and upon all associated and related life, and that it should have a prominent and conspicuous place in every church creed. It was not a crazy fancy of religious fanaticism that led to the placing on the old blue banner of the Covenanters the sublime motto, "For Christ's Crown and Covenant;" but it was the calm and settled conviction of men who loved their Saviour, and were ready to die rather than do anything to dishonor Him, who loved God's word, and made it their delightful and prayerful study day and night, whose clear and thorough apprehension of revealed truth has its standing proof in the cherished subordinate standards of the Covenanter Church, and whose advanced Christian Patriotism enraged the enemies of civil and religious liberty, and brought them often to the martyr's cruel death and glorious crown.

This doctrine pertaining to Christ's Crown Rights, so precious to our Covenant fathers, is no less worthy of high regard now, and the Committee in preparing our programme has most fittingly and impressively proclaimed this fact by giving the old Covenanter banner with its significant motto an honored place in the midst of those Scripture truths for which it has for generations, been a silent but effectual witness.

The verdict of our fathers as to the place this doctrine should have has not been set aside. The reasons on which it rested, when it was first proclaimed, are still present and in some respects with augmented force. It will not be amiss on this occasion to notice some of them.

1st. This doctrine of Christ's Mediatorial dominion over the Nations makes most directly and strongly for the honor of Christ. This is an all sufficient reason for the prominence we have given it in our testimony.

The commitment of "all judgment" unto Christ by the Father was made for the express purpose "that all men should honor the Son—Christ." This honoring of Christ is a matter of such great concern to the Father that, it is said, "He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father which hath sent him." However, men individually may know Christ by owning Him as Saviour, His honor in very great measure is withheld as long as His authority, as the King of Nations, is disowned or ignored. It is prophesied of Christ as King, Psalm 132 : 18, that His enemies would be clothed with shame, "but upon himself shall His Crown flourish." The high honor of this glorious promise will be reached only after Satan's kingdom in all its strongholds, has been destroyed. But among these seats of Satan's authority none are more helpful in maintaining the devil's hold upon the world, and none are more dishonoring to Christ, than the great world powers, the Nations, for they have organized government in His territory without any recognition of His sovereign authority, and are therefore nothing short of a world-wide rebellion against Christ. Hence the proclamation of the

Kingly claims of Christ, looks to secure for Christ world-wide honor, even that honor which will come to Him when "the kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ."

A doctrine so closely linked with the honor of Christ should have a high place. It cannot be too powerfully urged or too strongly emphasized. Little wonder that men and women have been so ready to make the greatest sacrifices in order to maintain this Christ-honoring doctrine. Little wonder that they gladly laid down their lives in its defense; for they were running by the side of the chariot in which Christ their glorious King, was riding forth to His conquest of the rebellious nations of this world. Their blood was shed like water as a willing seal to their faithful testimony.

2nd. Because of its intimate relationships to other primary doctrines of the Christian religion. It is closely associated with the priestly works of Christ. The exaltation of Christ was the reward of His humiliation in making atonement for men. 1<sup>st</sup>hil. 2 : 9-11, the connection between the priestly and the Kingly offices of Christ is strikingly presented in Zech. 6 : 12-13, where Christ is represented under the symbol of "The Branch," of whom it is said, "He shall grow up out of His place, and He shall build the temple of the Lord, and He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon His throne, and He shall be a priest upon His throne and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." This fact is also brought out in the declaration that Christ is a "High Priest forever after the order of Melchiseder Heb. 5 : 11, or a royal order more excellent than the Aaronic Priesthood.

Again, it is associated with the redemption work of Christ by securing the application of this redemption to all for whom it was purchased, as in the text, because Christ is King, and "Governor among the Nations," therefore all the ends of the earth shall remember, and turn to the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Him."

We have before seen in John's vision of Christ as he went forth to make war upon the rebellious kings of the earth, that the royal title, "King of kings and Lord of lords," was upon his blood-red vesture. This significant symbol clearly represented the intimate connection between priestly and kingly offices of Christ. This being so, we are only following the plain teaching of the Scriptures in giving this doctrine its high place in our testimony and in our affection.

3rd. Because of the world-wide sweep of its practical bearings.

The great work of Christian Missions has its undoubted right and all sufficient reason in the proclamation of Christ, Math. 28 : 18-20. All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations." The opening of heathen lands to the Gospel of Christ by breaking down the walls of pride and prejudice is the result

of the absolute and universal control of that Lord in whose hand is "the King's heart, as the rivers of water, and He turneth it whithersoever He will." Prov. 21 : 1.

The success of the effort to bring the nations of the world to submit to the authority of Christ is assured by the fact that, He is the reigning Lord of the world, omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent.

He laughs at the puny rebelliousness of the nations against Him, and derides their violent opposition. He has but to speak to them in His wrath, and they are like Belshazzar as he saw the hand-writing on the wall, Dan. 5 : 6. It is the promise of the Father to the enthroned Christ that "all his enemies shall become his footstool," and "all kings shall fall down before Him, all nations shall serve Him."

Again the promised glory of the Church will be largely attained through the Mediatorial rule of Christ. We read in Is. 2 : 2, and in Micah. 4 : 1, "It shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it, and the Lord shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

These world-wide practical bearings of the doctrine of Christ's Mediatorial rule entitle it to the high rank we claim for it.

4th. Because of its effective and ever available consoling power.

In all the trials and persecutions of the martyrs, and confessors of Jesus rising out of their "faithful contendings against paganism, popery and prelacy, and immoral constitutions of civil government," the fact that "the Lord reigned" was an unfailing source of comfort. The Christ-like calmness and courage of Stephen, as he was arraigned before the enraged council and doomed to speedy and violent death, is fully accounted for by the record that, "being full of the Holy Ghost, he looked up steadfastly unto heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God." The glorious truth that the one who sits on the throne of grace, while He is Man, and can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, is also the crowned Head over all things to the Church which is His body, has cheered and comforted Christ's persecuted people in the darkest times. "I am Jesus whom thou persecuted," gives a revelation of the Saviour King, which, while it conquered and converted the great persecutor, disclosed an infinite fountain of loving concern and helpful sympathy for His distressed victims.

A doctrine that has been so effective in filling the souls of those who fully believed it with light and peace and hope and courage has rightfully won for itself the place of highest honor.

### III. CONSIDER OUR NATIONAL OBLIGATIONS IN VIEW OF THIS DOCTRINE.

To every nation the divine demand respecting Christ, "The Governor among the Nations," is, "Kiss the Son," whose clear meaning, as may be seen from 1 Sam. 10 : 1, is to render loyal subjection to a reigning King. To comply with this demand a nation with a government like that of the United States should, at least, do four things:

1st. Make public acknowledgment of Christ's Mediatorial Kingship over us as a nation. For good reasons this acknowledgment should be made in the Constitution of the nation. This Constitution is the nation's fundamental law. In it then is laid down the principles and rules to control its agent—the government. It is the Supreme Law of the land. As a rule for the Nation's faith and practice this document occupies the place of pre-eminent dignity and authority.

2nd. There should be the acceptance of Christ's moral laws as the Nation's Supreme Standard. The nation as a moral person should obey the divine command respecting the Sabbath. The divine law should also be obeyed as to the qualifications of officers, "able men," "just men," "men who fear God and hate covetousness;" these are the qualifications of civil rulers set forth in God's word, and it is made imperative upon the people that only such are to be chosen. He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God, 11 Sam. 23 : 3, "Thou shall provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness, Ex. 18 : 21.

In the enactment of laws all should be in harmony with Christ's moral laws. Legislation should aim to apply the law of Christ to our conditions and needs.

3rd. There should be a distinct recognition and assistance of the religion of Christ. "The nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee," the Church of Christ, "shall perish, yea those nations shall be utterly wasted." Is. 60 : 12.

In endeavoring to carry out this divine injunction serious mistakes have been made, and vast injury has been done in both Church and state. But between the Scylla of Papal Supremacy, and the Charybdis of Erastianism, there is ample room for safe sailing with benefit to all, and no real injury to any. The state should protect religion, it should at least maintain the Sabbath as a day of rest by enjoining cessation of the business and amusements of other days. It should suppress such moral evils as blasphemy, profanity, impurity.

It should prohibit such essentially injurious and demoralizing business as the liquor traffic. It should prohibit all brutal and demoralizing contests. In short, the state should by its example, legislation and administration, make it "as easy as possible for all people in the nation to do right, and as difficult as possible for any one to do

wrong." This would in a wondrous degree serve the cause of Christ, and never be in sight of the danger line of an establishment of religion by the state.

4th. Our nation should enter into public solemn engagement of allegiance to Christ. Where this has been done in the true spirit of that divine ordinance, whether in the nation of Israel, or in the land of our fathers, it has been attended by marked national prosperity. It is the duty of the subject to own allegiance to His lawful ruler, and it is equally the duty of a nation to avow its allegiance to Christ, its rightful King. The commands of God to the nation of Israel were not necessarily for that people alone. There is nothing to indicate that in the duty of Covenanting they alone of all nations were required to engage in it. It is a most appropriate action for any nation that sincerely desires to sustain right relation to Christ, the Nation's King, to solemnly bind itself to Him by Covenant engagement. Then is the nation married to the Lord, by reason of the Lord's great goodness to us as a nation, we are under special obligation thus to honor Him.

How far these duties have been performed or neglected by our nation, I leave it to those who follow me to show.

#### CONCLUSION :

1st. For what purposes are we gathered here?

It is to be witnessed for our Royal Saviour, the Almighty and Universal King. We are here to contend for His crown rights in this nation. We are here to witness to this nation's dishonor to Christ, its rightful Lord.

We are here to show the Christian Citizen how truly to exemplify Christian Citizenship.

We are here to show how to make election day in this country "a testimony for Jesus Christ."

2nd. How shall all this be done most effectively? We say in reply that we must be faithful witnesses and tell the whole truth.

There should be no concession.

As there was seventy years ago in this country in the conflict with slavery, there should be now "The most absolute assertion of the uttermost truth without qualification or compromise."

We should so witness that it might be said of us as it was said of a noted reformer, "He did not conceal one-half of his convictions to make the other half more acceptable, he did not bury out of sight one truth to gain a hearing for another, he contended that nothing was politically right that was morally wrong."

While we witness faithfully it should be done charitably, with the desire to lead Christians into loyalty to Christ, rather than to harden them in disloyalty to Him.



**The Spiritual adjustment required.** Let us open our hearts wide in this hour to the King of Glory, our Royal Saviour. Let us consecrate ourselves anew to our special work and so we will "get nearer to God's heart, and feel its mighty pulses sending blood through all the wide-spread veins of endless good."

4th. What we do here will be far reaching. All over our land many are thinking of this Conference, and praying for it. Many will listen attentively for the trumpet's "certain sound."

There has been in recent years in our country a steady, providential making "ready a people prepared for the Lord." This seed-bed is as wide as the nation. The "present truth proclaimed here will be borne abroad, and by the divine blessing may yield a bountiful harvest of rectified public opinion.

5th. The complete success of our testimony for Christ's Kingly Claims is fully assured. The position that He occupies in the universe, as the enthroned King invested with absolute and universal dominion and as the actual all-controlling Sovereign of the world, assures it. The string that was touched when Christ left the tomb of Joseph, and ascended to His throne of glory at God's right hand will never cease its vibrations until the great government reform is complete.

"Thy Kingdom Come," shall have its full answer, under the dispensation of His Holy Spirit, Christ's will shall be done as in heaven so in earth. "His enemies will be clothed with shame, but upon Himself shall His crown flourish."

After the prayer at the close of the sermon the Rev. J. R. Wylie of New Galilee moved the following resolution:

**“All Christians, having been redeemed by the blood of Christ, should stand loyally for His Kingly authority over the nations and should recognize His right to rule their lives as citizens, a right generally neglected or denied.”**

This resolution was seconded by the Rev. J. F. Crozin of Beaver Falls, Pa., with the following address:

Christians should recognize the right of Christ to rule their lives as citizens, as in every other relation in life, because:

1st. That right is divinely conferred upon Him. “God the Father, hath highly exalted Him and given Him a name above every name.” Phil. 2 : 29.

“He (the Father) hath given Him (the Son) authority to execute judgment, also because He is the Son of Man.” Jno. 5 : 27.

All power (authority) is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Matt. 28 : 18.

2nd. He has purchased the right to rule. In that same second chapter of Philip the Apostle after rehearsing the various steps in His humiliation and sufferings, concluded,

“Wherefore—on this account—as the reward of all this humiliation and suffering (for the language is pointed and strong) God hath highly exalted Him and the entire teaching of the Bible is to this effect.

But we might inquire—Why, as the resolution states, is this right so generally neglected or denied?—We believe that some are not open to conviction in regard to the subject. For various reasons they do not want to be convinced—and who so blind as those who will not see?

But we further believe that it is largely because Christian people are not sufficiently informed in regard to the subject and this in great measure because there is so little attention given to it by those whom we would expect to give attention thereto. There is so little written on the subject.

Although volumes have been written on the Prophetical and Priestly offices of Christ, aside from our Covenanter literature, I do not know of a single volume which treats of His Kingly office and the duties arising therefrom as devolving upon His people, and, comparatively, there is so little published on the subject in other ways. Nor is this all. Scarce as it is, some of the literature which we already have relating to the subject is positively unscriptural in its teachings and consequently mis-

leading, owing to the misconceptions of truth on the part of the author's e. g., that otherwise beautiful hymn:

**"All hail the power of Jesus' name,  
Let angels prostrate fall.  
Bring forth the royal diadem  
And crown Him Lord of all,"**

conveys the idea that it is the right and prerogative of the creature to crown Christ as Lord of all whilst the Scriptures teach that they have no such prerogative—that God, the Father, has Himself crowned Him Lord of all and that the sole prerogative of all created moral beings in the universe is to bow in submission to Him, confessing Him as their own, as well as universal, Lord and King, to the Story of God, the Father, Historians even as they chronicle the heroic struggles of the Scotch Covenanters represent them largely as the champions of civil and religious liberty, rather than as contending for the universal Mediatorial dominion of the Lord Jesus Christ. Which doctrine alone faithfully applied and practiced secured true civil and religious liberty? It becomes us therefore who are instructed in regard to the subject to let our light shine more faithfully. Especially we would urge upon all our youth the importance of devoting their lives to the maintenance and defence of this grand doctrine and the practices flowing from it; for not until this doctrine shall be universally known, acknowledged and practiced shall the world be reclaimed for Christ.

## WHAT THE CONSTITUTION LACKS.

By Rev. R. C. Wylie, Wilkesburg, Pa.

The sharp distinction between constitutional and statute law is of modern origin. In the time of the Roman empire the word "constitution" signified a collection of laws or ordinances made by the emperor. It was used in the same sense in the early history of English law. Now, however, it denotes, not a law which the governing power imposes upon the people, but one which the people impose upon the government. Constitutions exist in two different forms, the written and the unwritten. The constitution of England exists only in the unwritten form. There is no single written document which contains it. To know what it is, it is necessary to consult precedents, acts of Parliament, and decisions of courts. Only thus can it be known by what principles the British government is bound.

The constitution of the United States is both written and unwritten. There is an unwritten constitution which was born with the nation, was given it by the God of Nations, and which has developed with the nation's growth. There is also a written constitution. It was framed in 1787, by a constitutional convention composed of delegates from the thirteen colonies. It consists of seven articles as originally adopted, and to these fifteen amendments have been added. It can be read in half an hour. The purpose of this paper is to examine this document to learn whether, from a Christian point of view, it is such a constitution as this Christian nation should have. This investigation implies that there is a moral standard to which even constitutions and all political institutions should conform. It is therefore necessary first of all to determine what that standard is. This is doubtless the most difficult part of our task. Many never think of measuring things political with a moral measuring reed. And yet, as Christians we are bound so to do. The revealed will of God furnishes principles whereby all things are to be tested. In stating that constitutions of government are to be tested by the Scriptures it is not meant that they are to be pronounced defective unless they contain all Bible truth. Church creeds should cover the whole field of revealed truth, but political constitutions have no such end to serve. Nevertheless, civil government exists within the sphere of morals. It has moral interests to conserve and moral ends to reach.

At this point we meet with two antagonistic theories of civil government. The one is the secular, the other is the Christian theory. The secular theory teaches that man's state of nature is outside of society; that nations and governments are the result of a social compact, and that all the authority a government has is delegated to it by the people who surrender a part of their rights to obtain protection for the remainder. Believers in this theory refer to such organizations as railroad and business companies to illustrate the origin and character of civil government. The thoughtful need no argument to show them that the analogy will not hold. The Christian theory teaches that God is the creator of nations and that their vast authority and power come from Him. Romans 13 : 1-7, is conclusive as to this matter. All writers of the first rank teach this truth. There are two other truths which are essential parts of the Christian theory, but which are often overlooked by writers on political science. These are, the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ over the nation and the supremacy of the divine will in determining all moral issues in the political sphere. These three are Scriptural principles. Yet they relate, not to things ecclesiastical, but to things political. They have not the slightest ecclesiastical bearing, and yet they are clearly religious. Here, then, is our moral standard or measuring reed for measuring constitutions of government.

The next task will be to take this moral standard and try the national constitution by it. Since the secular and the Christian are the only two theories of government there are, it is promised that the one or the other will show its presence and dominating power in every political constitution. Let us therefore examine the national constitution to see whether it measures up to the Christian standard, or whether the secular theory has determined its character. We begin with the preamble. It is as follows: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America." This is an admirable statement of the ends of civil government. It is difficult to see how it can be improved. Many a one, unprovided with a correct standard for measuring political documents would at once pronounce the constitution Christian. But a careful measurement with our moral standard already agreed upon will reveal a very serious defect. It declares that "We, the people . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution." This statement is objectionable, not because of what it contains, but because of what it omits. It is admitted that the people do ordain, and have the right to ordain constitutions of government. Peter says: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake." Striking out the words above quoted would not make the constitution Christian, and therefore their presence does not make it secular. But this preamble

does not measure up to the Christian standard. Had the expression, "We, the people," been followed by some such words as, "Acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all power and authority in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of Nations, and His revealed will as the supreme standard to decide moral issues in national life," its Christian character would be placed beyond all doubt. But while the people are recognized as ordaining civil government, there is not a hint given that the authority to do this comes from God, or that the nation and its government exist in the sphere of divine authority and are subject to the moral law. To make prominent the human and to ignore the divine element in civil government is of the very nature of secularism.

The first article of the constitution treats of the legislative powers of Congress. It prescribes the qualifications for membership, manner of election, etc. It enumerates the matters on which Congress may make laws, and denies certain powers to the states. But there is nothing said about legislation on moral issues, or about a moral standard for legislation on any issue. We find no fault with the contents of this article, but it contains nothing that brings it up to the moral measure we are now applying. All that it contains may be in perfect harmony with Christianity, but there are politico-religious principles which it does not contain.

Article II. treats of the executive power. It prescribes the qualifications of the President and the Vice President, and defines their duties. It prescribes the following oath or affirmation for the President: "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." There is here the same noticeable omission of all reference to divine authority and law. And this is the more remarkable because the precise form of the President's oath is here given, and even this oath omits the usual appeal to God. Inasmuch as such an appeal is the very essence of the oath, and there can be no real oath without it, this article certainly falls short of the Christian standard.

Article III. treats of the judicial power of the United States. It prescribes certain very wise and necessary rules by which this department of the government is to be regulated, but it contains no suggestion of our national relation to the Ruler and Judge of Nations.

Article IV. sets forth the relation of the United States government to the different states, and requires that full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts of other states. But there is no requirement that these acts shall conform to the moral standard of Christianity.

Article V. treats of amendments. This article makes it very difficult to effect any amendment to the National Constitution. This, however, may be an excellency rather than a defect. It makes it almost impossible to introduce anything objectionable, and it also makes it sure that the people are very much in earnest about it before they will introduce changes for the better.

Article VI. declares the Constitution, laws made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made under the authority of the United States, to be the supreme law of the land. No fault could be found with this if it were only made plain that this is merely the supreme human law, and that there is a "Higher Law," which is above all human enactments. But the omission of such a recognition of the "Higher Law" gives the Constitution a very pronounced secular character. This article also provides that Senators, Representatives, members of state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution, and then adds, "but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." Curtis in his constitutional history says that this clause was added, "for the purpose of forever preventing any connection between church and state and any scrutiny into men's religious opinions."

If the first part of this statement be correct, we cannot but wonder why the framers of the Constitution did not secure this worthy object in different language and why the same thing had to be done over again in the first amendment. The prohibition of all religious tests is very sweeping. It is proper to prohibit governmental scrutiny into men's religious opinions. But an oath in the name of God is a religious test. An oath to support a Constitution which renders due national submission to God, to Christ and to the divine will is a religious test. This clause, therefore, bears witness to the fact that the Constitution is not framed in accordance with the Christian view of civil government.

Article VII. declares that when nine states have ratified the Constitution it should go into effect. This is followed by the statement, "Done in convention by the unanimous consent of the states present, the seventeenth day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven, etc." It has been contended that these words are a Christian acknowledgment and make it a Christian document. But they merely show that it was made at a certain period of the Christian era. They are nothing more than the dating of the instrument. They were added by the clerk, were not voted on by the convention, and form no part of the Constitution. They have no value therefore in fixing its character.

The first amendment declares: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise

thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." Probably the general purpose of this article is commendable. It makes union of church and state impossible. It guarantees liberty in the exercise of religion, in speech and in writing. But might there not have been a limit wisely set? The new Constitution of Cuba makes Christian morality the limit. It would have been well had our Constitution done the same. The other amendments need not be considered. While proper enough, and some of them most excellent, they contain no recognition of the principles of Christian civil government.

In this investigation we have found a number of places in the Constitution where the relation of the nation and its government to God and Christ and the divine law would have fitted in most admirably. The preamble, the President's oath, the clauses relating to religion and freedom of speech, are places where Constitutions usually embody some acknowledgment of God and the moral law. Nearly all the state Constitutions at least acknowledge God. The Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and other public documents do the same. Have we not reason to fear that the failure to embody such acknowledgments in the National Constitution was intentional? The secular view of civil government was, at that period, making bold strides. Is there not reason to believe that it was at the behest of this atheistic view that all reference to God was omitted from our otherwise excellent Constitution? The members of the constitutional convention may have acted sincerely in their omission of all religious acknowledgments. Nevertheless, it is a fact that such an omission is the teaching of the atheistic, not that of the Christian view of civil government.

But the question may be asked, is the Constitution to be classed as a secular document because of this omission? It does not in so many words profess the secular theory, Why may we not therefore claim it as Christian? It is sufficient to reply that while Christianity implies a profession, the absence of Christianity does not. The man or the nation that is unwilling to profess Christianity is lacking in some things that make the Christian.

It may be asked again, is the Constitution the place for a religious acknowledgment? If there are acknowledgments of Christ and His law elsewhere will these not suffice? As for such acknowledgments in the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and some other documents, it need only be said that they have today only a historic, not a legal value. They cannot be appealed to as having at the present time any authority. We are glad of every religious acknowledgment made by our Presidents and they are quite numerous and some of them most excellent. But they are the acknowledgments



of the Presidents only, not those of the nation. Neither will acknowledgments in statute law be sufficient. The nature and purpose of the Constitution make it clear that there is no place quite so appropriate for the recognition of divine authority and law as in that document itself. A proper definition of the Constitution shows this.

The Supreme Court of the United States (*Van Horne vs. Dorrance*, 2 Dallas, 308) says that a constitution "is the form of government, delineated by the mighty hand of the people, in which certain first principles of fundamental laws are established." It is delineated by the people, and it is the people who should make this acknowledgment. In it certain first principles of fundamental laws are established. No nation should attempt to escape or ignore the first principles of fundamental law in the amendment we advocate. To give them their true place in the government they should be embodied in the Constitution.

Clear views as to the distinction between constitutional and statute law are essential. Because many do not understand this distinction they fail to feel the force of the argument for the proposed amendment.

Judge Jameson illustrates this distinction by considering the case of a ship dispatched by its owner upon a distant voyage. It would obviously be in the power of the owner to prescribe in advance as well the particular duties of the captain and crew from day to day, as the general nature and purpose of the adventure. But, how would a prudent owner manager in such a case? He would content himself with dictating the termini and object of the voyage, the rank and pay of the various officers, to which he might add general directions for the safety of the freight and the health and comfort of the crew. Beyond this, everything relating to the voyage would be left to the officers. They would make rules for particular exigencies, as they should arise, direct when to tack, when to furl and when to unfurl the sails to conform to the variations of the weather, and prescribe the particular course in which to steer from day to day, to avoid rocks and shoals, keeping constantly in view, nevertheless, and, as far as practicable, acting in literal conformity to the owner's instructions." (Constitutional Convention 84).

Two very important truths are made luminous by this illustration. The first is that the fundamental principles by which the ship of state is to be guided are to be laid down by the people, the owners of the vessel, and not by the officers who for the time may be in charge. The second is that religious acknowledgments belong to the class of fundamental principles which should be embodied in the fundamental law, and are not resorted to simply in times of storm and threatening disaster. As a nation we have acted on the theory that national religion comes under the head of tacking, furling and unfurling the sails, to conform to the variations of the weather. This is illustrated by the fact that in times of war we sometimes have orders issued to

confess national sins and to return to God. All this is well, but in addition the Constitution should declare our submission to the Ruler of Nations.

In whatever aspect the matter is viewed it is clear that the Constitution is the proper place for embodying the Christian principles of civil government, and that they now find no expression in that document.

What then is the political duty of Christian citizens? First of all, they should adjust their political relations so as to be free from the quiet of the nation's sin. Second, they should join their forces for the securing of such a constitutional amendment as will suitably embody the principles of Christian civil government, and give a sure basis for the Christian elements in our national life. There is no reason why this work may not be undertaken with good hope of success. (The Constitution provides for its own amendment, and prescribes the method. Swearing to support the Constitution as it is does not therefore pledge those who take this oath to oppose any amendment. It implies that they consider that document as it is a suitable instrument of government, but they are free to support any amendment that may be proposed in the orderly way. We may therefore confidently appeal to every Christian citizen to join in an effort to secure the Christian amendment).

Moreover, we have in God's word the assurance that all nations shall yet yield obedience to the scepter of Christ. In no way can we honor Christ more or render a more valuable service to mankind than by striving to supply what the Constitution lacks.

The Rev. J. S. Thompson of Beaver Falls, Pa., moved the adoption of the following

**RESOLUTION.**

**“The present Constitution of the United States fails to meet the requirements of God’s Word by its failure to recognize the authority of Christ and of His law, and violates that Word in giving the supreme place to the people without acknowledging the Sovereignty of God, and also in the terms of the oath prescribed for the President.”**

Mr. Chairman, brethren and friends of the Conference—The Constitution of the United States contains many excellencies, and none are more ready to recognize these than we. But with all its excellencies, there are found in it some serious defects, which sadly mar its perfection. Some of its original defects have been remedied by amendments that have been added to it. But its most serious defects still remain, and the future welfare of our nation imperatively demands that these shall speedily be remedied. Analyzing the resolution that is before us, the adoption of which it is my privilege now to move, we find that it brings three counts against the Constitution as it is at present.

1. “The present Constitution of the United States fails to meet the requirements of God’s Word by its failure to recognize the authority of Christ and His law.” This raises two questions, which are questions of fact, and ought to be easily answered.

First. Does the present Constitution of the United States fail to recognize the authority of Christ and His law? It is not necessary for me to dwell upon this question, as the preceding address has dealt at length with it. You have been shown that in the Constitution as it now is there is no recognition of the authority of Christ or His law. Examine it carefully from beginning to end and you will find that it nowhere contains any reference to, or recognition of, the authority of Christ or His law. This question is easily answered, the Constitution is before you, the recognition is not found in it.

Second. Does the Constitution by failing to make this recognition fail to meet the requirements of God's Word? Does the Word of God require that a recognition of the authority of Christ and His law shall be made in a Constitution of government? We answer without any hesitation that it does. As our time is limited I shall refer you to a single proof. Only one out of many that might be cited. The Second Psalm is unquestionably Messianic, dealing with the royal character and the royal claims of Jesus Christ. The nations of the world are in rebellion against the Lord, and against His Anointed. But His investiture with authority over them is complete. He has been given a rod of iron by which He shall dash in pieces these rebellious nations, unless they will speedily submit themselves to Him. That they may escape the impending doom He thus calls upon them: "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed ye judges of the earth . . . . Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little." Kings and judges are those who represent the sovereignty of the nation, and as such they are commanded to kiss the Son, elsewhere in this Psalm called the King. The kissing of the Son is a recognition of His authority, and a pledging of loyalty to Him. When Samuel anointed Saul he kissed him and said: "Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over His inheritance?" But in a constitutional government the sovereignty of the nation is represented by its Constitution, and in this Constitution there ought to be a suitable recognition of the authority of Christ and His law. The only way in which a constitutional government can suitably recognize the authority of Christ and His law is by making that recognition in its Constitution. The conclusion is inevitable, by its failure to recognize the authority of Christ and His law, our Constitution fails to meet the requirements of the Word of God.

2. The second count brought against the Constitution in this resolution is that, "It violates the Word of God by giving the supreme place to the people without acknowledging the sovereignty of God." Here again two questions of fact meet us.

First. Does our Constitution give the supreme place to the people without recognizing the sovereignty of God? An examination of the Constitution compels us to answer that it does. Turning to the Preamble, which is the enacting clause of the Constitution, we read: "We, the people of the United States," in order to accomplish certain desirable and necessary results, "do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." There is no word of recognition of the sovereignty of God. The people are the highest source of authority of which any recognition is made. Again we read in Art. IV.: "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be

made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby." This article is to be interpreted in the light of the Preamble, and of the Constitution as a whole, which nowhere makes any recognition of the sovereignty of God, but sets up the people as the source of the nation's sovereignty. Thus the supreme place is given to the people, without any recognition of the sovereignty authority of God.

Second. Does this violate the Word of God? We answer without hesitation that it does. Here again we must confine ourselves to a very small part of the proof that might be adduced. In the Word we read: "By me kings reign, and princes decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." But it is not so in this nation, for we have said: "We, the people do ordain and establish this Constitution." Again we read: "There is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." But it is not so in this land, for we have said: "We, the people do ordain and establish this Constitution." We read of the civil magistrates that "he is the minister of God to thee for good." But we have said differently, we have said that he is the minister of the people, for he gets his authority from the Constitution, and the Constitution recognizes no higher source of authority than the people. The Constitution thus clearly violates the teachings of the Word of God. In it the people have usurped the place of God, claiming for themselves that authority which belongs to God alone. Thus the second count against the Constitution is sustained.

3. "The Constitution of the United States violates the Word of God in the terms of the oath prescribed for the President." Two questions meet us here again.

First. What does the Bible teach in regard to the oath? In it we read: "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve Him, and shalt swear by His name." Again we read: "He that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of Truth." And one of the things of which God says, How shall I pardon it? is this, that His children have sworn by them that are no gods. The Bible form of the oath is thus clear, it is to be in the name of the ever living God, and must contain a direct appeal to Him.

Second. Does the oath prescribed for the President meet this requirement of the Word of God? Turning to the prescribed oath for the President we find that it reads in this way: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." There is no mention of the name of God, and it contains no appeal to God. Put that form of oath beside the Bible teaching regarding the form of

oath, and there is only one conclusion, it violates the teaching of the Bible in regard to this. It has been at least a frequent custom of the Presidents in taking this oath to kiss the Bible. But that does not help the matter in the least. That is no Bible form of oath, and is just as unscriptural as that prescribed in the Constitution. And if the oath were to be administered in the Bible form it would be an unconstitutional act, for the form is prescribed, and made mandatory. Thus the third count against the Constitution is sustained.

And now, if these things be true, it follows:

1. The most important duty pressing upon this nation is to so amend the Constitution as to rectify these wrongs. Congress might well lay aside the consideration of every other question that is before it, and give itself to the consideration of this one question until it would frame and send down to the states for ratification a suitable form of amendment to the Constitution. There are questions of grave importance before Congress, but none of such importance as this question, for there are no relations that a nation sustains that are so vital as its relations to God, Jesus Christ and His law. It would help to the solution of some of the problems that are before our Congress and which it is very doubtful whether under present conditions it will be able to solve for the best interests of those concerned, and for the glory of God. Indeed the glory of God seems to be at present of little concern to our Congress.

2. The most important duty of the Christian citizen is to labor for the securing of such an amendment to the Constitution. It is the highest act of patriotism, and of service which he can render to his country. Two things therefore should move the Christian patriot to work untiringly for the securing of this end. The honor and glory of his King. The welfare and prosperity of his country.

3. It follows therefore that while laboring for the securing of this end the Christian patriot cannot give his allegiance to that which is so vitally defective. There is but one position that he can occupy, and to that we have bound ourselves by our Covenant of 1871, in which we say: "We will pray and labor for the peace and welfare of our country and for its reformation by a constitutional recognition of God as the source of all power, of Jesus Christ as the Ruler of Nations, of the Holy Scriptures as the supreme rule, and of the true Christian religion; and we will continue to refuse to incorporate by any act, with the political body, until this blessed reformation has been secured."

Mr. Chairman I move the adoption of this resolution.

The Rev. J. S. Martin of New Castle, Pa., seconded this resolution, giving the following address:

**Mr. Chairman and Fellow Citizens:**

In rising to second this resolution, which I heartily do, it would certainly be as unwise, as it seems to me unnecessary, at this late hour of the day, to dwell at length upon the points involved therein. And all the more so, because they have already been more or less fully developed by those who have preceded me. I shall therefore content myself with saying a few words by way of emphasizing the thoughts already brought to your attention. Passing over the first half of the resolution, I call your attention to the latter half, which relates to the Constitution's violation of the divine law. This violation, as specified in the resolution, is twofold.

1. It gives to the people the supreme place, which the Bible declares belongs to the Lord. And this it does without acknowledging the sovereignty of God. That Jesus Christ is vested with authority over all nations and peoples no intelligent student of the Word of God can or will deny. It naturally and necessarily follows, therefore, that all nations, our own included, should acknowledge Him as supreme. Has the United States so done? If so, we shall find the acknowledgment in the National Constitution—the one and only place such an acknowledgment could be made. Understand me, I am now speaking of the "supreme place." There is but one supreme law in our land. All others are inferior. In the very nature of the case there can be but one supreme law, and that law, in a republic such as ours, is the written National Constitution. It so declares itself. In Article VI. of this document we read: "This Constitution and the laws . . . made in pursuance thereof . . . shall be the supreme law of the land." It not only declares itself to be supreme, but operates as supreme in the practical workings of the government, and that, oftentimes, in contravention of the law of God. Take, for illustration, the question of Sabbath opening of the World's Fair in 1893. Congress, as you know, made an appropriation of money to the managers of the same, conditioning the appropriation, at the request of the Christian people of the land, on Sabbath closing. After receiving half the sum appropriated by Congress the managers decided it would be more to their interests financially to open the gates on Sabbath and make no effort to obtain the remainder of the appropriations. Consequently, after the first or second Sabbath, the gates were thrown wide open on that day. As you'll remember, at the instigation of the friends of the Sabbath, an injunction was served upon the managers to restrain them from Sabbath opening. The case went from court to court until at length the decision was rendered against the friends of the Sabbath and in favor of Sabbath opening. And if the Associated Press dispatches of the time were reliable, the reason given for the decision was in substance the following: "The Bible only knows the Sabbath. The United States Constitution knows no Bible. Therefore,

Congress had no right to place such a condition upon its appropriation." Whether, upon investigation, the above reported reason for decision be found correct in every detail or no, this is certain, viz.: that Congress justified the carrying of the mail upon the Lord's day on the ground that the United States government as defined in the Constitution is purely secular. See Journal of Senate, under date of January 19, 1829, and Journal of House, under date of March 5, 1830. Nor is such the practical bearings of the Constitution on the minds of national officers alone. To say nothing of its effects on the minds of state officials, see what they are on the officers of our great municipalities. Witness the metropolis of our country this very hour. The would-be reformers, District Attorney Jerome, and Mayor Low, of New York City, are favoring the submission to the state legislature of the question as to whether or no the saloons in the city shall be open a portion of the Lord's day, proposing to be governed, in their reform efforts, not by what God requires, but by the will of the people as expressed by their vote. We do not wonder that men who have sworn fealty to our national fundamental law, which explicitly declares that the laws which we, the people make "shall be the supreme law of the land," are anxious to discover what the will of the people coming specially within their domain is, with a view to be governed absolutely by it. Such is the logic of their oath, such the practical bearing of the National Constitution, the Word of God to the contrary notwithstanding. What matters it, therefore, even though all common and statutory law, both state and national, together with all state constitutional law, should acknowledge the sovereignty of God; still He would not have the "supreme place," with our supreme law as it is. The nation must, in her fundamental written law, dethrone "We, the people," and enthrone Christ in their stead. Then, and then only, will He have the "supreme place" in our land.

2. It leaves out, in the form of oath prescribed, all appeal to God, which the Bible teaches to be the very essence of the oath. In Deut. 6 : 13 we read: "Thou shalt fear the Lord and shalt swear by His name." See also Deut. 10 : 20 and Isa. 65 : 16. Moreover, in Josh. 23 : 7, the Lord forbids His people to take an oath in the name of idol gods and, in Matt. 5 : 34-36, the Saviour forbids the taking of an oath in the name of any created thing. The teaching of Scripture on this point, therefore, is most explicit. We are not to swear by any created thing nor by any idol god. Our appeal is to be made to God and to Him only. And to Him it must be made, if the oath is to be an oath in any true or proper sense of the term. An oath is virtually a Covenant with God. In the light of this Scripture teaching, let us look now, for a little, at the form of oath prescribed in the Constitution for administration to a President-elect—which is the model of all oaths adminis-



tered under the Constitution. It is as follows: "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." It will be seen at a glance that in this there is no appeal to God, not even so much as the mention of the name of God. And why? Not because there was any precedent for such omission. Nowhere under the Articles of Confederation or among colonial or even English records could be found such a Godless form of oath. The reason appears to be in Article VI., Section III., of the Constitution, which reads: "The Senators and Representatives . . . and the members of the several state legislatures and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states shall be bound, by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." There is considerable religion in an oath in the true and proper sense of that term, so that to have required an appeal to God in the model oath would have been a violation of the "no religious test" clause of the Constitution. It would seem, therefore, that the omission was studied. The Constitution must be consistent with itself. This it could not be and contain both the Scriptural form of oath and the "no religious test" clause. Hence the emasculation of the oath. True, the Constitution does not forbid a man in taking an oath to make an appeal to God—if he desires so to do—but it does most emphatically forbid that he shall be required to make such an appeal—the very thing that the Scriptures require. All the Presidents of our country after George Washington down to Rutherford B. Hayes, took the Presidential oath without so much even as mentioning the name of God. To their credit, be it said, that Washington, Hayes and all from him down to the present incumbent added, "So help me God." This, however, was extra-constitutional. So far as the Constitution itself is concerned it makes no such requirement, and thus degrades the model oath from the high and sacred position of an appeal to God to the low level of a pledge or promise to man, no matter how solemnly made. Moreover, it renders possible the admission, to the highest position within the gift of the American people, of the most blatant atheist. Whereas the Word of God explicitly declares that "they that rule over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God."

For these two reasons, therefore, First, that the Constitution violates the divine law in giving to the people instead of to King Jesus the supreme place, and, Second, that it violates it in emasculating the oath by leaving out all appeal to God—both of which reasons are specified in the resolution—it seems to us clear that this resolution should receive our heartiest support.

## Monday Evening February 24.

Monday evening session was presided over by Mr. D. S. Anderson, Allegheny, Pa. Dr. D. B. Wilson conducted devotional exercises.

Then followed the evening addresses.

### What is the Consistent Attitude for a Christian to take Under a Government which bars Christ Out?

It is assumed at the outset that the state is a divine institution; that as such it of necessity stands in fundamental relationship to God; that in keeping with this relationship God has been pleased to appoint his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, to be the Ruler of Nations; and that he has furthermore in his Holy Word graciously furnished men with an infallible standard for the determination of national conduct. It is assumed as well that in consequence of these great foundational truths all nations ought to recognize God as the source of authority and the author of law; ought with unwavering loyalty to acknowledge Jesus Christ in His royal capacity as King; and ought with untellable gratitude to take the Word of God as contained in the Scriptures as the unerringly apt and adequate manual to direct them in the solution of every question bearing on the moral issues involved in civic life. Moreover, it is assumed that the nation in which we live has for some reason neglected to acknowledge God as the source of authority; that it has elected to carry on government according to a supreme and fundamental law which leaves Christ out; that it has given the Word of God no place in the legislative, judicial and executive councils of the land; and that in this way it has, as a matter of fact, ignored and set at nought the divine arrangement for the well being of society. Again, it is assumed that the attitude of our nation in this respect is an attitude of implicit rebellion against the Most High God; that it is an attitude whose primal, whose basal quality is indisputably sinful; that the sin is akin to the first sin of Adam in which he essayed to be independent of the will of God; that in substance it is the first

sin of Adam perpetuating and visibilizing itself in the state; that it has in it all the elements arising from the want of original righteousness; that it contains in it in epitome the corruption that pervades the whole nature of man; in a word, that it is original sin articulating itself at the source of civil life; and that from it, in consequence, as from a fountain of impurity, flow vast and ever swelling volumes of that putredinous iniquity with which the terrific vortex of party politics is being fed and fouled and gorged at this very hour.

That is to say, then, it is assumed, to begin, with, that this nation, in attempting to carry on government according to a supreme law which rules God, Christ and the Bible out, is guilty not simply of one sin among many sins, but rather of the one intrinsic sin, the germ of all the rest, or of the one dynamic sin which generates the many. "Sin, in the Biblical view," says James Orr in his *Christian View of God and the World*, and he is speaking of sin in its essential character, "consists in the revolt of the creature will from its rightful allegiance to the sovereign will of God, and the setting up of a false independence, the substitution of a life for self for a life for God." This statement, as is obvious, connects itself inherently with the subject before us. To disobey the divine command to acknowledge Christ as King and His Word as law is for the creature will of the state to revolt from its rightful allegiance to the sovereign will of God; is for it to set up a false and baneful independence in the presence of "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords;" is for it to substitute a life for self for a life for God. In being guilty of such a sin, therefore, the sin of undeniable rebellion, this nation, it is assumed, has broken the one spiritual bond by which it, or any other nation, can stand in unison with God, in league with his Son, or in subserviance to His law.

The question, then, which every Christian in our land has to face is this—What attitude shall I maintain in a nation that has lifted up the hand of rebellion against the Most High? What principles shall control my actions in a land where the creature will of the state has revolted from its rightful allegiance to the sovereign will of God, has set up a false independence of its own, has substituted a life for self for a life for God? Or, from still another angle, what stand shall I take in a civil society that has undertaken to carry on government according to a law which bars Christ out, and with him His Holy Word, and with unruffled serenity has raised its voice in substantial accord with the chief priests in the Judgment Hall of Pilate, when they cried: "We have no king but Caesar?" In circumstances such as these, what position must I take?

Now it is evident, in the first place, that a loyal follower of Christ cannot consistently design himself to a life of inaction.

It has been estimated that there are about twenty-five per cent. of our voting population that do not go to the polls at all. They have virtually, if not explicitly, declared that under present conditions they will have nothing more to do with the electing of men to fill their country's places of public trust. Many of these men, no doubt, have persuaded themselves that they are too busy to vote. Others, again, have concluded from the way things are going that voting is useless. But some, and the number of these is by no means inconsiderable, are fast becoming unwilling to be implicated in the intolerable wickedness that is allowed to sway its undisputed scepter in every campaign. Consequently, in this third class who do not choose to cast their ballots are to be found some of the excellent of the earth, some who are intensely loyal to Christ—Christians indeed in whom there is no guile. They are men who have come to be disgusted with such thieving, such bribery, such low chicanery of every description, as have verily become ubiquitous in the world of politics at the present time. They are men who have been keen enough to see that whichever way the elections in any given case may go, the results simply serve to register the degree by which the successful party has been able to exceed the defeated ones in political intrigue. No wonder, then, that they are filled with loathing and with righteous indignation. No wonder that, in despair of doing good, they should finally resolve that they will have nothing more to do with politics, that they will quit the field, that they will stay at home, and even that they will abandon everything to the unprincipled men who are already at the helm and leave them free to cleave their wicked way untrammelled. The wonder is that they are willing to stop with that. The wonder is that such a strong aversion to this moral putrefaction should not impel them to take decided steps against the men who are thus in their own high-handed way doing the utmost that in them lies to sink their poisoned spears into the heart of the King of righteousness. No loyal Christian can consistently retire from the field until the fight is over and the victory is won. At bottom, it is the honor of Jesus Christ that is at stake. It is His right to the first place in the supreme law of the land that is involved. And this nation of ours has been crying out for more than a hundred years through the majestic voice of its great Constitution: "Away with Him, away with Him." The crucifixion has been going on. Political wickedness has been nailing the Son of God to the tree, has been putting Him again and again to an open shame, and is doing it now. It will not do therefore to stand back and say with a sort of inertia: "Let be, let us see whether Elijah cometh to take Him down." Something must be done, and the faithful follower of Christ must go to work and do it. If he can do nothing else, he can at least let the public hear what he knows. The one or

two Apostles that stood on Golgotha and witnessed the agonies of the Son of Man had no power, it is true, to take their beloved Lord from the cross, but by the help of God they reported what they saw, and all Christendom has bowed the knee. And so, also, in the present crisis, the true Christian, to be consistent at all, must labor in some way for the good of society, must put forth his energies in some direction to stay the hand that is striking the thorns and driving the nails and thrusting the spear, must in nowise and under no possible kind of a pretense remain inactive.

Again, in the second place, it is evident that a loyal follower of Christ cannot consistently act in any position or under any provisions where the supreme test of action has been framed in such a way as to keep Christ out.

No man may be said to be following Christ when he enters doors which shut Christ out. He may have been following Him up to the very threshold of such doors, but when he has crossed the threshold and has closed the doors, then he and Christ, it would seem, have, for the time being at least, parted company. It can hardly be held that a man is following the one whom he has left behind him. Moreover, within the doors that bar Christ out there is always the spirit of a false independence, and no man is ever permitted to enter such a place until he has engaged beforehand to be true to the spirit and to be governed by the principles which the institution, let it be what it may, was established to propagate. At all events, this is true of that great building made by the hands and the hearts and the intellects of the founders of this Republic—the Constitution of the United States. It, at least, “as by the sequel you will see,” set up an unwarranted independence, and asked men to be true in their political life to an unchristian spirit and to deal out their services under little better than pagan pledges, when in 1787 it swung to, with perfect composure, in the face of God, Christ and the Bible, the two dark massive doors of its enacting clause and its oath of office. By the former it declared the principles which were to find embodiment in the subsequent parts of the Constitution and were consequently to form the basis for the government of the people for whom the Constitution was ordained and established. By the latter it provided that sworn allegiance to these principles should constitute the supreme test of action for every man that proposed to hold an office or cast a ballot under its aegis. What, then, are these principles? And are they such as a true and loyal Christian may consistently swear allegiance to? These are fair questions and are worthy of the dispassionate consideration of every Christian citizen.

Let us begin with the first. The enacting clause, or the preamble as it is called, lodges all authority in the people. “We, the people of

the United States," to use its own language, are designated as the source and fountain of all authority in this land. As there is in this no recognition, no intimation even, of the true source from which all authority, both in heaven and on earth, can come, there is in it, in consequence, both in spirit and in fact, the setting up of a false independence, there is in it a tacit but none the less effectual usurpation of the authority that belongs to God alone, a deep and profound and awful violation of the first and great commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." And yet this is but the half of it. The brief clause in question not only misplaces the source of authority and power, but with cold colorless precision it actually rules out the One whom God, as the fountain of all authority, has appointed to be "the Governor among the Nations." In effect, it resolves itself to this—We, the people of the United States, without owing any allegiance to, or acknowledging any dependence upon, or asking any help from, or promising any submission to, the Lord Jesus Christ, do ordain and establish this Constitution. These, therefore, the substitution of humankind for divine authority and the rejection of Jesus Christ, are the two outstanding principles that meet us at the very threshold of our supreme and fundamental law.

The third principle, however, is the same in kind, as also is the fourth. The enacting clause proceeds at once to enumerate the purposes which the Constitution was intended to realize, the ends which it was meant to accomplish, the blessings which it was designed to guarantee. But in doing so it specifies such things, and only such things, as can come ultimately from God alone, through Jesus Christ. To whom but God does it pertain to make a nation and form it continuously into "a more perfect union?" Who but God can supply men with the power and the disposition to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty?" "By me," says God, shall men be able to "decree justice." It is God that "giveth quietness." He is "our defense." Upon Him wait "the eyes of all." And when He dispenses "the blessings of liberty," then shall men "be free indeed." These are God's prerogatives. Shall flesh and blood presume, as Isaiah puts it, to "sit in the seat of God?" When the great kingdom of Babylon magnified its powers and said: "I will exalt my throne above the stars of God . . . I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High," what was the sentence that flamed down upon it in righteous wrath from heaven? Was it not this: "Thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit?" And was it not done? Men cannot arrogate to themselves functions that appertain to the Lord of the Universe without affronting "the Majesty on High." Yet this, when considered from the point of view

which is concerned with the rights of God, is precisely the third principle in consonance with which the enacting clause of the Constitution was formulated.

The fourth principle to be mentioned here lies embedded in the assertion that the one document, to the exclusion of all others, shall be the supreme law of the land. "We, the people of the United States," the instrument declares, "do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." By "this Constitution," and by it alone, all transactions—legislative, executive or judicial—must be tried. With it all treaties must accord; in fact, they are a part of it. The Book whose contents were written by the finger of God has no place in the councils of the United States of America. And what is more, its teachings have been flatly contravened. Take a few examples. The Word: "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." The Constitution: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." The Word: "He that swearth in the earth shall swear by the God of Truth," and, "Thou shalt swear by my name." The Constitution: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm)" by no God and in no Name. The Word, speaking of Christ: "All kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him." The Constitution, in a treaty with Tripoli: "The government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion; it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquillity of Musselmans." That is to say, that the fourth principle thus enunciated in the enacting clause not only bars the Bible out, but with the same stroke prepares the way for the construction of certain sections in the body of the Constitution which shall distinctly contradict the plainest teachings of the Scriptures with respect to some of the most vital interests of society. The Word has been ruled out, and that, too, as it would seem, by keen calm calculation.

These, then, in so far as the divine rights are concerned, are the great cardinal principles that lie embosomed in the preamble of the Constitution, namely, that in the sphere of political life there shall be the substitution of human for divine authority, the rejection of Christ, the assumption of divine prerogatives, and the slighting of the Bible. These are the four dark and frowning panels in the first of those colossal doors that guard the entrance to this, our proud edifice of civil government.

But there is another door, to-wit.: the oath of office. By it, as has been noted, every man that would be an officer or would vote for one is bound beforehand in sworn allegiance to the principles laid down in the enacting clause, and made articulate in the body, of the Constitution. All officers, both national and state, "shall be bound by oath, or affirmation," says the instrument itself, "to support this Constitu-

tion." Now it will readily be granted that this oath which all the officers are obliged to take is one in signification which, indeed one in essence with, the oath administered to the President by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. This latter oath, however, is accurately worded and explicitly prescribed in the Constitution itself. The President solemnly engages, to the best of his ability, to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." The meaning of the term "support," therefore, may be held to be defined with consummate skill and with perfect clearness in the Presidential oath. To "support," or uphold the Constitution is exactly to "preserve, protect and defend" it to the best of one's ability. Moreover, the choice of these three words, so far from being merely a happy coincidence, belongs to a plan that had been weighed in the balances with exquisite nicety, that nothing might be found wanting. The first, to take them up in their order, is manifestly the most generic of the three and may be said to contemplate environments that are perfectly peaceful. To "preserve," as all will agree, means simply to maintain intact and unimpaired, to keep in the same condition, unmolested, without change or alteration. But the second word, it will be observed, begins to be specific and may be said to contemplate a somewhat unsettled state of affairs. It postulates a condition in which the outlook is more or less threatening, one that discloses indications that an attack of some kind is likely to be made. To "protect," accordingly, implies the taking of such steps as may promise to be effectual in preventing the attack, of whatsoever sort it may be. The third term, however, presupposes that the attack has at length been made, and that the forces at hand must be called out immediately to meet the enemy. Thus to "defend" is to take the field for the purpose of vindicating the cause that has been assailed. So that the wording of the oath, as is patent, is clear in its import, definite in its aim, comprehensive in its scope. The terms define with admirable lucidity the nature of the obligations under which every man that would execute the provisions of the Constitution is inevitably placed. In a word, they embody and elucidate the constitutional conception of civil allegiance.

The oath of office, therefore, puts all who take it—whether they take it in person or through representatives—under sworn allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. In other words, it binds them, first of all, to "preserve" the whole Constitution to the best of their ability, that is, among other things, to maintain intact and unimpaired, to keep in the same condition, unchanged and unmolested, these four principles, as foundational, namely, that the Constitution is right in substituting human for divine authority, that it is right in rejecting Jesus Christ as King, that it is right in arrogating to itself the prerogatives that belong to God, and that it is right in casting aside the Holy Scriptures. Moreover, it binds them, in the second



place, to "protect" the whole Constitution to the best of their ability, that is, among other things, to take such steps, in case they should be called for, as may prove to be effectual in preventing any attack, armed or argumentative, upon the ruinous assumptions that in political affairs it is right to substitute human for divine authority, to reject Christ, to presume to perform the functions that appertain to Almighty God, and to dishonor the Bible. And lastly, it binds them to "defend" the whole Constitution to the best of their ability, that is, among other things, to take the field, whenever these doctrines or any one of them may happen to be assailed, and vindicate them as best they can, showing, however, vigorously the conscience may recoil from the task, that it is right for the Constitution to ignore the sovereign authority of God, that it is right for it to make no recognition of the Lord, Jesus Christ as "the Governor among the Nations," that it is right for it to enrobe itself in unacknowledged might and majesty and say like Babylon: "I will be like the Most High," and that it is right for it to blot from the supreme law of the land every trace of the Word of God. For if the oath means anything, it means unqualified allegiance to all that falls legitimately, at the time of taking it, within its compass.

Thus if language is to be regarded as of any value at all, the oath of office, it would seem, "solemnly" and inviolably holds the men who take it to the maintenance of such foundational principles as the Constitution at the time contains. And though all men may, indeed, and many men do take the liberty now and then to speak and even to labor against the principles which they have bound themselves previously by oath to "preserve, protect and defend," yet it would be unwise, not to say perilous, to teach that such liberty had come to be theirs by virtue of their oath to the contrary. Swearing with uplifted hand to do a thing is hardly the particular act which gives a man the freedom to labor and pray for its undoing. Nor is there any relief in the fact that the Constitution provides for its own amendment, for every man that casts his ballot engages solemnly, to the best of his ability, to "support" the Constitution just as it is until the amendments, of whatsoever nature they may be, shall have been made; he engages—so long as it remains in its present condition—to "preserve, protect and defend" it with its ground work of false and atheistic principles just as they are, at least for the time being. But to engage to "support" the Constitution as it now is is all one in principle whether it be for a minute or for a millennium. Of course it is plain enough that the men who at any given time swear to "preserve, protect and defend" the Constitution as it is may with unchallengeable consistency labor for the adoption of any amendment which shall be in harmony with, and shall promise to give a more perfect expression

to, the fundamental principles upon which the constitutional structure at the moment in question is standing. An amendment of such a character, it is clear, would in the essence of it be but a step—and in most cases, perhaps, an indispensable step—in the preservation, protection and defense of the Constitution. But that men who have pledged themselves to “preserve, protect and defend” the supreme law as it is may by any possibility labor consistently for a proposed amendment which shall be out of harmony with and subversive of the fundamental principles upon which the structure is based is not so demonstrable. An amendment of such a character would manifestly involve an intrinsic contradiction, for an amendment, according to all the laws of proper thinking, must be in keeping with the essence and the spirit of the instrument which it aims to amend. And this—unless it is justifiable to juggle with that that is sacred—is doubly, is infallibly imperative where morals are concerned, for in such a sphere at least men cannot pledge themselves to the false and be true to the truth, at the same time and on the same question. To swear to “preserve, protect and defend” a constitutional law which rules God, Christ and the Bible out is wholly out of harmony with any suitable efforts to have the divine supremacy acknowledged. The two are inherently contradictory. The oath that binds men to do the one binds them not to do the other. The oath of office is therefore inexorable. It binds all who take it into an alliance with the wrong. And until the agreement is broken there is no escape from the meshes of the sin.

These terms, therefore—first, to “support” the Constitution, or uphold it in all its provisions; secondly, to “preserve” it, or keep it in its integrity as it is; thirdly, to “protect” it, or guard it against every kind of assault; fourthly, to “defend” it, or contend for its principles in the face of opposition—these terms are the modes of speech fixed upon by the founders of our Republic to define allegiance. They are the terms that were adopted to collect and condense into the smallest intelligible limits the ideas that were designed to constitute the supreme test of action for every citizen that should choose to cast a ballot. They are the terms, which, in connection with that that lies behind them and gives them substance, contain the stipulations by which men are wont to bind themselves, though in large measure unthinkingly, to disclaim the crown rights of the Nazarene within the realm of state. They are the four dark and ominous panels in the second of those colossal doors that guard the entrance to our imposing and in many ways magnificent edifice of civil government.

In the year 1787, then, in the Constitutional Convention, these two ponderous doors were made, matched, fitted, joined, and, when all was ready, swung together in the face of divine supremacy and all that it involves with the low sullen hush of calm rebellion. The nation,

in its sovereign capacity, and for the honor of its majesty, tasked the strength of its clear mind and its strong right arm to bar the doors against the claims of Almighty God and of Jesus Christ, and it succeeded. To Him that sought admission through its portals then to the world of politics, to Him that seeks it now, the answer has ever been—"Lift up thy hand, O man, and swear, and say, 'And now, O God, on entering here I break with Thee; O Christ, I leave Thee out; O blessed Book, I seal thee up, and from Thy hand, O Sovereign Lord, I wrest the scepter of dominion!'" Is it too much for any man to say that when these two portals swing together thus in the face of the meek and lowly Son of Man, they ought at that very instant to swing together also in the face of every loyal Christian in the land? Shall the Blessed One, the Christ of God, be made to stand unheeded at the threshold of this proud edifice of ours, and shall His faithful follower calmly bid Him a fond adieu and pass in, leaving his Lord knocking at the door and waiting until His head is wet with dew and His locks with the drops of the night? Will loyalty go in where Christ has been legislated out? I hold it to be the eternal truth of God that loyalty to Christ stops her foot at the very spot where the Lord of Glory has been affronted.

But is this all? Is this the climax, the summit of the sin? Alas, no; by no means. There is another consideration before which the thought of leaving Christ behind pales into comparative insignificance. If I simply leave my Lord behind me when I pass those darksome portals, I do not well, of course, yet not the worst. The one thing above all others that should blanch my cheek and chill my heart is the awful fact that in crossing the threshold of our civil edifice I am obliged to identify myself with, to bind myself into one with, the great intelligent body politic that has always kept the doors closed against the Lord and his Anointed, and in doing so has said: "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us;" I am obliged to turn, on entering, and place my own strength—what little I may have—against the doors, that I may help to keep them shut in the face of Him "whose I am and whom I serve." I shudder to think of leaving my Lord behind me, standing without under the scorching scorn of men, but at the thought of crowding the door, however quietly in His face I exceedingly fear and quake. Here, if anywhere, I must "stand in awe, and sin not." For whatever other channels of action Christian loyalty may open up for me, it infallibly forbids me, once and forever, to join hands with men in swinging the doors of civil government against the Holy One of Israel whom God has exalted "to be a Prince and a Saviour," against "The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords."

What position, then, must I as a loyal Christian citizen take? This one—to be consistent—and no other. I must at whatever cost refuse to enter the edifice whose doors have been closed against Jesus Christ. I must not become one with those who have engaged to the best of their ability to keep Him out. I must stand without with Him who is “my strength and my Redeemer,” bearing His reproach; for apart from Him I can do nothing.

Mercer, Pa.

W. J. McKNIGHT.

## The Relation the Voter Sustains to the Official Oath of His Representative .

Dr. J. W. Sproull, Allegheny, Pa.

Does he sustain any? Does the representative, when he qualifies, act simply for himself? Or does he act for the electors so that the oath which he takes, divested of the merely personal element, they too take?

Today in the City of New York Albert T. Patrick is on trial for the murder of William Marsh Rice. Able counsel is employed in his defense. Every effort, likely to prove successful, is being made to secure his acquittal. If found guilty, he will be taken back to his prison, to await sentence of death. Then, if the law be allowed to take its course, he will, before long, suffer the extreme penalty inflicted upon those found guilty of murder.

But Albert T. Patrick did not, himself, kill William Marsh Rice. The person who committed the deed, who administered the poison, was Charles F. Jones, the valet of Mr. Rice. He has made a full confession, giving in detail the horrible particulars and assigning the reason for the commission of the awful crime. If this confession be true, and it carries with it the evidence of probability, Jones poisoned Rice.

And yet Lawyer Patrick is placed on trial, charged with the act, and notwithstanding the determined efforts of his counsel, may be found guilty. Why is this? A man innocent of the act, to be put to death for the crime of one confessedly guilty.

There is a principle in law generally accepted as true, which applies to this case—"Qui per alium facit per se ipsum facere videtur"—He who does an act through the medium of another is considered as doing it himself. Jones, while admitting that he did the deed, claims that he was only a tool in the hands of Patrick, acting throughout for him. Whether or not the valet should suffer the extreme penalty of the law, will depend largely on the answer to the question relating to the influence exerted over him and his personal responsibility. But as to the infliction of the death penalty on Patrick, if he be guilty, as charged, there will be no difference of opinion. He it was that ad-

ministered the poison as really as though he had done it with his own hand, and he ought to die. "Respondeat superior." Let the principal be held responsible.

Both parties admit the correctness of this maxim. Hence it is that the prosecution are putting forth every effort to prove that Patrick was the instigator and Jones the tool, while the counsel for the defense, although not willing to admit murder was committed, are doing all in their power to prove that Jones was no tool but a free agent and that all he did, including his confession, was deliberately done for a purpose. If it be proved that a murder was committed, the verdict will hinge on the one point, was Jones Patrick's agent, acting for him?

To what extent is this principle applicable? Universally and without restriction? In Broom's *Legal Maxims* (Pp. 816-866) are given numerous applications of it and also instances where it will not apply. Of course, one is responsible for the acts of another only so far as that other represents him or for the legitimate consequences of such acts. There may be modifying conditions. But, in general, the maxim is true—"Qui facit per alium, facit per se"—He who does an act by another does it himself.

The correctness of this principle will be seen, if we but consider the consequences that necessarily flow from its denial. Then all that would be necessary for one to be guilty of greatest crimes and yet be regarded by the law as innocent, would be for him to influence another by threats, bribes, persuasion or in some other way, to perform the overt acts. Such a theory, reduced to practice, would subvert the very foundations upon which society rests.

I have thus dwelt at length upon this principle, because it has direct application to the question—What relation does the voter sustain to the official oath of his representative?

Our government is not a pure democracy. All the people do not come together, as in a town meeting, to deliberate on and decide questions relating to the public welfare. Certain persons, to whom is accorded the right of suffrage, select, in the manner designated, one of their number to act for them, to represent them. The electors are not compelled to exercise the right of suffrage. They do so of their own free will, accepting the conditions required by the government,

Blackstone (Book I., Page 157) refers to the relation that exists between the representative and those he represents in the following language: While it is desirable that "legislative power" "should be exercised by the people in their aggregate or collective capacity," this would "be highly inconvenient" "in so large a state as ours." "It is, therefore, very wisely contrived that the people should do that by their representative which it is impracticable to perform in person." That is, he takes their place; they legislate through him.

One of the conditions required before a representative can enter upon the duties of his office is that he take an oath of loyalty to the government, swear to support the Constitution. The taking of this oath is not optional; it is obligatory, imposed by the authority of law. The government requires it as security for the preservation of the Constitution and the maintenance and execution of the established law. The representative takes the oath of office not as a mere personal act, but as representing a constituency, who, on account of their number, cannot themselves, directly take part in legislation, and so delegate one to act for them.

There may be a personal element in the oath, relating exclusively to the individual, and, with which, those, whom he represents, have nothing to do. But in every such oath there is an essential, a permanent element, which relates to allegiance to the government. That is always contained in it, whatever else is omitted.

That it is eminently proper that they who are actively engaged in the administration of the affairs of government should be its loyal friends and ready, when required, to take an oath to that effect, may more, that, at stated times, they should be required to do so, all will admit. This question of loyalty, however, does not relate exclusively to the representative. It has to do with the electors. They, after all, are the persons that legislate. Allowing a reasonable liberty for the exercise of private judgment, they at the same time require their representative to carry out their views on all important issues. If he refuse to do so, they send another in his place. It is they who determine the policy of the government. It is necessary not only that there be a loyal representative, but also that there be, behind him, a loyal constituency. One disloyal representative can do but little harm, when an entire constituency is disloyal, revolution is in the air.

No government would allow any large body of voters to exercise the right of suffrage, who would declare their unwillingness to take the oath, which he, whom they elect to represent them, must take, ere he be allowed to enter upon the duties of his office, if made aware of their unwillingness. Such persons would be regarded as disloyal and in troublous times would suffer the consequences of disloyalty. The right "to tender the oath of allegiance to any person whom they suspect of disaffection" is not only "claimed by all governments," but when the emergency arises, is exercised. If it were at all practicable, it would be eminently proper that the electors be required to take at certain times the very same oath of loyalty as do their representatives and which, if they took a direct part in legislation, they, themselves, would be required to take. This would be a test of loyalty and any, who would refuse to take the oath, ought to be denied the right of suffrage.

However desirable such a test would be, it is impracticable. It is really not necessary. The same object is accomplished, on the theory that the representative, when he qualifies, represents the electors. "He goes with a commission in their name and, as their representative, takes for them, as well as for himself, the prescribed oath," on the basis of which he sits, deliberates and votes. The electors thus bind themselves by the oath he takes and so are equally and morally responsible with him. "Virtually, yet imperatively, they require him to swear the prescribed oath in their name," as otherwise he could not act for them. Such a view of the relation that exists between a voter and his representative dignifies the use of the elective franchise and greatly strengthens the government. It is in accordance with the principle, "what we do by another, we do ourselves."

The voter and his representative stand in exactly the same relation to the government. A member of "any association whose constitution is known and avowed involves an approbation and support of that constitution." Those who voluntarily unite in it must be held as approving and engaging to uphold it. Voters, accepting the prescribed conditions, casting their ballots for some one to act for them in governmental affairs, "formally avow themselves a constituent part of the society" and give their approval of the constitution under which they exercise the right of suffrage, and of their representative swearing to support it. In so doing they "homologate the known constitution and take upon themselves the responsibilities while they claim the privileges of members. They claim a right to take part in all the affairs of legislation and by their chosen representatives to sit, deliberate and vote in all matters that require attention."

Blackstone, treating of the oath (Book I, P. 368), argues that the "formal profession or oath of subjection is nothing more than a declaration in words of what was before implied in law, which occasions Sir Edward Coke very justly to observe that "all subjects are equally bound to their allegiance as if they had taken the oath—The taking of the corporal oath is but an outward declaration of the same." In accordance with this, it is maintained as a "principle of universal law that the natural born subject cannot by any act of his, no, not by swearing allegiance" to another government, "put off or discharge" his natural allegiance to the former; as Sir Michael Foster observes, "The well known maxim which the writers upon our law have adopted and applied to this; 'Nemo potest exuere patriam,' comprehendeth the whole doctrine of natural allegiance.'" If, then, one is a native of a country, the Constitution of whose government he cannot conscientiously swear to support, more than staying away from the polls is necessary that he free himself from the guilt incurred by occupying a position in which it is understood that he, really, if not formally, swears



to support it. In order to free itself from all complicity in the guilt of this nation on account of its refusal to recognize the claims of God, his Christ and his law, our church maintains a position of dissent and publicly testifies against the nation. If the position maintained by Blackstone be correct, and it is generally accepted, there is no escaping from the conclusion, that the person who votes for another to represent him in the government, by that act acknowledges himself to be bound by the oath of loyalty taken by his representative and which is regarded as already, resting upon him. The representative takes for him the formal oath.

The government acts on this principle. Residence, good conduct, etc., are not sufficient to entitle a foreigner to the right of suffrage. He is regarded as the subject of another government until he renounces allegiance to it and takes the oath of allegiance here. That a foreigner may become a citizen of the United States the essential condition is the taking of the oath of loyalty, in substance, the same as that taken by the representative. That admits him into the governing body and entitles him to the full rights of citizenship as long as he remains in the land of his adoption. He takes the oath of loyalty which the government regards as virtually taken by all, and which is the essential requirement in order to citizenship.

This then is the conclusion to which we come. The oath of office taken by a representative, divested of the merely personal element, and, regardless entirely of its character, whether proper or improper, is, virtually, taken by the electors. When being qualified, he represents them. Even if Jones is found guilty and dies the death of a murderer, Patrick, if the charges against him are proved, ought to die the same death. That which we do by another we do ourselves.

## The Blighting Effect upon Spiritual Life of an Oath to an Unchristian Constitution and to Unscriptural Laws.

The Rev. Dr. R. J. George,

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Christians:

The deliberations of this Conference have reached an intensely practical point. It has been shown that the Lord Jesus Christ is a royal Saviour, and that by the appointment of God the Father He is the Governor among the Nations.

It has also been shown that the Constitution of the United States is unchristian in that it makes no recognition of the Kingly authority of Christ, or of the supremacy of His law; and in that it contains provisions which are contrary to the revealed will of God. It has been shown further, that loyalty to Christ forbids a Christian to swear to an unchristian Constitution, and it has been demonstrated that the voter is responsible for the official oath taken by his representative.

The question is now raised, what is the effect upon the spiritual life of an oath to an unchristian Constitution and to unscriptural laws? The question does not concern the officeholder alone, that would confine it to a comparatively small number; but as the voter is responsible for the official oath of his representative; the question has to do with the great body of Christian voters who through their representatives bind themselves under the sanctions of an oath to accept this unchristian Constitution as the supreme rule of their political life and swear to maintain and administer the unscriptural laws made under it.

My proposition is this:

An Oath to an Unchristian Constitution and to Unscriptural Laws has a Blighting Effect upon the Spiritual Life.

I will first consider this proposition from the point of view of the effect of such an oath on the relation of the soul to Christ. And on this I remark:

I. An oath to an unchristian Constitution makes impossible the full surrender of the soul to Christ.

The first condition of a vigorous and healthy spiritual life is entire surrender to God. On this point there is no difference of view among

Christian teachers. If any part of the life is withheld from Christ that part is blighted in its spirituality.

I have seen a blighted tree. Portions of its top were leafless, fruitless, dead. No life-giving influences from the tree entered those withered branches. The tree was not wholly dead, but it was blighted. These withered branches, cut off from vital union with the tree, not only were blighted themselves, but they had a blighting effect upon the whole tree. This illustrated the inevitable result which follows when any part of the life is separated from Christ. It is a scriptural illustration. Our Lord says: "I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me and I in him the same bringeth forth much fruit; for apart from me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me he is cast forth as a branch and is withered; and they gather them and cast them into the fire and they are burned." (John 15 : 5, 6. R. V.).

Now I do not affirm that an oath to a Christless Constitution as the supreme rule in political affairs separates the life wholly from Christ, but I do affirm that such an oath makes it impossible that the life shall be wholly surrendered to Christ, and that that part of the life which is held back from Christ is blighted, and the political sphere of life being spiritually blighted, has a blighting effect upon the whole life.

Many of you are familiar with the noble words of Dr. Terrett on this subject. Speaking on "Christ the Nation's King," he says:

"Christ claims the man, the whole man for himself in obedience and service. But man is whole only in his relations, domestic, social and political. Man is born to be a citizen. He was made for the nation as truly as for the home. He is not, cannot be, all that he ought to be as a man until he is all that he ought to be as a citizen. If it be true then that man belongs by nature in political relations, who shall say that in these relations he is emancipated from the authority of Jesus Christ. If he be Christ's servant he will show it here. He cannot be Christ's servant and not show it here. The best of man's life is his relational life, and in all his relational life he belongs to Christ. By what argument shall we be justified in saying that while a Christian man is bound to submit himself to Christ's authority, yield himself to Christ's influence, and open himself to Christ's inspiration, in his domestic relations, in his social relations, in his business relations, that in his political relations he is justified in recognizing some lower law, and in acting under the impulse of some poorer motive. If man belongs in the nation he is bound to serve Christ there as much as anywhere. This is man's largest sphere; these are man's noblest engagements, solemnest obligations. Shall he not here, if anywhere, acknowledge Christ's authority and seek to do His will? Christ cannot spare a single inch of manhood. He has redeemed, and He can

use it all." (National Reform Documents, Philadelphia—Conference 1888). Of like import are the words of Prof. Joseph Kyle, of Xenia Theological Seminary, in an address to the young people of his church on "The Separated Life." "What is your political life?" he asks. "This also must be 'holiness to the Lord!' We are to be 'holy in all manner of conduct!' This injunction has to do with one's political action, as certainly as with his business conduct or his religious duties."

The truth of these presentations of the claims of Christ upon man in every sphere of his life and especially in the political sphere will not be questioned. Every Christian conscience responds to these words. If we would have fullness of spiritual life we must be wholly Christ's. Has it a blighting effect upon the spiritual life for one to reject the authority of Christ over him in his business life? Most certainly it has. Has it a blighting effect upon the spiritual life for a man to separate his family life from Christ? It cannot be otherwise. How then can it fail to have a blighting effect upon the spiritual life for him to exclude Christ from his political relations? It cannot fail. I do not hesitate to affirm that no one can attain to the highest degree of spiritual life which God has made possible to man who does not give his life wholly to Christ, and that no man can give himself wholly to Christ who separates his political life from Christ's authority by swearing to an unchristian Constitution

From the point of view, therefore, of its effect upon the relation of the soul to Christ we are forced to the conclusion that an oath to an unchristian Constitution has a blighting effect upon the spiritual life.

The second point of view from which I will consider the proposition is that of the effect of such an oath upon the relation of the soul to the holy law of God. On this I remark:

II. An oath to unscriptural laws binds the soul to a false standard of morals.

There can be no healthy spiritual life without conformity to the divine rule of holy living. There is only one perfect standard of morals, and that is the moral law as revealed in the Bible. When, therefore, one takes an oath to unscriptural laws, he binds himself to conform to a false standard of morality. Such an oath can be kept only by doing that which is immoral in the sight of God. An oath to a Christless Constitution, as we have seen, renders impossible the entire surrender of the soul to God. That is bad enough. But there is a deeper depth, when under a Constitution from which all reference to Christ is excluded, and which makes the will of the people the supreme law of the land, there have grown up systems of wicked laws "made in pursuance thereof," and when Christian voters, by the official oaths of their representatives, have sworn that they will maintain and ex-

ecute these laws which are contrary to the law of God, it is impossible that their spiritual life can escape the blighting effect of this unholy alliance. I shrink from the conclusion, but I find no evasion for me. If one binds himself by his church covenant to render obedience to the law of God everywhere, and always, and then in his political relations binds himself under an official oath to obey laws which are contrary to the divine law, he is compelled to violate either his official oath, or his sacramental vow. And broken oaths and broken sacraments have an awfully blighting effect upon the spiritual life.

Take for illustration the laws establishing and maintaining the Sunday mail service. Those laws are in open violation of the command "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy!" The man who swears to execute these laws by carrying or distributing the mails on the Lord's day binds himself and all whom he represents to live in habitual disobedience to God. Has it a blighting effect upon the spiritual life for one to engage in deliberate and voluntary desecration of the Sabbath from year to year? To ask the question is to answer it.

Another great body of unscriptural laws which has grown up under our unchristian Constitution is the shameless divorce system. Christian citizens through the official oaths of their representatives have sworn that they will administer these laws which are in acknowledged antagonism to the law of God. Thus the land is full of adultery. Is not the flagrant disregard of the seventh commandment destructive of the spiritual life?

Some years ago I had a conversation with a judge from one of our western states on this subject. Having learned that I was a Covenanter minister he expressed himself strongly in opposition to the position of political separation, which, of course, I endeavored to defend. I inquired how many grounds of divorce were established by the laws of his state? He replied that the law specified eight causes. "How many grounds are fixed by the law of Christ?" I asked. He answered: "There is only one, the sin of adultery." "How then," I said, "do you as a judge administer a law that is in direct violation of God's law of marriage?" He replied that he interpreted the law very rigidly and that persons seeking divorce avoided his court as far as possible. "But," I said, "when they do appear before you and establish their claim to a divorce on grounds which the law of your state specifies but which the law of Christ forbids, what do you do?" He replied: "I do not hold myself responsible for the law, but I am bound by my oath of office to grant the divorce." Now here was a Christian judge who had bound his soul under the solemn sanctions of an oath to a false standard of morals and who in fulfillment of his official oath felt himself compelled to trample underfoot the divine law of marriage and the sacred institution of the family.

Do the Christian voters of these United States realize that they are responsible before God for all the infamous divorces granted in accordance with the laws, by judges acting in fulfillment of the official oaths taken by them as the representatives of those who have chosen them. Again, I say, I shrink from the conclusion, but I see no possible escape from it. These shameless divorces are granted by thousands until our infamous laws are become a stench in the nostrils of all Christendom. The fact is our nation has become so degraded by this legalized uncleanness that we are on the verge of licensing the vilest forms of prostitution. On the verge! did I say? Alas! we have gone over the verge and to our everlasting disgrace the flag of our country is floating over the vile dens of licensed prostitution under the supervision of the military authorities in our new possessions. Such is the blighting effect upon the spiritual life of an oath to unscriptural laws.

To illustrate this point still further, I will relate an experience under the liquor license law of this state.

I spent seventeen years in pastoral work in a good sized town where for the first seven years of the time there was not a licensed saloon or hotel. The judge of the court was a man of high Christian character, prominent in the church. Applications for license were made as regularly as the March court convened, and they were as regularly resisted by the foremost citizens of the place and refused by the judge. We had one good temperance hotel, and the judge held that as long as that was sufficient to accommodate the public, he could under the law refuse all applications for license. But the town grew. The demands of the public increased. The temperance hotel passed into other hands. Then the judge issued the license and we had a whisky hotel. The town was up in arms. An indignation meeting was called. Denunciations were bitter. In defense of the judge it was said that he was just as much opposed to the liquor traffic as any citizen of the town, but that he held himself bound by his official oath to grant the liquor license whenever it was shown that the house for which the application was made was necessary for the accommodation of the public. The judge believed now when he granted the license, that the liquor traffic was a curse upon the town, just as he had believed before when he refused it, but he was sworn to the immoral license law, and for his oath's sake he granted the license. In granting the license the judge was not acting for himself. He was the representative of those who elected him to the office. The official oath which bound him to license the saloon bound them, and when the act was done in accordance with the law and in fulfillment of his official oath it was their act as truly as it was his. The awful fact is that the great body of Christian citizens are by the official oaths of

their representatives sworn to legalize, authorize, protect and foster the accursed liquor traffic, and in the name of God, I do declare that such oaths are "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," and that they are not only blighting the spiritual life of the church, but they are blasting it with the brimstone flames of Gehenna.

Christian men! is it not time that the church would arise in the name of Jesus Christ as King and in the power of His might and would break asunder the bonds which are binding her to this body of sin and death?

"Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city, for henceforth there shall no more come into thee, the uncircumcised and the unclean. Shake thyself from the dust, arise, sit on thy throne, O Jerusalem, loose thyself from the bonds of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion." (Isa. 52 : 1, 2 R. V.).

From the point of view therefore of the effect of an oath to unscriptural laws upon the relation of the soul to the holy law of God—we are forced to the conclusion that such an oath, has a blighting influence upon the spiritual life.

The third point of view from which I will consider the proposition is from the effect of such an oath on the work of the Holy Spirit in the soul. And on this I remark:

III. An oath to an unchristian Constitution and to unscriptural laws prevents the enjoyment of the fullness of the Holy Spirit.

To fallen man there is only one source of spiritual life and growth. "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the spirit giveth life." Whatever hinders the full enjoyment of the influence of the Holy Spirit has a blighting effect upon the spiritual life.

Much is said and written in our times concerning the fullness of the Spirit. Religious teachers represent it in different ways. Some say there is one act of faith receiving the Spirit for conversion and a second act of faith at another time receiving the Spirit as a spirit of power for service. Others distinguish it as the first and second blessing. Others again, speak of the second experience as the infilling of the Spirit. The Scriptural doctrine seems to be this: That the believer, through the act of saving faith, receives Christ and in receiving Christ receives the Holy Spirit, and that through abiding in Christ he receives the fullness of the Spirit's power. "Abide in me, and I in you." To expect to receive a "second blessing" by which we will become "spirit filled" is a vain conceit if we are not abiding in Christ. The fullness of the Spirit is the result of living union with a living Redeemer, as living branches in a living vine.

Rev. James N. McConkey, in an excellent treatise on "The Three-fold Secret of the Holy Spirit," impressively sets forth this truth. He

says: "A child of God, brought by the Spirit under conviction as to this truth, sees God's claim upon his life, and lays it at His feet, a living sacrifice. In answer to that surrender there comes to him from God a fullness of power, blessing, and spiritual life, beyond his fondest imaginings, and his spirit rejoices in the riches of his fuller experience. So manifest is the Spirit's presence in his heart, so consciously is he filled with this life, that he feels as though he had reached a new state of spiritual power and experience which will never leave nor diminish. But by and by there comes a change. The brightness of the experience seems to dim, its power begins to wane, its manifestation to diminish. He still continues to "claim" what he feels is gone, to profess what he does not possess, in the hope that this may bring back the blessing. But at last he breaks down in despair and henceforth refers to all this as a "lost experience," a blessing which he once enjoyed but which has now fled away. In such a case—only too common—what has happened? It is not that the Spirit has ceased to reveal Himself in His former fullness. It is not a question of lost indwelling, but of lost manifestation. The Blessor has not left, but the blessing has. The manifestation of the Spirit's fullness was perfectly satisfactory to him in kind and degree, but not in permanence. It failed in continuousness, slowly fading away like the flush of the twilight in a sunset sky."

It would be difficult to draw a more striking picture of a blighted life. Why is it? There are two absolute human conditions of the fullness of the Spirit. The first is a life wholly surrendered to God, and the second a life of implicit obedience. "And he that keepeth His commandments abideth in Him, and He in him." (1 Jno. 3: 24.) Now suppose the act of faith in receiving Christ is followed by an oath to be governed by a Christless Constitution, will not that tend to quench the spirit? and an oath to unscriptural laws in direct disobedience to the law of Christ, will not that grieve the Holy Spirit whereby we are sealed to the day of redemption? I do not say, that the new life will be destroyed, for it cannot be, but it will be blighted because it will fail of the fullness of the Spirit and of the full fruitage of the Spirit's work.

From the point of view, therefore, of the effect of such an oath upon the work of the Holy Spirit in the soul, we are forced to the conclusion that it will have a blighting influence upon the spiritual life.

While I thus speak I grow sick at heart. If you could only say to me: "The facts are all against you, there is no evidence anywhere that any blighting influence has fallen upon the spiritual life of the church," how glad I would be to be convinced of my mistake. But you cannot. The evidence is too painfully manifest. Men may differ as to the cause, but they cannot differ as to the fact. The church's



growth is arrested. Her zeal is growing cold. Her treasuries are depleted. She is shorn of her strength to cope with the evils which, like the giants of Philistia, are defying the armies of the living God. There must be a cause. The cause is widespread, affecting the whole church. It is persistent, it goes on from year to year. All efforts to bring about a revival of religion are fruitless. At the opening of the new century, conferences were held, committees were appointed, calls for prayer were sent out and answers came back: "We will pray," "We will pray." Weeks, months, the year went by, but the revival came not. Why? There may be various causes, doubtless there are. But disloyalty to Christ in political life is an adequate cause for the decline of religion which marks our age, because it renders impossible the enjoyment of the Spirit in His fullness. "The Holy Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified."

For centuries before the Reformation the spiritual life of God's people was blighted by anti-Christian Rome. Reformers arose seeking to reform the church from within. Reforming councils were held at Pisa, and at Basel, and at Constance, with the avowed purpose of reforming the church "in head and members." But it was all in vain. At last the spiritual life sank so low that Rome sent out her emissaries selling indulgences for men to live in sin, much as our government licenses evil for revenue. The Reformation came as a mighty protest against an anti-Christian Church trafficking for gain in the bodies and souls of men. The Reformers separated themselves from all complicity with the evil, and with that came the revival of religion which saved the church and gave Protestantism to the world.

Beloved, when I think of the ministers and members of the church in the United States crying to God for a revival of religion, while at the same time they are bound by the official oaths of their representatives to an unchristian Constitution which refuses the Kingly crown to their Lord, and are sworn to unscriptural laws which profane the Sabbath and destroy the family, and perpetuate the awful crime of the liquor traffic, I verily believe the answer of God to the prayer of His people is this:

"Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." Then will the church "revive as the corn, and grow as the vine and send forth her roots as Lebanon."

## Tuesday Morning, February 25th.

After devotional exercises, The Rev. R. H. Martin, Beaver Falls, Pa., moved the following resolution:

**A Christian cannot in Loyalty to Christ swear to carry on our Government according to a Law that leaves Christ out.** He said:

This resolution should be of interest to every Christian citizen. What loyalty to Christ requires of a Christian in his political life; cannot be a matter of indifference to anyone who loves his Saviour. Every Christian should be loyal to his country. He should take a deep interest in all that concerns its welfare. He should be ready to promote its welfare in every lawful way. Every Christian owes loyalty also to Christ. His first and highest allegiance is to Christ. He is to be loyal to Him in every relation of his life—in his political, as well as his ecclesiastical, business and social life. Whatever loyalty to Christ requires of a Christian in his political life, it is his duty to do.

In making loyalty to Christ the touch-stone by which he regulates his political actions, so far from doing that which will require him to be disloyal to his country the Christian is doing that which will require him to be loyal to it. There can be no conflict between loyalty to Christ and to one's country. He who is loyal to Christ is most loyal to his country.

What part can a Christian, in loyalty to Christ, take in carrying on our government?

Will loyalty to Christ permit him to join the political body, become an officer in the government, and take an oath to carry on the affairs of the government according to a law that leaves Christ out? Our resolution affirms that it will not.

This resolution affirms two things, that we need scarcely spend time in proving—that Christ is the King of Nations, and that the law by which the affairs of the government are regulated—the Constitution of the United States—does not recognize the authority of Christ over the nation. The Constitution knows no Christ, no Divine Authority or law to which the Nation is subject. Disowning the Divine Authority, it sets up the "will of the people" as the supreme authority. That Christ is the Nation's King is clearly taught in the Word of God. He is there declared to be "the Prince of the kings of the earth," "the Governor of the Nations." The government is said to rest on His shoulders. If He is the King of Nations, then His

authority over nations is supreme, and the nation and its government are under obligation to acknowledge and obey His law, and the Christian citizens of a nation owe it to Christ to accept His law as the supreme standard in their political life, and thus to carry out His will in the nation. This is what is involved in loyalty to Christ.

In view of the fact that Christ is the Nation's King, and that the Constitution according to which the government as carried on leaves Christ, His authority and law out, we believe that a Christian in loyalty to Christ cannot swear to carry on our government according to that law.

I. Because it requires him to give his allegiance to the secular theory of civil government.

A Constitution of civil government that leaves Christ and His authority and law out is based on the secular theory of government. It is based on the theory that government has no higher source of authority than the people; that their will is supreme in national life. It denies that government has anything to do with God, that Christ is the Ruler of Nations. It disowns the authority of His law over the nations.

When a Christian swears to carry on our government according to that law, he swears allegiance to the secular theory of government. His action declares that he believes that theory. He agrees to carry on our government according to that theory. He declares that Christ is not the King of our Nation, that His will is not supreme in our national affairs, that His law is not binding. He declares that as a citizen he does not owe his highest allegiance to Christ. A Christian cannot be loyal to Christ in doing this.

II. Because it requires him to regulate his political actions without any reference to the law of Christ.

Not only does an oath to the Constitution require him to give his allegiance to the secular theory of government, but it also binds him to be governed in his political action, by another law than the law of Christ. This law he accepts as the supreme standard in his political life. Whatever that law, and the laws framed in accordance with it, require him to do, he binds himself to do. If it requires him to do what the law of Christ would require of him, well and good. He does it. If it requires him to do what the law of Christ forbids, he has sworn to do it just the same. He has taken his oath that he will regulate his political actions without any reference to the law of Christ. When he takes an oath to the Constitution and enters upon the duties of his office, he leaves Christ and His law behind him. Loyalty to Christ will not admit of this. If Christ is the King of Nations, and His law is the supreme standard of action in political life, the Christian is bound to take His law as the supreme standard of

his political action, and to regulate his political life by that law. Loyalty to Christ will admit of nothing short of this.

Suppose the church were to set aside the law of Christ, as the standard of its government, and put another law in its place. Could a Christian in loyalty to Christ, the Head of the Church, bind himself to regulate the government of the church by that law? Christ has the same authority over nations as over the church. His law is the supreme standard in civil as well as in ecclesiastical life, and if it would be disloyal to Christ to swear to carry on the government of the church according to another law than Christ's, it is disloyal to Him to swear to carry on the government of the nation according to a law that sets aside His law.

III. Because it will require him to do, in many instances, what is directly contrary to the law of Christ.

Many of the officers of our government in fulfilling their sworn duties are breaking Christ's law. A Christian man is elected judge in one of the counties of Pennsylvania. In taking his seat on the bench, he takes a solemn oath that in fulfilling the duties of his office he will be governed by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of Pennsylvania framed in accordance with it, any other law to the contrary notwithstanding.

About this time each year applications for license to sell liquor will come before him. He must act on them. The law of Pennsylvania requires the judge to grant these licenses in every case where the applicant is a fit character to sell liquors and the place for which license is asked is necessary for the accommodation of the public. Who will dare say that a Christian judge in granting a license to sell intoxicating liquors and thus carrying out the law of Pennsylvania, is not breaking the law of Christ, and disloyal to his Master!

We have laws in all the states of the Union, excepting one, on divorce that are at variance with the law of Christ. The grounds of divorce, in the great majority of our states, range in number from six to ten. The law of Christ recognizes but one ground. An application for a divorce comes before a Christian judge in one of these states where the laws are at variance with Christ's law. The ground on which the divorce is prayed for is admitted by the law of the state, but not by the law of Christ.

The judge must grant the divorce, though in doing so he goes squarely against the divine law.

The judges in nearly every state and county of the Union are granting divorces every term of court, contrary to the law of Christ—breaking the command of Christ—"what God hath joined together let not man put asunder." Can a Christian in loyalty to Christ separate

husband and wife and break up the sacred institution of the family, contrary to Christ's command?

Many other cases might be cited, but the two just mentioned are sufficient to prove the point, that a Christian man in fulfilling the duties of an office under a government that leaves Christ out, is oftentimes required to do what is directly contrary to the law of Christ. If it is wrong for him to do this, it is wrong to put him in a position where he is required to do it. For these three reasons loyalty to Christ will not permit a Christian to swear to carry on our government according to a law that leaves Christ out.

The Rev. F. M. Wilson of Parnassus, Pa., gave the following address:

Mr. Chairman:

In seconding the resolution moved by Mr. Martin, I would offer the following considerations:

First, one's oath of office makes him directly responsible to Christ. The fact that a person, before entering upon the discharge of official duties in the state, is required solemnly to swear as he shall answer to Christ before His judgment bar, that he will faithfully discharge those duties, makes it impossible for a Christian "to carry on our government according to a law that leaves Christ out." The fact that in our land the nation has committed the sin of emasculating the oath and has disrobed it of every appeal to God does not remove the difficulty. The command of God, "Thou shalt swear by my name" remains; and the loyal Christian will refuse to be sworn without making his appeal to God. In the sphere of the state Christ, the "King of kings and Lord of lords" makes special and absolute claims. The Christian must respect these claims. How, then, shall a Christian in loyalty to Christ swear by Christ's name that he will be governed by a law which leaves Christ out of the very sphere in which He demands absolute supremacy? Such an oath is manifestly self-condemnatory.

Again, such an oath places one in hostility to Christ, the King of Nations. Indeed, a government set up without acknowledgment of Christ is in rebellion against Christ, and no Christian in loyalty to Christ can swear to "preserve, protect, defend" and carry on a government that is in rebellion against Christ.

But we are asked: Do you mean to say that simply because our government fails to acknowledge the authority of Christ, as Ruler of Nations, it is in rebellion against Him? We answer, yes; and for this reason: Our nation occupies a part of the territory of King Jesus and openly claims that the territory between the lakes and gulf, the Atlantic and Pacific belong solely to this nation and not to Christ. And our government proceeds to occupy and rule it without any reference to Him, whose it is. Jesus is a King and the Father has given Him all the earth for His kingdom. His kingdom extends from sea to sea and from the river unto the ends of the earth. There is not a foot of land on this earth that does not belong to Jesus Christ. Now, I ask, what right has a nation to set up a government on a part of

the territory of Jesus Christ without any acknowledgment of His supreme authority as the King of that territory? Is not the nation that does that in rebellion against Christ? And can a man be loyal to Christ and swear allegiance to that government which has been set up on a part of His territory without any acknowledgment of His authority?

The relation of a loyal government to Christ may be illustrated by that which is familiar to every intelligent American citizen; viz.: the relation of the several States to our Federal government. A state may have its own laws, customs, institutions and regulate its local affairs according to the desire and best interests of its own citizens, so long as it acknowledges the supreme authority of the Federal government as extending over it. While the state is sovereign in its purely local affairs it must, at the same time, acknowledge itself as a part of the nation, and acknowledge the supreme authority of the general government. And this for the obvious reason that the state occupies a part of the territory of the nation. The government of the United States is over and above that of each and every state. And the moment a state fails to own, or disregards that Federal authority, it assumes the attitude of rebellion against the national authority.

The principle becomes, if possible, clearer when illustrated by the admission of a governmental territory into the Union. The Territories of Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma are at the present time applying for admission to the Union as states. Now, these territories are a part of the territory of this nation; and the Federal government has laid down certain well-defined laws to govern territories in the formation of their state governments. If in the process of setting up its state government, New Mexico, for example, acknowledges the supreme authority of the Federal government and respects its law governing the formation of states within the territory of the nation, all well and good. The state is loyal to the Union. But let New Mexico proceed to set up its state government without any acknowledgment of the supreme authority of the Union, let it go on simply as though no higher authority existed, thus disregarding all authority and law beyond or above itself and we would say—and this nation would say—that portion of our country was in rebellion. And if that condition of things was continued, the Federal authorities at Washington would have the national troops down there inside a month.

We had the Civil war as the result of precisely such attitude on the part of the Confederate states toward the Federal government. The Confederate states did not declare anything against the Federal government. They simply took a part of our territory and set up a government on it without any acknowledgment of the authority of the Federal government over them. They did not in their new con-

stitution disclaim and renounce, in so many words, the authority of the United States. They simply assumed the attitude towards the Federal government that we as a nation eighty-four years before assumed toward Christ; viz.: acted as though the Federal government had no existence. They took a part of our territory, and set up government independent of the Union. We took part of Christ's territory and set up a government independent of Him. We called the action of the south rebellion; and the war came. Historians have called and will continue to call it the War of the Rebellion. It is clear, then, that our nation, occupying a part of Christ's territory, and set up without any recognition of His supreme authority or even of His existence, is in rebellion against Him, whose kingdom ruleth over all. Can a Christian in loyalty to Christ swear, as he shall answer to God on the great day, "to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution" which places the government in rebellion against Christ?

Another consideration: "To swear to carry on a government according to a law that leaves Christ out" would be to disclaim all submission to the law of Christ, the one supreme rule of a Christian's life. Certainly God never addressed His Word to civil governments without intending that they should obey it. Nor can we hide behind the claim that God addressed the Bible to the Jews alone, and so it is not applicable to other nations. A large part of the Word of God was never addressed to the Jews at all. God sent messages by His prophets to Nineveh and Tyre and Assyria and Babylon and Egypt. And so far as those messages are applicable to our day they come to Great Britain, Germany and France and America. When God's law directly declares what America shall do and shall not do, can a loyal Christian swear to carry on the government according to a law that leaves Christ out? "No man can serve two masters." Ye can not serve God and America, unless America stops rebelling against God and submits to Him. Christ makes His will the supreme law of the Christian. This government makes the Constitution which ignores His authority that supreme law. Therefore the loyal Christian cannot bind himself by that Constitution. But if our nation would acknowledge Christ and the supremacy of His law, as this nation requires, the several states of our Union to acknowledge the supreme authority of the Federal Constitution all would be well and the loyal Christian could then swear allegiance to the government.

Lastly, a "Christian in loyalty to Christ, the King of Nations, cannot swear to carry on the government according to a law that leaves Christ out" because our Lord in His Word expressly declares that civil rulers are in a special and additional sense the servants of God. "By Me kings reign and princes decree justice. By Me princes rule and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." (Prov. 8 : 15-16). "He



that ruleth over men must be just; ruling in the fear of God." (2 Sam. 23 : 3). And in Rom. 13 : 4, Paul twice declares that the civil magistrate is "the minister of God." What, then, becomes of the pernicious theory that a Christian is not subject to Christ in his civil life? Instead of stepping out from under the authority of Christ his King when a Christian enters civil office, he comes under additional responsibility to Him. He is no longer a private servant of Christ, but becomes the "minister of God" to bear the sword in such a way that he is a terror to evildoers and a praise to them that do well. He is doubly the servant of Christ. How, then, can he swear that, while discharging his official duties, he will be governed by a law which leaves Christ and His Holy Law out?

The result was adopted by a rising vote.

The Rev. J. C. McFeeters, D. D., of Philadelphia, Pa., addressed the Conference on

## The Need of Awakening the Conscience of the Christian Citizen to Loyalty to Christ.

The subject is a delicate one. It should be handled with tenderness and yet with candor. It implies that the conscience of the Christian citizen is asleep. Sleep is natural in season. Night is intended to suspend labor and watchfulness, and to close the eyes of man in slumber; but when morning comes, and the sun, rising in his splendor and majesty, chases the shadows away, man is expected to arise, and with open eyes and strong heart, take in the glory of a new day, and accept its solemn obligations.

While the world was in the night of darkness previous to Christ's first advent when only stars of Gospel light were shining, and even afterward when the night-like eclipse of the dark ages fell upon the earth, the conscience of the Christian was evidently, and somewhat naturally, asleep on the great question of the duty of the nations to the Lord Jesus Christ. But as the sun has risen and filled our land with light and liveliness, with energy and activity on a scale more stupendous and marvelously effective than ever witnessed under heaven, surely the conscience of the citizen ought to be awake on every great question of our republic. The night is past, the day is upon us, it is high time that we awake.

Citizens may be divided into two classes: Christian and non-Christian; the former being largely in the majority.

Christian citizens may be subdivided into voters and dissenters; the former of these far outnumbering the latter. In fact, the dissenters, that are enrolled are nearly all found in the Covenanter Church with its membership of about ten thousand.

The voting Christians are to be found in the other churches. Let us consider first the conscience of dissenters, and afterward that of Christian voters.

Let us then turn to the dissenters, and get as clear a view as possible of their conscience in relation to civil government. They are the people who have severed their connection with the government.

because it is disloyal to Christ; it refuses to own His authority and fails to conform to His will. Conscience has compelled this separation. Yet though awake in this regard, in other respects it is evidently asleep, and there is cause for alarm lest its sleep be unto death, even the death of the Covenanter Church.

If dissenters have discovered the Christ-dishonoring attitude of this government, and have knowledge of the gross insult offered to Jesus whom the Father has crowned "King of kings and Lord of lords," should they not be persistent in urging His claims and declaring His royal rights? Can anything, except a sleeping conscience, explain the intolerable indifference that at present exists?

If they believe that the relation which voting Christians sustain to the government is a compromise of religion, a violation of the sacramental oath, and a dishonor to Christ, should they not strenuously, yet kindly make it known to their brethren? And what can account for the shameful shyness on this subject, except a sleeping conscience?

If they are persuaded that the wrath of God will fall upon our land in judgments, except there be repentance and reformation—and what if the fires are already kindled—should they not use every effort to arouse the country to the knowledge of the danger, and urge the people to employ the means of escape?

What reason can be given for the half-heartedness, or utter indifference, seen in the work of moral reform? What, except a sleeping conscience?

If the Christian voter, whose eyes are closed to the great moral issues of the day, is guilty, because he allows his conscience to sleep, how great is the guilt of the dissenter, who, though the eyes of the understanding be open, indulges his conscience in the sweetness of slumber?

If a hotel were on fire, and a few of the inmates were awake in time to escape, and would withdraw without making greatest effort to arouse all the others, would they not be held in everlasting disgrace? Dissenters who withdraw from the government without striving to bring non-dissenters to a knowledge of the sinful and perilous condition of our country, and of their sins in relation to it, are of all men the most censurable. Yea, it seems to us, they are of all men the most guilty. Greater guilt is scarcely conceivable. It is to be feared that they who have such intelligence, and bestir not themselves to awaken others, are in a stupor which can be dispelled only by the terrific judgments of God. With what derision does the prophet speak of the "Watchmen," that are "dumb dogs, that cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber."

Now let us consider the condition of the conscience of the Christian voter, as it appears in the light of existing facts.

The conscience is the power of mind that acts upon moral questions, reaching conclusions concerning right and wrong. Whether it be awake or asleep can be known only by the conduct of the person. If a Christian lives in wrong relations, if he persists in a wrong course of conduct, his conscience must be asleep. Now consider the relations which the Christian voter sustains, and the course he pursues, and in our humble judgment, nothing is more manifest than that the conscience of all such is overpowered with a weighty stupor, or sunk into a deep sleep. And if God will graciously use these words to awaken any one, or any number, we shall have our earnest desire, and He shall have all the glory.

1st. The Christian voter is involved in the great wrong done to Christ by accepting and enforcing a Constitution of civil government that disclaims all relation to the Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus says: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." The apostle says: "There is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." Yet this government, in its highest accepted law, is oblivious to this royal fact, and unconsciously perhaps, but no less wickedly, despoils the Lord Jesus of His authority over the nation, and idolatrously clothes the people with His power and glory.

Can a man, redeemed by the blood of Christ, and saved by His grace from eternal wrath, do this, unless his conscience be asleep? Can he, with open eyes, and heart astir, for any known reason whatever, so deeply and shamefully wrong his Lord and Saviour?

2nd. The Christian voter becomes responsible for the laws that proceed from this Constitution, and for their effects. He belongs to the organization that applies the constitutional rules, and acting voluntarily under them, personally accepts the responsibilities that arise therefrom. Here we find laws directly in conflict with Christ's law, desecrating His holy day by calling into the mail service more than one hundred thousand men on the Sabbath, corrupting the home and filling the land with adultery by vicious divorces, increasing misery and multiplying crime by sustaining the saloons. The Christian voter has hand and part in all this, inasmuch as he is a personal factor in the organization that does it. What an attitude for a man of Christ to assume! What guilt in relation to the saloon alone! What sorrows, what blighted homes, what blood, to make answer for! Could the dead bodies of those slain yearly by the saloon alone be piled up like cordwood, the ghastly pile would stretch for miles. The assassin of our beloved President might indeed say, as Jehu said: "I have slain my master, but who slew all these?" And how shall the Christian voter arise and confess to the awful deed? How can he explain his part in the horrible slaughter? What man redeemed by the Lord can

be thus implicated in crime of gravest character, without having a sleeping conscience?

3rd. The Christian citizen betrays the important trust of civil power, consigned by the Lord Jesus to his care, when he gives it over to the enemies of his Lord. Civil power absolutely and originally belongs to God; mediatorially he has invested it in Christ; administratively Christ has deposited it with the people; and representatively the people transfer it to the officials whom they elect to office. In this sense the people are sovereign. The Lord has invested them with the power of self-government. This power is a most sacred trust. The rights of our seventy-five millions, the interests of future generations, the progress of Christianity, and the glory of our Lord, are involved in the use of this power. To deposit it in the hands of those who are hostile to true religion is to betray a most sacred and precious trust. Nor is this an unfrequent occurrence. How often, for instance, have the Christian people to rally at the State capitol to prevent the enemies of our Lord from repealing the Sabbath law and opening wide the gates of Sabbath profanation! And why? Because Jesus has been betrayed by His people who have turned His entrusted gift of power over into the hands of His enemies. Can such cold and continuous treachery be practiced by those who are saved by the blood of Christ and consecrated by His Spirit, except the conscience be asleep?

4th. The Christian voter is chargeable with a horrifying wrong when he chooses a man of God to fill an office in the government on the basis of the present Constitution. Selecting a man of high moral standing and unsullied conscience, the voter places him in a position where he must take an oath to meet the requirements of his office according to existing laws. This often involves him in great wrongs.

Is the case in point that of a President, or a Governor, a Mayor or a magistrate? And is he found in active relation with the church of Christ? Is he esteemed for piety, prayer and faith? Is he celebrated for the breadth and depth and height and weight of his principles, and the grand Christian character they have developed? Does he arise in holy might and majesty above his fellows like a mountain above the plains? Surely such a man is best qualified to wield the powers of office. But will the Christian voter take a person who thus fears God, and place him where he must vitiate his conscience, violate the laws of his Lord, and incur the wrath of the Almighty? While the Constitution of government remains as it is, such is the horrifying position of Christian officials in our country. Consider some of our Presidents, with their irreproachable personal character, their devotion to the church and her work, their private religious life, and follow them as they enter office, and solemnly take the oath to administer the

laws, as they exist, and call upon God to help them. Then think of some of these laws diametrically opposed to the revealed will of Christ, profanely antagonistic to His ordinances and kingdom, perniciously and persistently destructive of home and happiness, morality and religion. Such are the laws that relate to the Sabbath mail service, the system of divorce, the saloon, and other ponderous iniquities. But the climax of the most glaring presumption seems to be reached when the candidate-elect, in taking the oath of office, calls upon God to help him to administer such laws. Hear, O heavens, and give ear O earth! Can a more horrifying position be conceived for a religious man to occupy? Can a Christian voter take his brother, whom he loves, and whom God loves, and place him where he will be involved in such flagrant guilt and awful peril, except the conscience be asleep?

5th. The Christian voter is adding his part to the great wickedness which may eventually provoke God to pour out direful judgments upon our country. The great sin is forgetfulness of God. Other sins arise out of this like strong branches from the trunk of the oak. God has ordained civil government to reveal Himself therein. Every law should be traceable to His illustrious and exalted Self. Every act of legislation and administration ought to be a ray emanating from His all-radiant Person. But the government has been ingloriously separated from God, and degraded to the low level of human will. The system is a wall shutting out much of the light of the glorious high throne.

The connection between God and our government is cut off at the fountain head, the Constitution. Thus the highest object which God had in view in ordaining government on earth, the manifestation of His presence, power and Person, is at least partially lost. Hence the pernicious laws and monstrous wrongs that arise in the government out of the will and lust of man, as naturally as flags grow up in the mire. Such perversion of government and its uses, if continued, cannot fail but result in divine wrath. The Judge of all the earth will do right. He cannot deny Himself. He may suffer long, but not always. The ruins of the kingdom of Israel are the monuments of His avenging wrath. The warning is for all nations. And can the Christian citizen assist in nullifying God's greatest purpose in civil government, and thus provoke Him to His face, unless the conscience be asleep? Can he thus imperil his country and hasten inevitable and destructive judgments? Can he engage in a work which in the light of divine truth resembles treason rather than patriotism, unless conscience be asleep?

They who will do their best for Christ and for country must keep the conscience awake on all the great questions that are pressing to the front for solution. And no question is more important than that

which involves the claims and rights of our Lord Jesus Christ in civil government.

It gives no pleasure to speak such words. They may appear to be severe and full of censure. But they come from the heart, and with deepest emotions of sympathy with our fellow citizens, and interest of our country. We speak the words of truth and soberness, as God hath shined into the heart through the face of Jesus and the written Word. Such truths are a burden. The soul shrinks from uttering them. But the welfare of our country demands the truth as it is in Jesus the King. Multitudes of souls are thirsting for the truth in its fullness and power. Faithfulness to our generation requires clear trumpet notes of the truth. The peril of our beloved nation, the peril of souls around us, our own peril in the great Day of Accounts, lay heaviest obligations upon us to tell the whole truth on the vital question of the reign of King Jesus over the nations. In the spirit of humility, and with all charity, have we declared that which is in the depths of the heart. "According as it is written, I believed, and therefore have I spoken. We also believe, and therefore speak." And to any who may take issue with us, we cordially and sincerely say: "Come now, and let us reason together."

The Rev. B. M. Sharp, of McKeesport, Pa., moved the following resolution :

**“The Christian who separates himself from an Unchristian Constitution owes it to Christ and to his country to do his utmost to bring his country to know, acknowledge and serve Christ.”**

Let us inquire how those who have separated themselves from an Unchristian Constitution can bear testimony so as to secure this end.

1. By making known the fact that they have taken this position of separation through loyalty to the Lord Jesus. Some say to those who have taken this position, “You are doing nothing.” The reply is: “We at least are preserving our integrity as Christ’s witnesses, and that is every Christian’s first and highest duty. By our separation we can wield a greater influence and power for good than we ever could by swearing to that which is wrong.” Christ says: “He that is not for me (i. e. in every relation of life) is (so far) against me.” We may form no alliances with evil, nor compromise our testimony against the Lord’s enemies. One says truly: “Contact with evil defiles; identification imperils; partnership incriminates.” When one who separated himself from our Unchristian Constitution was asked, “Why did you not vote to-day?” he replied: “All who went to the polls voted to sustain the Constitution just as it is, with its rejection of God and all the great evils it sanctions and protects, but I, by political separation and known absence from the polls, voted against the Constitution and all this great wickedness.”

A protest against an immoral organization to be effective, must come from without. No wise opposer of secret societies would join a Free-Mason lodge expecting to wield a greater influence against it from within. Abraham did more to save Sodom from without than Lot who lived there. Moses accomplished more for Israel’s deliverance outside of Egypt than when within Pharaoh’s palace. The consistent Christian outside the political body, with Christ, can do vastly more for this nation’s moral welfare and safety than the inconsistent Christian inside the political body, without Christ. Lincoln said: “He who molds public sentiment goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces opinions,” therefore we should



take the position that will do most to mold right sentiment. If Christ in abolishing slavery secured man's rights by bullets not by ballots, has he not means at command to secure his own royal rights without his witnesses compromising with evil to bring this about? The most powerful principle in moving the world is right, not expediency nor policy. God will bless the course of right and loyalty. They make void the law who say: "Let us do evil that good may come." A good end never can be a justification for using a wrong means, for that is but following out the principles and practices of Jesuitism.

2. By public proclamation of Christ's royalty and of the supremacy of his law.

As Christ's witnesses we are to publish his royal proclamation. We should preach it from the pulpit, proclaim it from the platform, publish it in the press, sow this land broadcast with literature, and reach the people through eye and ear, with Christ's regal claims. We should organize conventions and institutes, arrange for its presentation at Chautauquas and church assemblies and young peoples' conventions. We should preach it in the school houses, discuss it by the wayside, and keep it before the public by calling attention to its vast importance. We should use every means to make it a live question, and get the people so deeply interested as to create a general sentiment in its favor. Then will its acceptance soon follow. Reforms have usually come from agitation, therefore agitate, agitate! agitate!! God says to his witnesses, "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression."

3. By giving the fullest testimony for Christ's royal claims.

Christ said to his church, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." That world-wide commission is being measurably obeyed. But Christ's other co-ordinate and equally important command has not, which is: "Go ye, therefore and make disciples of all the nations." His authority is unlimited. This command comes to all His witnesses. Christ promises them His presence and power. Virtually he says: "Go, conquer this world for me." Teach all governments that supreme allegiance is due Christ as King. Moreover, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." But teaching that Christ is the nation's king and law-giver, is an important part of the "All things commanded." His witnesses are to proclaim, they must say to rulers, Christ the Mediator, is "King of Kings," "The Governor among the nations," "that at Jesus' name every knee should bow and tongue confess that Jesus is Lord," "that all kings shall fall down before Him," all nations shall serve Him," and as ambassadors of heaven's King, warn and demand from rulers submissive loyalty to Him, "Kiss ye the Son, lest He be angry."

Christ's charge to His church is of momentous importance. Yet has it been ignored and disobeyed. In so important a matter, is not the silence

of His witnesses criminal? Is not conscious half-witnessing, betrayal? The position of a consistent witness may be one of isolation and trial, but whilst his royalty is so dishonored and gospel retarded, we dare not be unfaithful to our royal Lord. If others be unfaithful in defending the King's honor, then must our testimony be made full and explicit. Christ's claims are more than constitutions! Can man be true to Church and State, whilst he is doubly false to God? How dare Christians, "Render unto Cæsar everything in politics, and unto God nothing."

Those who separate themselves from an Unchristian Constitution should do their utmost to bring their country to Christ.

1 Because only by proclaiming Christ's claims as King can they meet their responsibility and help avert his threatened judgments.

The consistent witnesses of Christ occupy a position of highest honor and of deepest responsibility. This position requires absolute fidelity. They must be faithful, or be no longer Christ's witnesses. From such witnesses the King requires "much," because "much" knowledge concerning his royalty "has been given." When reading Ezekiel, third chapter, they should hear King Jesus saying, "Give them warning from me," then may they hear further, "Thou hast delivered thy soul." How pointed are his commands. We dare not neglect or disobey.

Our times call for fidelity; our nation is in peril. Godliness, political corruption, Sabbath profanation, intemperance and other giant evils are growing beyond restraint. Victories gained over monster evils seem but drawn battles and indecisive. God's warning judgments pass almost unacknowledged, while our country's downward course in wickedness is rapid. The downfall of the empires that rejected God foretells our nation's doom, unless it be anchored to the "Rock of Ages." Our country is nearing a mighty crisis. The ship of state is drifting down the current of godlessness. Before her is the great Niagara of destruction; already she is nearing the rapids. Christians, patriots, shout loudest warnings! Throw out to her the life line of loyalty to the Lord of Nations! Save our beloved country from that awful vortex of ruin which engulfs "all the nations that forget God." Rally the Christian Citizens and save this greatest Republic for the greatest King.

2. Because the world's evangelization and the conversion of governments to Christ are advancing according to the measure of fidelity shown in witnessing for Christ as King.

Love for Christ and for our imperiled country demands of his qualified witnesses utmost fidelity. Stupendous results hinge upon their faithfulness. The cause is inspiring. They are the heralds of Christ's blessings to the world. They have glorious truths to tell, large resources in Christ's promises and open doors in his providence. The work is in line with prophecy's fulfillment and with Christ's coming victories. The result is not doubtful. First comes struggle, then glorious triumph.

Jesus is saying to his witnesses, "Bring earth's governments to own and serve me as King, and I will make you kings and priests unto God." In a battle of the civil war, a battery was planted on a hill. The general said, "Captain, this is the key to our whole position; if we lose this, we lose the battle." The captain replied, "General, after the battle you will find us here, living or dead." So the Great Captain is saying by His word and providence to his consistent witnesses, "To you I have entrusted the key to the whole Christian position. Hold it for me." May the Lord make us faithful to this mighty trust.

"Stand where the old reformers stood!  
Nor fear to take their station,  
The cause for which they shed their blood,  
Still needs our attestation.

Stand for the truth and when he comes,  
Whose standard thou art bearing,  
As thou hast born the cross, thou shalt  
A crown of life be wearing."

The Rev. John C. Slater of White Cottage, O., gave the following address:

Mr. Chairman:

I take pleasure in seconding this resolution because it affirms that the political dissenter may be a true reformer. The resolution states that "the Christian who separates himself from an unchristian Constitution, owes it to Christ and his country to do his utmost to bring his country to know, acknowledge and serve Christ." But no man is under obligation to do the impossible in the service of his country. The logical inference is that the Christian, who in loyalty to Christ separates himself from an unchristian Constitution, is not by his act of separation withdrawn from the field of active effort for the reformation of his country. He is still in a position to do his utmost to bring his country to know, acknowledge and serve Christ. The obligation resting upon the Christian is twofold. He has a duty to Christ, and to his country. This twofold obligation rests upon the great principle of loyalty—loyalty to Christ, and loyalty to his country. Without the one, a man cannot be the highest type of Christian; without the other, he is no patriot.

Loyalty to Christ is the test of a man's Christianity because of the nature of the relationship between Christ and the believer. "One is your Master, even Christ." Unless we are willing to recognize this relationship, we cannot be entitled to bear the name of Christian, and with this recognition is the obligation of loyalty. But what does loyalty to Christ include? As related to this discussion we mention—

1. Obedience to the commands of Christ.

"Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." Now, one of the commands to which Christ asks our obedience is this: "All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations." This command makes it the chief business of the Christian in this world to labor for the universal recognition of the authority of Christ over nations as well as individuals. This declaration of universal authority, and the command to make disciples of all the nations, makes it the duty of Christians

to regard all those who reject this authority as the enemies of Christ; and to do their utmost to bring the rebellious into subjection to their Lord and Master. Christ claims the homage of our country, and it is therefore the duty of the Christian to do his utmost to bring his country to know, acknowledge and serve Christ.

2. Loyalty to Christ demands that the Christian shall be a true witness for Christ. His commission to His followers is: "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me." The duty of the witness is to "tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth." The Christian who separates himself from an Unchristian Constitution knows a great deal of truth concerning the case in hand. He knows the truth of Christ's Kingship over the nation, and of the supremacy of the divine law. He perceives the truth as to the nation's disloyalty, and disregard of the divine law. In short, he knows of the obligation resting upon the nation to know, acknowledge and serve Christ, and as a true witness he must do his utmost to bring his testimony before those who do not know the truth. One cannot be true to Christ unless he is faithful to the trust committed to him in the knowledge of the truth, and seeks to so present the truth that men shall be led to act according to the truth. In loyalty to Christ the Christian strives for the reformation of his country.

The second division of this obligation of the Christian rests upon the principle of loyalty to country, which is patriotism.

We have said that loyalty to country is the test of a man's patriotism, and we now assert that the Christian who separates himself from an Unchristian Constitution owes it to his country to do his utmost to bring his country to know, acknowledge and serve Christ, in order that he may show what true patriotism is. Very often the reformer is stigmatized as unpatriotic. He is charged with the crime of slandering his country's fair name. To vindicate himself, exhibit his patriotism, and expose the fallacy of the criticism, he must be in earnest in his efforts for reformation. If he exposes evils in national life, it must be with the purpose that moves the skillful surgeon to bring to light a loathsome disease—that it may be removed. Patriotism does not mean a blind devotion to every existing condition, but the love for and defense of the country's highest and best interest. We argue, therefore, that patriotism demands the Christian's utmost efforts for his country's reformation, because:

The country's safety and well-being demand this reformation. History clearly shows that a nation cannot reject Christ as King with impunity. Destruction and desolation await the nations that forget God. "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." The security of the nation demands that it know, ac-

knowledge and serve Christ. Otherwise the ship of state must certainly be dashed to pieces upon the rocks of rebellion against Christ, and go down into the depths of oblivion. Shall not the true patriot do his utmost for the reformation and safety of his country? The necessity is urgent. The state governed upon the basis of an Unchristian Constitution is comparable to a ship without her pilot, and with a disabled rudder. The Lord Jesus Christ has been chosen of God as the Governor among the nations, and is therefore the only pilot who can safely guide the ship of state. The divine law has been given of God as the supreme law of the land and is therefore the only rudder that will guide the noble vessel in the channels of safety. The Christian who separates himself from a Unchristian Constitution recognizes the peril of the nation. Driven and tossed by every wind of public clamor, and carried by the currents of popular will, the wreck is imminent. Patriots must sound the alarm. They must point out the danger. They should do their utmost to avert the impending disaster. Having separated himself from the imperiled ship of state, the Christian is in the position to throw out a life line which may be used to draw the noble vessel into the docks of reformation that the rudder of Divine Law may be adjusted, and then with her Captain and Pilot on board, the noble vessel shall sail out upon the open sea of Loyalty to Christ the King, in a voyage of a truly unparalleled prosperity, and with no fear of a recurring panic to disturb her peace or impede her progress.

The resolution was adopted by the Conference by a standing vote, no one rising when the negative vote was called for.

## **Tuesday Afternoon, February 25th.**

**Mr. James A. McAteer, Pittsburg, Presiding,**

Prof. James M. Coleman of Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa., addressed the Conference on

### **The Failure of Christian Citizens acting under the Present Constitution to effect any Real and Lasting Reformation by the use of the Ballot.**

It is not my intention to show that nothing has been accomplished by the use of the ballot. That will not be attempted here, scarcely elsewhere. Still less is it my purpose to pass hasty judgment on the earnest patriot who in the support of some righteous cause has gone through reproach at the caucus and the polls to frequent defeat. Rather do I wish to reason with such an one over the cause of the failure to gain results by the use of the ballot. The Christian citizen will scarcely claim that the records of the political campaigns of the century of our constitutional history give much evidence of moral victories at the polls. Three generations have come and gone; another now has the work in hand. Is it not time to consider the cause of a century of moral failure?

#### **1. The dominant idea in the state is not Christian.**

I am not greatly moved by the fact that in a decision of the Supreme Court we find the statement made incidentally that "this is a Christian nation." This only I would ask: Has the Supreme Court ever based its decision in any case, avowedly, on the teaching of Christ? If it is not Christian in the sense that the law of Christ becomes a rule of action, it is not Christian in that sense which wins the blessing of Christ. Repeated reference has been made in preceding addresses to the Constitution. Hamilton defined the Constitution as "The principles by which we have chosen to be governed." When

our fathers framed the Constitution in 1787, when it was ratified by the people of the several states, it was a choice of "principles." In these principles they found no place for the Christ in all the record, of the Philadelphia Convention, in all the extant records of the ratifying conventions, while the voices raised in protest against this denial of the Christ were as that of John in the wilderness.

Every age has its dominant idea. It does not rule unhindered, but is modified, to some extent, by the subordinate ideas of the age. The dominant idea in religion in the eighteenth century was materialism, in politics it was individualism. How far these ideas dominated the minds of the people of this country a century ago, how far they find expression in our Constitution, we can not tell. We know the fact that it represented the people and that it was, and is, Christless. Other points in the Constitution were debated long and earnestly, this one passed almost without question. Therefore we have a right to say that that collection of "principles" not only instituted a frame of government, but it expressed the political character of the people who made it. Does it not express the dominant idea still? A few voices are heard in protest now, doubtless more in number than a century ago, but the masses are satisfied. There probably is not a single member of Congress, there probably has never been one, who would have lent his support by voice and vote to the submission of a Christian amendment. It is but little that one may be found to propose the reference of such a measure to a committee, since such act does not necessarily imply that he favors the bill. The men who hold to all the reforms that are embodied in the Christian amendment, do not accept the dominant political idea and are not sent to Congress.

It is an idea on which history is largely constructed that the laws of any people at the time when made, or obeyed, are the expression of their life. Since the Constitution which denies the Christ is even now the accepted expression of the social conscience, there is something more vital required than a mere change in law. That something is social regeneration by the Holy Spirit. Does this consideration aid in explaining why political reformation has not been accomplished by the use of the ballot? The ballot box rests upon the Constitution. It is the Constitution which makes it legal. Every one who casts a ballot must stand on that basis. He must accept the dominant idea which has made these things what they are. May he then hope to bring in the kingdom, while pledging himself by oath to leave out the King?

2. The Constitution puts the ethics of Weismann in place of the ethics of Christ. The reader who is familiar with the doctrine of evolution, knows the meaning of natural selection. It is this natural selection which Weismann has carried over from biology to ethics and



made the standard of conduct. This phase of the evolution doctrine is based on the idea that each species of lower life produces larger numbers of its kind than can mature. There then ensues a struggle for life between these different members. Those that best suit the environment live, those that fail to meet this condition must perish. According to natural selection the environment makes the selection. The organism does not shape the environment, but the environment the organism. Conformity to environment is the condition of life. For the organism to chose its own course, to set up an end for itself, would prove unfitness for survival. The application of this biological formula to ethics means that the individual, the organism, must conform to the people, his environment. He thinks something different from their thoughts, his acts disagree with theirs, at his peril. He must conform to the social environment. The institution which is here has justified its right to live by living. It is the fittest that survives. So it comes about that whatever is, is right. What ought to be, natural selection can not tell us because it can not look into the future. It worships at the altar of the god of things—as they are. Under such ethics there is no place for the reformer. The environment may, perhaps, tolerate him. It will certainly be indifferent to his appeals. Does that fit the facts of present day politics? We are told that the saloon satisfies a social need, that it is the poor man's club. It has survived because it met the demands of the environment, therefore, we can not abolish it. Indeed, it is said, we should not abolish it. The social evil is a survival in the struggle. We must segregate it, regulate it. No matter what Jesus said about it, since His teachings are not applicable to our social needs.

What is the lesson that the workman and the man with the small business is learning? That the strong must not be burdened nor hindered by the weak. Let him win who can is the tiger philosophy of Weismann. The longest tooth and the sharpest claw must succeed. To such an ethical standard have we attained. We have forsaken Jesus for Weismann. All over the English-speaking world is preached the doctrine of Anglo-Saxon supremacy. Not supreme in the sense of the ethics of Jesus where He that is greatest becomes servant of all, but supreme in the power to crush weaker people and despoil them of their goods. Should this intense competition cease, says Weismann, degeneration would set in. Within the last few months the negro has learned that he must no longer claim that the color of his skin is not a barrier to suffrage. After a generation his ballot is taken from him by the action of one great political party and with the tacit consent of the other. During three years we have been striving to quench the hope of independence in the heart of the brown man. During

these years we have sent to the Philippines three hundred millions of treasure and have floated back to our Golden Gate three thousand of our dead brothers for the success of the creed of Weismann and the survival of the fittest. During these years the Anglo-Saxon has maintained a military censorship such as had never been known before, that the people at home may not know what is being done by their authority abroad. Nor need we wonder as we learn that under the shadow of the flag which once beckoned the way to freedom we have ordained the continuance of human slavery in the Sulu Islands by the will of the people of the United States. Nor need we cross the sea to meet the Weismannism which denies freedom of speech and action, if it does not harmonize with the belief of the crowd. In the press, in the halls of Congress, it is a frequent charge that the man is a traitor who presumes to voice his protest against the will of the majority.

It may seem strange that an American, a native of that land which has been the symbol of freedom, should need to act the part of Cassandra to warn against the danger of a denial of freedom of speech and of conscience. Yet is this situation not the logical outcome of the rejection of Christ and the acceptance of Weismann? The appeal to the will of the people is an appeal to force. In its last analysis it can mean nothing else. Covenanters learned centuries ago what that meant and they may learn again. Nor may they be the only pupils to find a place in the hard school where a man's opinion makes him an outlaw. Suppose the Christians of this country continue to accept a Constitution of government which rejects the Christ, may the Lord not take them at their word to let them see the working out on their own flesh and blood of the doctrine which they have taken in His room? Would it take another century to lose the freedom which our fathers left to us as a precious inheritance? I might plead the rights of the Christ as I am pleading the rights of men for divine and human rights are but different sides of the shield. We can not cast one away and retain the other,—not always.

God hath set limits to His patience, and we can not forever reap the fruits of His death, while we deny the power of His life.

3. Political action on the basis of an unchristian fundamental law tends to become materialistic.

As was stated at the outset, I do not claim that no good has come from voting. My purpose is to show that lasting reformation must rest on a more substantial foundation than mere human will. We are quite accustomed to the spasmodic reforms that spring up over night like Jonah's gourd and then at the demand of the party managers wither away, leaving mourners as sincere as the prophet who

expected to sit under the shadow of the gourd. The Constitution tends to color the political structure which rests upon it and when the character of the people corresponds with that of the Constitution, such consequences are certain.

In considering whether good may result from the use of the ballot, it is necessary to distinguish between that which is a natural outcome of the act and that which God may bring out of it. In 1528 the Scottish leaders gave their suffrages for the death of Patrick Hamilton and the record runs that "his smoke infected where it blew." Out of that smoke came the Scottish Reformation, yet history weaves no garlands for those who kindled the fire. This illustrates the principle that good comes out of deeds, even when the doers are blameworthy for the act. While not claiming that the acts compare in culpability, this indicates how voting on a Christless basis may result in good. Voting under conditions which involve the denial of the supremacy of Christ can not be a good act. Good can not, therefore, be its natural product. History, science, and Scripture agree that like must come from like. The bad root produces the bad fruit. It is in the very constitution of nature that each thing produces after its kind. If the fruit is to be good we must make the tree good. As the act of voting does not, under present conditions honor Christ, He cannot honor the voter however good his intentions. Surely the Christian may not safely go where he can not take the name of Jesus with him.

But some one says that voting abolished slavery and that was a lasting reformation. Let us see whether slavery was abolished by the ballot.

During the years preceding the Civil war, the two great political parties, Whigs and Democratic, had abetted slavery, as Wendell Phillips stated the case, "one party laboring to preserve it, the other not to have it hurt." In 1856 the Republican party took the field with the doctrine that slavery should not be carried into the territories. At that time there was no party in the field which advocated the abolition of slavery, or any restrictions upon it in the states where it existed. When Mr. Lincoln took office as the successful candidate of the Republican party, he declared that he "would save the Union with slavery if he could, without it if he must." In the first weeks of 1861, Congress by a two-thirds vote in each House, passed the following as a proposed thirteenth amendment to the Constitution: "No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish, or interfere, within any state, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said state." Mr. Blaine writes in his "Twenty Years in Congress:" "Never before in the existence of the Federal government

had its territory been so open, by Congressional enactment and by judicial decision, to the slaveholders as on the day that Abraham Lincoln assumed the office of President of the United States. It is a singular fact that, on the eve of the utter destruction of the institution of slavery, its legal status was stronger than ever before in the history of the government, and the area over which it might spread was far larger than at any previous period."

The amendment quoted above which was submitted by Mr. Corwin, a Republican Senator from Ohio, was interrupted in its ratification by the states, by the outbreak of hostilities in the south, only Maryland and Ohio having given their sanction. This means that after a quarter century of agitation the voters acting through their respective representatives had, so far as law could do it, given the slaveholder a perpetual ownership in his human chattel. At this point God ceased to be patient and cast His ballot for war at Fort Sumter. Lincoln tried to keep his oath of office and save the Union with slavery, but in the gloomy days of 1862, when Confederate success endangered the existence of the Union, the President vowed to God that if Lee were turned back in his invasion of the north that the slave should be freed. Lee retreated southward after the indecisive battle of Antietam and the President issued his proclamation which freed all the slaves within the states then in rebellion. The states of Delaware and Kentucky were the only slave states exempt from the proclamation. Would any one claim that this result was effected by the ballot? It was a revolutionary act justified, as the President declared, as a "military necessity." It is true that the thirteenth amendment, which abolished slavery, was passed by the ballot, but all that it did was to ratify what a "military necessity" had already accomplished. At the present time it is an open question if the voting on an unchristian basis may not deprive the negro of the privileges of the thirteenth amendment, since it has already made obsolete the political privilege of voting conferred by the fifteenth amendment.

The denial of the rights of God is logically followed by denial of the rights of man. Our government has already made it a crime for the Filipino to ask for self-government. Shall the black man in the midst of the dominant race dare to claim the privilege?

As an evidence that voting on a basis which is unchristian tends to materialism one need only point to the campaign issues of the past century. Has there been a single national campaign when the dominant issue was the uplifting of man, the honor of woman, or the protection of children? In the majority of cases the dominant issue has been the protection of iron, or some other factory product. Is it strange when moral issues are not dominant in the campaigns that

we have not moral political conditions? From the time of the first Congress to the present one the chief political aim has been the protection of infant industries and the latest infant, the United States Steel Corporation, with its capital listed at over a billion dollars, wails as woefully for protection as did its feebler predecessors. The causes for the changes of parties have been materialistic. The overthrow of the Democratic party in 1840 was mainly due to industrial depression. The success of the Republicans over the Democrats in 1860 came, to a great extent, from the dissatisfaction over the panic of 1857. The government nearly changed hands over the crisis of 1873. Falling prices elected Mr. Cleveland in 1884 and Mr. McKinley in 1896. Now it is not my intention to argue against making these questions the issues in political campaigns, but their dominance during a hundred years has made money the chief end in politics. Is it to be wondered at when money is the end of each campaign that voters are found ready to sell their votes for money? Since there is no appeal to conscience as to how he votes, is it strange that he has no conscience in the matter? Rather is it the natural outcome of a century of materialistic politics. The main body of the voters of today have never cast a ballot in national elections on any other issues than tariff and money. During most of that time a few earnest men have been trying to make the moral issue of Prohibition the dominant issue and they have failed. I believe that they will fail, for there is no promise that we can do the Lord's work except in His Name. The money in a man's pocket may be of importance. I believe that it is. But it does not compare for a moment with the man. Infant industries may need special care, but they are but as the dust in the balance compared with the infant that our Lord took in His arms, that flesh and blood which bears a soul. Yet our license system sells these priceless things for revenue. That is the logic of materialism. What we have sown in constitutional law we have reaped in political results. When the Christian, no matter how earnest he may be, accepts the constitutional basis which denies the Lord, he has shorn himself of his strength and is a victim of the political Delilahs who prostitute his strength to ignoble ends.

4. Political action on an unchristian basis endangers the existence of self-government. I do not forget that mere changes in law are of small account compared with changes in the social life of which law is but the expression. I do not forget that the chief end is less the remodeling of the fundamental law, than the regeneration of the state. Yet the Constitution is of great importance through its influence on the political action, which is based upon it. Even as the

Constitution is the reflection of the social life, so is the political life shot through by the principles of the Constitution.

It is clearly recognized here that legal changes do not go to the root of the matter. This is illustrated in the divorce question. The reformers are making a righteous demand for uniformity in statutes relating to divorce. If this uniformity is secured by a law of Congress prescribing a goodly number of causes for divorce the only result would be to rid ourselves of the shameful instances where men are held to be legally married by the laws of one state while legally divorced by the laws of another. If, on the other hand, the single Scriptural cause were prescribed as the only legal ground of absolute divorce it would not, in itself, make any radical change in the situation. It is the right thing to do, but unless this change in law is accompanied by a more sacred idea of the marriage relation, the number of divorces would suffer small decrease. New York and Pennsylvania lie side by side, with numbers and characteristics of population that bear comparison. The former admits one cause for absolute divorce, the latter allows nine. Yet for the twenty years from 1867 to 1886 the divorces granted in Pennsylvania exceeded those in New York by only five per cent. (See Report of the Commissioner of Labor for 1889 on Marriage and Divorce).

The report also shows that the number of divorces granted to parties who had been married outside the respective states was about the same. The evident conclusion furnished by statistics is that while reformation of the law may touch the sore, only reformation of the life will effect a cure. The present unrighteous divorce laws have lent their aid in creating this condition. So is it with the Constitution of government. It is corrupting the political life. All historical evidence goes to show that republican institutions can be maintained only by a moral citizenship. It is Christianity, the royal rule of Christ in the social life, which makes democracy a possibility. Pennsylvania has been under the rule of one political party and practically of one man for many years. The amount of political corruption which obtains in the state has made her name unpleasantly familiar to the reading public. In the debasement of city government Pennsylvania has no close rival west of Constantinople. The condition of the state administration is scarcely better. The blight of her political life has fallen upon the church till it seems to be impossible to rouse the social conscience. It is only a logical result of this corruption of the citizenship that the political ruler of the state has withdrawn from certain of the largest cities in the state the privilege of electing their chief official, on the ground that they are not qualified for self-government. Even this fact is perhaps less ominous than that from these cities

there has come no ringing protest against an act which would have meant an uprising a century ago. The people by their silence admit that they are no longer fit to govern themselves.

If voting on an unchristian basis has had that result in a century, what may we expect from its continuance. The historian of Rome notes one of the evidences of her decline in the fact that her history comes to center itself in a few men, Marius, Sulla, Pompey and the Caesars. In the earlier age when Rome could calmly bide her time with the great Carthaginian at her gates, the Roman citizen was a sturdy peasant, living an honest life. But as her conquests brought the plunder of the richest cities of the world within the grasp of the meanest soldier, when the greed of gold and the lust for conquered lands and slaves had made honest toil a thing to be despised, the days of the Republic were numbered. It is then that the Caesar comes. The times call him into being and place and the reins of government, which the corrupt hands of the citizen can no longer hold, fall to the master of men. When materialism has done its perfect work in politics, it comes to the Caesar at last. By political profession in fundamental law and by political practice which corresponds with the profession, the American state has sought to exclude the Christ from His rightful place, as Ruler over the life. Ill fares the land, if He takes us at our word. Can the Lord afford to give to the Christian citizens of this country the great moral victories which they seek to gain, so long as they profess obedience to a will which excludes His own? "Those that honor Me I will honor," is one great fact of history. Shall not those who have sworn in His blood to follow Jesus refuse longer to accept any basis of action which excludes the Christ?

The Rev. R. J. Gault of New Alexandria, Pa., moved the following resolution:

**“The history of the past century goes far to prove that no real reformation is to be expected from the ballots even of Christian Citizens, while they choose men to carry out as supreme political law, a constitution that knows not the Lord.”**

No one can deny that many reforms are needed today. We are accustomed to hear a great deal said about reform by the ballot. We would be led to believe that there is not an evil in existence that could not be corrected by the election of certain candidates, if we would listen to their representatives. We hear little else during a Presidential election. But as the election passes and the newly elected men take their seats, we seen no reforming hand laid upon the evils that were so strongly denounced a few months before. There is no change in the state of affairs, and this in spite of the fact that the men elected are generally Christian men, and elected by the ballots of Christian voters.

That many reforms have been effected cannot be denied, but no true reform under present conditions owes its origin to the ballots of Christian citizens. The spirit of party politics that is in character the same with its fountain head, a Constitution that knows not the Lord, is too powerful and forces the moral convictions of Christian citizens into the back ground. We urge this resolution, because:

1. God will not use an immoral agency to effect a moral reform. “A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit.” “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one,” even though he be a Christian citizen.

Like produces like, is a principle that governs in nature and it is just as true in morals. God makes use of instrumentalities suited to the end designed. God does not send an infidel to preach faith in Jesus Christ, nor a libertine to preach morality. Why could not the seven sons of Sceva cast out the evil spirits? Why could not Simon



Magus give the Holy Spirit by laying on his hands? Why did not Christ permit the devils to speak or confess His name? And why does he say to the wicked, "What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, and that thou shouldst take my covenant in thy mouth?"

It is for a similar reason that God has not made and will not make use of the ballots even of Christian citizens, under the present Constitution, as a means of true reform. Every true reform is heaven sent; a messenger of God's love and mercy to the world. Would God employ an enemy on such a mission? History, sacred or profane, makes no such record. Knox, Calvin and Luther were mighty agents of reform, but they used the Word of God and their work has been a blessing to the world. And no reform has ever taken place that had any other origin than the Word of God. Such systems as polygamy, Mahomedanism, Brahminism or the reform now in progress in the Philippine Islands under the auspices of the United States liquor interest, represent reforms that rest upon the human will when divorced from God's law.

Some may say, was not slavery put down by the ballot? Did not the Republican party come into power through the ballot? And did not Abraham Lincoln issue the Emancipation Proclamation that freed the slaves? Yes, all that is true, but is that what Abraham Lincoln was elected to do? Is that what the Republican party intended when they went into power? President Lincoln said: "If I can preserve the Union without freeing the slaves, I will do it."

Slavery was put down as a war measure in the providence of God. To give the ballot the credit for the emancipation of the slaves would be very much like giving the credit of saving the world from starvation to Joseph's brethren because they sold him into Egypt.

God meant one thing, the Republican party meant another. Because God can make the wrath of man to praise Him does not make the wrath of man the proper channel of reform by any means.

In 1894 one of the leading divines of New York City led a crusade against the corruptions of Tammany. The ballot was his weapon of reform. He employed detectives, published the evidence collected as political capital. A sweeping vote was turned in against the ring, and the Tammany Tiger appeared to be slain, but it was only playing possum. And the sow that was supposed to be washed soon returned to her wallowing in a filthier mire and took the reformer with her, and there the beast and the false prophet are today.

The ballot under a Christless Constitution is a weapon that the Lord will not and cannot use to effect true reform, and what is still worse, it fowls the hand that uses it.

I urge this resolution because:

2. The use of such a weapon for reform renders the conduct of the Christian citizen inconsistent. God demands consistency. "Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing and I will receive you; and I will be a Father unto you and ye shall be My sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." God's servants in the great work of reforming the world must be sanctified. The men who to-day are honored as having done the most to put down slavery, are the men who did not vote to put it down, but uttered their testimony fearlessly against it. Such men as Garrison and Phillips, Sloane and Milligan, who loved not their lives unto the death, men with iron in their blood, who dared to face the mob; heroes of faith, who like those of the eleventh chapter of the Hebrews have turned to flight the armies of the aliens. They did it not with the ballot, but with a fearless and consistent testimony. Moses inaugurated the mightiest reform in all history. How did he begin his work? His first step was to dissent from a government that was at enmity with God. He refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. The political sagacity of the present day would rule that one of the mistakes of Moses, but God points to this as the faith of Moses, the very secret of his power. The man who was to lift Israel out of that sink hole of bondage and iniquity must stand with both his feet on the outside. The ballot in the hands of a Christian citizen is David in Saul's armor. To win the reformer's victory he "cannot go with these." An act that is wrong or inconsistent can never advance the cause of righteousness because a good man does it. A good man cannot make a sinful relationship a source of good by entering it. "A tree is known by its fruit." It is very common to reverse God's method of judgment and judge the fruit by the tree. What does this lead us to say? Nothing is very bad if there are good men in it. There is Free Masonry; there are Sabbath-breaking corporations, and immoral organizations of almost every kind that have a good man in the showcase somewhere, and we are asked to judge the fruit by the tree. These things must be right or good men would not be in them. A very beautiful tree may yield crab-apples.

God is no respecter of persons, but He is a respecter of righteous acts. David's sin was none the less harmful because the man after God's own heart committed it. When men do evil that good may come, God does not call them reformers, but says their condemnation is just.

It is a small matter to the devil whether a ballot is cast for or against him when he has the compact under which the ballot is cast drawn up in his favor. It will all go to swell his returns.

Christ says: "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty." Satan is not going to be voted out of the world or out of the United States by such a carnal weapon as the ballot under a Constitution that knows not the Lord. The effect of such a ballot can only be what it has been, to vote Him further in. It is by the blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony that the followers of Christ are to trample Satan under foot. Therefore every ballot that rests on the supremacy of man's will in politics is a weapon drawn from the armory of Satan and will never be used to lead this world to God.

This resolution was seconded by the Rev. H. G. Foster, Beaver Falls, Pa.:

By this resolution attention is directed particularly to the discouraging feature of reformation effort by the use of the ballot, as long as it is sought under the recognized supremacy of a Christless Constitution of government. The resolution does not assume in a positive way that reformation is impossible, but that "no real reformation is to be expected from the ballots even of Christian citizens," under such circumstances, and that the history of the past century goes far to prove this true.

History and experience are of great worth in influencing us to recognize and accept truth. In turning to glance at the departed century, we should not fail to recognize the worthy effort at reformation on the part of a host of sincere and devoted men and women. It is with all readiness granted that the generations of Christian citizens throughout the past century in their efforts for reformation by the use of the ballot under the recognized supremacy of a Christless Constitution, have exhibited much of courage and devotion. All praise to such. But it is the fact that history unks these efforts to secure "real reformation" with failure, that awakens earnest inquiry and leads us to ask why this is so. In this connection we would call attention to reformation effort along three lines:

1. —Anti-Secrecy Reform.

In the old cemetery at Batavia, N. Y., stands a large and beautiful monument, erected to the memory of Capt. William Morgan. The record of history is that "he was abducted from near this spot in the year 1826 by Free Masons and murdered for revealing the secrets of their order." As a result forty-five out of fifty thousand members left that society. Thurlow Weed states that "a large number of zealous anti-Masons determined to make it a political issue." A governor was nominated for the state of New York. "For several years (1827-1835), the anti-Masonic party exercised a considerable influence in the elections of the country."

In this we have a striking illustration of honest and faithful effort to uproot and destroy these institutions of darkness from the land by the use of the ballot under a Christless Constitution of government. Everything seemed favorable to success. The charge of murder was well substantiated. Nine-tenths of the membership renounced the order. "Real reformation" was confidently expected by almost every one. But with the lapse of only eight years it died as a party issue and all efforts to bring it to the front again have failed. In more recent years "The National Christian party" with "The National Christian Association," representing a host of faithful and devoted workers, has sought to lift the people of this land from a worse to a better condition by the overthrow of the empire of darkness; but with all this effort secretism seems to be increasing in reach and influence.

What does this failure suggest? Is it not evidence that Christless institutions, such as institutions of secrecy, are not likely to be rooted out of society by the use of the ballot even of Christian citizens, so long as they have the shelter of a Christless Constitution. No effort looking to such reformation can take deep root in this hard-pan of human rebellion against the Lord; while every form of evil, being in harmony with the Christless Constitution, prospers at will. It is growing in its natural soil.

## 2. Sabbath Reform.

As we turn to consider reformation effort looking to the preservation of the Christian Sabbath by the use of the ballot under the recognized supremacy of a Christless Constitution of government, a similar result appears. In this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania the Sabbath law of 1794 marks the high attainment reached at an early period. For a time it seemed all that could be desired; quietness and rest were enjoyed. But how has it resulted? To what degree are the blessings and privileges of the Sabbath secured to the citizen today? Let those compelled to labor seven days in the week give answer; let those thronging the parks during the hours of the Sabbath answer; let empty church pews answer; and the united testimony will be that the Sabbath in its observance is fast going. The most this law is useful for today is in measuring from what heights and into what depths we have fallen. None feel inclined to call this a reformation by the use of the ballot under a Christless Constitution. You may plant your seed in the unbroken hard-pan, but you will not find much satisfaction in its growth and development. "Sow to yourselves in righteousness; break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek the Lord, till He come and rain righteousness upon you." "Ye have plowed wickedness, ye have reaped iniquity." It is worthy of note that this language was addressed to a nation that had turned away from the

Lord. Nations in rebellion against the Lord cannot secure and retain to themselves with success and profit an institution of the Lord like the Sabbath, any more than the Philistines could secure and retain with success and profit the ark of God. It may even become a source of evil to those at enmity with God. And is not this what the Sabbath is fast becoming to many people of this land so far as it secured to them today by the use of the ballot under a Christless Constitution? **It is, with many, a day of idleness productive of crime.**

### 3. Temperance Reform.

If we change our view point to consider reformation effort by the ballot in seeking the overthrow of the traffic in liquor, we have but to look on a similar outcome. In this we meet with one of the most menacing evils of our day. Think of one billion dollars and more spent each year for strong drink; of thousands each year going down to a drunkard's grave and a drunkard's hell. Think of the depth of poverty, sorrow and distress in homes and communities.

Alongside this form of growing wickedness, has developed ways and means by which it is hoped to withstand and, if possible, at length remove the curse from society. In 1869 the National Prohibition party was organized as an effective agency to this end. Honest and good men have despised popularity and borne ridicule and contempt that they might advance the cause of temperance. But what has this political movement gained in the course of this generation, compared with the marvelous development of intemperance? One, at least, of the pillars upon which the throne of dominion in this land today rests **is whiskey.** The ballot has given little of real temperance reform. With the ballot in hand we are sinking into a drunken stupor in which we can scarcely hope to hear or heed the awful warnings of the God of Judgment. Appalled at such outcome of honest and untiring effort by the use of the ballot, we feel driven again to the inquiry: Why is it? And may it not at last prove true that effort for reformation by the use of the ballot under a Christless Constitution is of necessity and all along the line a failure? "There is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved," but that of Jesus Christ. An individual sinner cannot of himself overcome sin within; nor can a nation. Christ Jesus is the One provided and exalted of God to do this. Before Him every knee is commanded to bow, and every tongue to confess that He is Lord. Upon such confession and recognition, He will deliver individuals and nations from the bondage and suffering of sin.

One who for many years had been troubled with poor eye sight went, after great suffering, to a specialist who said: "Your eyes are all right; the difficulty is in your constitution." Following this suggestion,

the constitutional difficulty was remedied, and clear vision was restored. May we not expect that after a while; after repeated failure in well-meant effort by the use of the ballot; after we see that, like one in the quicksand, every effort by the use of the ballot under a Christless Constitution finds us farther down and more completely under the dominion of evil, we shall awaken to the realization that it is a constitutional difficulty that must be remedied?

One long ago said, what time has since abundantly verified, that "the controlling thought over men and offices must be of that purity which recognizes a tribunal before which no deceit prospereth." Our Constitution fails just here; and wickedness in all lines, rapidly developing in the face of honest effort in the use of the ballot under it, should lead to a recognition of the Lord and His holy law as supreme above the people of the land and the Constitution which they have written. "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." Before Him "no deceit prospereth."

With the hope of attention turning to our national constitutional difficulty, and of sentiment awakening for constitutional amendment, that there may be a foundation upon which we may reasonably expect real reformation, we gladly second the resolution presented, viz.: "The history of the past century goes far to prove that no real reformation is to be expected from the ballots even of Christian citizens, while they choose men to carry out, as supreme political law, a Constitution that knows not the Lord."

The Rev. A. Kilpatrick of Valencia, Pa., addressed the Conference on the theme,

### The Attitude of Protest — The Attitude of Power.

My old professor of natural science in the Indiana University, Dr. Richard Dale Owen, one day asked the class of forty young men: "How many of you when boys, tried to lift yourselves over a fence by your bootstraps." And when most of the class had admitted, that at one time or another we had attempted that feat, he asked: "Did you never lift a bag of apples your own weight over the fence?" This was followed by the question: "Why could you lift a bag of apples your own weight, and could not lift yourself?" He then said if we would follow up the investigation we would know why Archimedes asked for a place where he could stand, if he were to move the world. The force, the power, the energy, exerted by the boy who attempts to lift himself, is exerted as much downward as it is upward. In the material world, success in lifting matter to a higher level, demands separation from the matter to be lifted.

The same principle is true in the moral world. No sinful person can be lifted from the level of sinfulness, to the higher level of holiness, save by a power outside of himself. "Oh Israel! thou hast destroyed thyself, from Me is thy help found." Any reformation that is self-originated is worthless, but bring to bear on the sinner the love of God, or the Cross of Jesus Christ, let that take hold of the sinner, and it will lift him up, up, up, to the throne of God and of the Lamb. The power that is to lift the sinner, must be a power that is not self-originated.

Our theme suggests that this same principle is true in the social and political life. The power, the force, the energy, that lifts society or the nation to a higher level, cannot be effective, if it originates in or is exerted by, the whole, or by a part, of the organized body. If social life is to be regenerated and thoroughly Christianized, if nations



are to be lifted to such a height that "Voices shall be heard in heaven saying, the kingdoms of this world have become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ," it will be when the witnesses for Christ, place themselves outside of the evils from which the nations are to be saved. Let the fulcrum of God's law be placed as close as possible to the social and political life, but place the Christian as far from the evil as possible, and the nation must rise.

If Archimedes with his lever could move the world, Christians, separated from all complicity with the sins of the nation, can lift the nation up to a more perfect national life.

In this discussion we take it that by the expression: "The Attitude of Protest" is clearly meant the Bible doctrine of practical separation from everything that is wrong and sinful in political life. Christ claims the whole man, and He claims the whole man in all the relations that the man sustains. In every relation, in the political, as well as in every other, the believer is bound by the authority of Christ, as is made known in the Holy Scriptures. And it is wrong and sinful, and disloyal to Christ, for the Christian to enter any political organization on the condition expressed or implied that the final appeal shall not be to His law.

Protest is the position taken by a person, who would be free from the guilt of other men's sins. For there must be some way by which the Christian can free himself from the guilt of the sins of the nation in which he lives. The act of the nation in violating the law of God brings guilt upon every citizen of the nation. The guilt belongs to all, and the punishment can be justly inflicted upon all. But God in His love has provided a way in which the citizen of the nation can, in measure, free himself from the guilt of the national violation of the law of God. And that way is by voluntarily refusing to act with the nation so long as the sin is continued. Such separation is not only the way of safety, but is the position of power.

I. Because such separation from evil is the divinely appointed position. Search the Bible through from Genesis to Revelation, and we find that God has commanded His people, to take no other attitude toward sin, than that of separation from sin. We can only give a few of the commands. "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." Numbers cannot change moral law, nor make that right which God says is wrong. "Depart ye, depart ye; go out of the midst of her, and touch no unclean thing." "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord." The great duty of the friend of Christ is to separate from everything that is unclean in the sight of God.

Take the New Testament command, "come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you." But we rest

our position, not on the positive commands alone, but on the whole spirit of the Bible, on the declared reason for which the Church of Christ has been organized. What does the word Church mean? That which has been called out and separated from the world. And then the history of the Bible. Its whole testimony is, that so long as God's people were separated from the sins of the nations, they were strong. But let them become blind to the sins of the nations, let them cease to bear a practical testimony against these sins, let the line of separation be blotted out, and the result was, weakness.

God no where promises to make those who are in sworn connection with any evil, the instruments of removing that evil from the political body

This then is our argument, God requires His people to protest against and to separate themselves from evil. Such protest must be a position of power, or God would not ask His children to separate from those who violate His law.

II. History proves that such an attitude is one of power.

The power of Enoch, Noah and Abraham lay in the fact of their separation. Righteous Lot may vex his righteous soul from day to day over the sins of Sodom, but so long as he remains in Sodom, so long is he weak. The power of Moses over Egypt, grew out of this, he refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. Israel is saved from the sin of the Golden Calf only when the tribe of Levi comes out on the Lord's side.

The same truth meets us in the history of the Christian Church. Peter is strong when he breaks away from the false position of the Jew, but he is to be blamed, when he is forced into complicity with Judaizing teachers. The reformation of the sixteenth century would have been turned backward, had Martin Luther not separated from the Papal Church. Others before him saw the truth of justification by faith alone, who did not withdraw from Rome. The Presbyterian ministers in Scotland who accepted the Indulgence may have done some good in the world, but they are weak when compared with those who refused the Indulgence.

I do not say that those who remained in sworn connection with the nation did nothing against slavery, or are doing nothing against intemperance, Sabbath desecration, and kindred evils. We would not so limit the Almighty. But we do say that they could do much more, if they would separate from all complicity with these evils.

As Rev. David McKee once said: "It will take the bright light of the Judgment Day to bring to light the little good these Christians did for the overthrow of slavery, who refused to protest against the nation's responsibility in that sin."

Our King can make the inconsistency of His witnesses to praise Him, but he does not promise to give large rewards to those who live in connection with evil. He does threaten wrath.

III. The attitude of separation from evil is the attitude of power because it arrests the attention and directs it to the evil in the nation.

Dissent is more than mere separation from the nation that sins: It means the pointing out of the reason for that separation. And when the reason for the dissent is declared, others are led to examine, to inquire if the reason be true. The thinking citizen asks: "Is it true that there is something wrong here, that I had not observed?" Prejudice often hinders such investigation, but separation because of the evil is the ordained means of calling attention to the evil. The non-voting abolitionists were only a handful. Their attitude toward the nation for its participation in the sin of slavery did a thousand-fold more than their ballots could have done.

A certain wise man said: "Why do you talk of dissent as an attitude of power; dissent is simply doing nothing? And it does not need power to do nothing." Dissent is more than a negative thing. It is doing the most difficult thing. It is doing what must be done first, the most unpopular thing to do, what few are willing to do, viz.: Point out the sin, declare its motives, and its effects. It is easy to follow the multitude. It is easy to drift with the current. It is work to stand against the tide. Dissent from a nation is as much a political act, as positive and as real an act, as is voting. Protest, to have power demands energetic efforts to turn the drift from sin to righteousness.

IV. Because it gives consistency to the testimony.

The strength of any testimony given against a national sin, is measured, by the consistency of the witness who gives the testimony. No one is impressed very deeply by any testimony that the frequenter of the brothel gives in favor of social purity. The world gives but little weight to the testimony which the moderate drinker at the bar of the saloon, gives against the saloon, nor to the words of the reader of the Sunday press, against the sin of Sabbath desecration. Why? Because the life, the conduct and the words, contradict each other. I listen with respect to the non-voter who speaks against the evils in our government, while I have only contempt for the voter. He is not consistent.

He is not consistent. He accepts the principles on which the Government is founded, and then cries out against the things he has accepted. Let the man come out and touch not the unclean thing, and the world listens, though it may not heed.

The real promoters of any reformation are those, who take their stand outside of what is to be reformed. Oliver Johnston says: "The Abolitionists who went into politics injured their cause. The true

Abolitionist laid aside the scepter of a political ballot, rather than use it against the slave." The south offered no reward for the body of any political Abolitionist, dead or alive. For the slaveholder realized that the Abolitionist who voted, was as harmless living as he would be dead. Connection with any national sin blinds the person involved in the sin to the sinfulness of the act. It does more, it shears his locks, and makes him grind in the prison house. Achan cannot fight the Lord's battle with the Babylonian garment and the wedge of gold buried in his tent. To be "strong in the Lord and in the power of His might," we must so adjust our relation with the nation that we shall be at the farthest possible remove from complicity with the guilt of the nation.

Truth is like a sword, useless when unused, dangerous when not carefully and consistently employed, but when practically used it becomes "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds."

V. Because it inspires hope that the evil, for which we have taken the attitude of protest, will be removed. It has been remarked that our church has not been much affected with what has been called "The dry rot of Second Adventism." Why? Second Adventism rests on despair. Its corner-stone is that the Church of Christ, even when filled with the Holy Ghost, is powerless to convert the nations to righteousness. And Christ must come in person to convert or destroy nations, they neither know nor care which. It does not believe that God's present methods for making the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ will succeed. Second Adventism cuts the nerve of hope.

Let Christians take the position of separation from all complicity with political Atheism and disobedience to the law of Christ, the position toward evil that Christ means His witnesses to take, and then the promises of Christ become magnetic batteries to strengthen this hope. Separation from evil is life drops to hope, but poison to despair.

We cannot reform the nation, any more than we can regenerate the soul. But when Christ witnesses separate from evil, then Christ by His Spirit and by His Providences, does the work. And as surely as we separate from national evils, and in proportion to the completeness of that separation, so surely will the hope of final success fill the soul. We know that the evil will be removed. We may not know whether its evil, and the nation will be removed together, or whether the evil will be taken away and the nation left, but the evil will be removed, this we know. Separation from evil nerves the arm, clears the brain and cheers the heart, because Christ will do the work. At times those who take the position of separation from evil may be forced to

ask: "Has the Lord forgotten?" and to cry: "How long, Oh Lord, how long?"

But never have they to ask: "Where is the promise of His coming?" They know that "His throne is in the heavens, and His Kingdom ruleth over all." And to Him on that throne they cry: "Take to Thee thy great power and reign?" They cry as they look at evils that are entrenched behind civil law: "Overturn, overturn, overturn."

The Rev. Prof. R. J. Melsaac, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa., moved the following resolution:

**The Reformer to be effective must stand clear of the wrong which he would reform.**

In supporting it he gave the following address:

Christ said to His followers: "Ye are the salt of the earth." In using such a figure He had reference, doubtless, to that quality of salt which gives it its chief usefulness: namely, its power to preserve that with which it comes in contact. The figure indicates that it is through the influence which good people exert on the world that the world itself is preserved from decay and dissolution. It indicates also, that God has a purpose that extends further than the salvation of individuals, that the world is preserved, and good people are kept on it, in order that, through the renovating and purifying and quickening influence of their lives, it also may be brought to share in the blessings of Christ's Gospel. The Son of Man has come to seek and to save that which was lost, not simply those who were lost.

The regeneration of the world then, is the work laid upon His followers by Christ. They are the means through which He works. "Ye are the salt of the earth."

But if this be true, that the followers of Christ are the salt of the earth, then their effectiveness in fulfilling their mission of preserving and renewing the world must depend on their coming in contact with it. We know of no such thing as action at a distance. Salt kept to itself is of but little value. It must come in contact with that which it is to preserve. Good men, then, are not to stand aloof from the affairs of the world, as if afraid to sully their white robes with its work-a-day concerns. In its social life, in its business, in its politics, there must be felt the purifying, sweetening influence of this divinely provided salt. It would be a denial of their mission, to hold themselves apart with shrinking sanctity as beings of another mould from common men, and from timidity allow corruption to go on un-

checked and the best interests of the world to be blighted. Under other skies, and in different circumstances the time for putting on white robes will come, but here the Christian ought to wear his workday clothes.

But while every opportunity of helpfulness is to be embraced, while every possible mode of co-operation with whatever is good is eagerly to be seized, yet one condition still holds and must ever hold. The Christian must still continue to be salt. "Salt is good, but if the salt has lost his savor, wherewith will ye season it?"

There is hope for a corrupt world. That may be applied to it which will purify and cleanse and restore it. God has ordained the human instrumentality through which this is to be done. But what of the professing Christian or the church that has become identified with evil and that exerts no influence for righteousness in the world? Such are as the salt without savor, fit only to be cast out and trodden under foot. One's effectiveness, as a reforming and regenerating power in the world, is just in proportion of his freedom from the taint of that evil which it is his business to reform. "I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world," says Christ, in His intercessory prayer; "but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil." Their value to the world depends on their being kept from the evil, and it depends also on their being left in the world.

These are the conditions then that have to be met by those who would help the world:

First. Contact with evil that is in the world.

Second. Freedom from its taint.

How can these conditions be met? How can a good man come in contact with the world's sin, and yet keep himself free from its contamination?

He must come in contact with it, in order that his influence may effect its removal, and at the same time he must himself be free from its contaminating power, else his influence is nothing.

It would seem almost impossible that these conditions could both be met, and this difficulty, apparently so great, has doubtless led many to the adoption of a wrong course. It has led good men to shrink back from taking any part in the affairs of the world, to feel that any contact with such matters would blight their spiritual life, and sully their purity.

It has led others, too, who doubtless also were well intentioned, to feel that there was no way for them to remedy the evils, but by themselves becoming, more or less, identified with these evils. Both courses are futile, worse than futile, they are wrong.

The reconciliation of these apparently opposing conditions, is perhaps not so impossible as it seems.

It all depends upon the way in which we take hold of our work. A great burden, the burden of the world's guilt and wrong, is to be removed. He that would move it must come up close and grasp it hard, in order that he may be able to put forth his strength, but he must himself stand clear of the load that he would lift. He who gets up on the burden may tug and pull and strain every nerve, but it is all a useless struggle; he is lifting against himself. He has only increased the difficulty of really removing the burden at which he is tugging so lustily, for his own weight, whatever that may be, is now added.

Slavery had its opponents among the southern slaveholders themselves. Some of them saw the evils inseparable from the institution and they desired and worked for its abolition. But they were working from within the institution itself and their work counted for nothing. It was only when such men as Phillips and Garrison took hold of it, coming into as close contact with slavery as even the slaveholders themselves, but yet standing clear of it, that the great evil of human bondage was made to totter and to fall. Their attitude toward it was that of the man who comes squarely up to the burden that he desires to lift, but who is careful to see that his feet are planted free of the burden itself. Then grasping it firmly, all the strength he can put forth goes toward its removal.

Help must always be given from the higher to the lower. Without the sun to illuminate and warm the earth there could be no life upon its surface, but when the radiant, vivifying beams fall upon it, the germs of life stir to activity, the dead and barren soil becomes fruitful and is clothed with life and beauty. So the moral and social world is helpless of itself to rise, and only when quickened from above, when laid hold of by a power, out of, and superior to itself, can it make any advancement.

This power from above is vested in good men and women. It is theirs to use for the renovation of the world, but it will be available for this purpose only so long as it remains truly a power from above. When merged in and identified with the evils of the world, its force is destroyed. The hydraulic press is an instrument of great power (but until the pressure is exerted upon the water from without it remains merely an inert mass. The reformer is that outside pressure. He must be distinct from, and yet in closest contact with that inert mass into which he would put life and motion.



The Rev. A. A. Samson, New Concord, O., seconded the resolution. He said:

I support this resolution for three reasons:

**First. Public opinion requires it.**

The effective reformer must take public opinion into account. It may either help or hinder his work. As far as he is concerned, he should use every right and wise means to gain its aid. The man who is implicated in the wrong which he denounces will prejudice public opinion not only against himself, but in some measure against the reform which he advocates.

To be sure public opinion is not the standard of right or wrong, but it requires the reformer to live as well as teach his reform. It may not accept the reform advocated, but it respects the consistent advocate. Respect begets interest, interest consideration and consideration influence, some of which will be favorable.

Indifference to wrong is deplorable. Public opinion will generally be indifferent as long as the reformer is not clear of the wrong which he denounces. Let him be clear of it, and the effect is shown by the drawing of the lines either for or against the proposed reform. That marks a stage of advancement in his work. When the lines are drawn, then before long the contest is on. It may be a prolonged and tedious contest, but it will ultimately result in victory for righteousness.

The reformer who stands clear of the wrong which he would reform, throws out a challenge to public opinion which it cannot ignore. Such a challenge was given by the Garrisonians and other able abolition agitators, when they maintained a public and practical dissent against a pro-slavery Constitution of government. Who can deny that such action on their part had an important place in the strengthening of the anti-slavery cause, by strengthening public opinion in its favor? It is ever true that public opinion is prepared and strengthened for the suppression of evil when the champions of righteousness are themselves clear of the evil which they oppose. When they are not clear of it, the just retort of public opinion to their plea is—"Physician, heal thyself."

Second. Consistency requires it.

Inconsistency is one of the chief evils of our age. If not more general among professing Christians, it is at least more marked among them than among other classes of people.

Many persons having vowed to renounce the world, to deny themselves and to take up their cross and follow Christ, still live largely for themselves and the world. Yes, there are leading Christians, reformers, who preach, pray and plan for the overthrow of evil which they abet. Little wonder that the world laughs, and that the forces of evil remain at ease when reformers are fettered with their own inconsistencies.

Consistency indicates sincerity and earnestness, and makes a favorable impression. But inconsistency warrants doubt as to sincerity. Inconsistent reformers gender indifference or disgust in persons whom they might win to their cause, if they lived as well as preached it.

The man who advocates temperance reform and at the same time keeps or patronizes a saloon is an ineffective reformer because he stultifies himself.

The champion of Sabbath observance who makes use of railroad trains or reads the Sunday newspaper on the Lord's day, nullifies his work because of his inconsistency.

The man who believes in and advocates the doctrine of Christian civil government and swears to uphold and support the same, spoils the effect of his belief and teaching by his inconsistent action.

Inconsistency receives strong condemnation in the Bible. The most scathing denunciations that Christ ever pronounced upon men were upon the inconsistent. The severe and merited rebuke which Paul administered to Peter was on account of his inconsistency.

The profession becomes a motive power for good when it is supported by and embodied in the life. What we are weighs more than what we say. The effect is strong when what we say and what we are correspond and are combined in the field of reform.

Third. The Bible requires it:

This is the all important reason—the reason which is fundamental to all the resolutions before this Conference. The proposition before us is certainly founded upon and supported by the Revealed Will of God. The Bible forbids wrong doing of any kind. Then any reform, method of reform, or reformer, to produce a good and lasting effect must have divine approval. The reformer who opposes some kind of evil of which he is guilty cannot be effective for good because he opposes God's will. God's Word requires the reformer to "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 path."

Be not wise in thine own eyes, fear the Lord and depart from evil. (Prov. 3 : 5-7). When God directs the path of the reformer, then He does effective work. The condition of such direction is the acknowledging of God in all His ways and the departure from evil.

Again, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. (Matt. 7 : 18 and 20). When a reformer is inconsistent, his work is useless because he is corrupt and cannot bring forth good fruit. Many reformers say: "The liquor traffic is wrong, yet is so powerful that we cannot abolish it. But through the government, either municipal, state or national, it may be restricted by the license system and that will do some good. Therefore we advocate and support the license system."

Thus they become implicated in the evil, and do another wrong by putting the arm of the law around that monster of iniquity which God curses. Are such reformers trusting the Lord with all their heart and departing from evil, or are they not rather wise in their own eyes and leaning unto their own understanding? It is the adoption and working of the principle which the Bible repudiates, viz.: "Let us do evil that good may come." (Rom. 3 : 8).

In another line: There are many good people, among them some reformers, who believe and desire that the government of our land and its supreme law should become distinctly Christian, since it is now fundamentally secular and atheistic. Yet while working for the change they become or remain a part of this evil system, and by solemn oath swear to uphold what God condemns. Are such reformers in line with God's directions as found in II. Cor. 6 : 14, "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" These verses certainly require that all Christians stand clear of wrong, reformers among the rest. Verse 17 emphasizes the requirement. "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you." The ground of God's acceptance and blessing is not only that we believe the right, but that in upholding right, we stand clear of the wrong. It is not that we believe civil government to be an "unclean thing," by no means, for as an institution it is "ordained of God." But because it is so "ordained of God" it should be constituted and conducted according to His directions. When it is not, then it is required of God's children that they stand clear of the wrong. Those who do so, can be effective in opposing the wrong since they follow God's directions.

## Tuesday Evening, February 25th.

The last session of the Conference was presided over by Mr. John W. Pritchard, of New York. After devotional exercises the addresses of the evening were given as follows:—

### THE MASTER PASSIONS OF A WITNESS.

By Rev. W. M. George, Brooklyn, N. Y.

“Lord God of Abraham, Isaac and of Israel let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word. Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast turned their heart back again.” (I Kings, 18:36. 37) The prayer of Elijah that called down fire from heaven upon Mt. Carmel. Have you ever noticed the significance of the mountains of Palestine.

#### HOLY MOUNTAINS.

Sinai stands for the law; Calvary for the cross; Hermon for the quiet waiting; Pisgah for the heavenly vision, and Carmel for faithful witnessing. In our religious experience we need to visit them all.

#### EXPERIENCE.

We need to go to Sinai to stand before the law until driven to Calvary to stand before the cross; from Calvary to wait for the dews of Hermon where God commands the blessing, ‘even life for evermore; from Hermon to Pisgah to see “the King in his beauty,” and “the land that lieth afar off,” and from Pisgah to Carmel to speak for God.

#### A FAMOUS BATTLE-FIELD.

Carmel is described as one of the most beautiful mountains of Palestine. Its name signifies a “country of gardens and vineyards.” In shape, like a flattened cone, it lifts itself 1,500 feet above the waves of the Mediterranean on the one side and on the other looks out over one of the most famous battle-fields of the world—the plain of Egdraelon and the valley of Jezreel. There Deborah and Barak vanquished the haughty Sisera and sang, ‘Oh my soul, thou hast trodden down strength, the stars in their courses fought

against Sisera. The river of Kishon swept them away." There also was heard the cry, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon," as the faithful three hundred swept the Midianites out of the land. There Saul and Jonathan fell before the Philistines on Mt. Gilboa when David sang, "Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their death they were not divided. They were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions. How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!" There the banners of the Crusaders fluttered in the breezes, and the eagles of Napoleon were wetted by the evening dews. But none of these things is to be compared to a battle that was fought once near the summit of Carmel. Where one man whose name means, "My God is my strength," stood against all Israel, and single-handed subdued a kingdom, "wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, out of weakness was made strong, waxed valiant in fight, and turned to flight the armies of the aliens."

#### A CRISIS-HOUR.

When Elijah came to the crisis-hour of the conflict it was about 3 o'clock in the afternoon. It was no time for vain repetitions. He came near to the altar of Jehovah and drew his mightiest weapon—prayer. That prayer had in it four petitions. But what petitions they were! He seemed to pray in an agony, and to gather into those four short sentences the wrestlings of a life-time. Here are the four master-passions of the true witness. The first is concerning God: "Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel." The second has reference to himself: "And that I am thy servant." The third has reference to his work: "And that I have done all these things at thy word." The fourth has reference to his people: "Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast turned their heart back again."

We will notice:—

I. His petition concerning God. "Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel." It was because Elijah knew God and loved him that he prayed this prayer. Notice these names. Abraham was called the friend of God; and the "God of Abraham" may mean the friend of the friendless. Isaac was one of the meekest of men; and the "God of Isaac" may mean the portion of the lowly. Jacob was the pilgrim; and the "God of Jacob" may mean the guide of the pilgrim. But these three names in Scripture may have a special significance. The appeal is to the God of the Fathers, and the God of the faithful, and the God of the Covenants, "Which covenants he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant," "that they might set their hope in God."

Well may we to-day pray to the God of our faithful fathers. In this day of return to the dead forms of Rome, God of our faithful Protestant Father, Martin Luther—Luther, who said, "here I stand, I cannot do otherwise, God help me," who when warned not to ride into Saxony lest he meet his old enemy, Duke George, replied, "I would ride into Saxony if it rained Duke Georges for nine days running," God of Martin Luther, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel.

In this day when creeds are assailed on every hand, God of our Presbyterian Father, John Calvin, give us "men with empires in their brains," men, who by the help of the Holy Spirit shall understand "the deep things of God."

In this day when vows taken, are so lightly esteemed and so easily set aside. God of our faithful Covenanted Father, John Knox, of whom when dead 'twas said, "there lies one who never feared the face of man;" "let it be known that thou art God."

#### GIVE US PURITANS.

And in this day when righteousness is set at naught, God of our faithful Puritan Fathers, "let it be known that thou art God in Israel" and in America. One of the most common outeries to-day is this "We don't want to be Puritans." Every movement for godliness in the State is put down with one word, "We are not Puritans" Who are these Puritans anyhow, that every one is so sure we do not want to be? History tells us that their brows were high, their eyes keen, their hearts aglow, their blood crimson-hued, their back-bones steel.

They were free-born, and were never in bondage to any man. And when in the world's battle for liberty, tyrants roused the lion that was in them, some stayed on that side the Atlantic and remained in England, and some crossed to this side and made America. Among the granite hills and amidst the wintry storms of New England, those granite men hewed and laid the three granite pillars of this Republic—Reverence, Righteousness, Reason.

"They shook the depths of the desert gloom.

With their hymns of lofty cheer,

Amid the storm they sang,

And the stars heard and the sea.

And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang

With the anthem of the free!"

Who were these Puritans?

Among poets, John Milton; among theologians, John Owen; among orators, Wendell Phillips; among commentators, Matthew Henry; among ministers; Charles Spurgeon. As to being Puritans, some of us would not object, and some of us need not be scared. God of our Puritan Fathers, let it be known this day that thou art God, and give America another race of Puritans.

## II. His petition concerning himself. "And that I am thy servant."

There is nothing that a true prophet desires for himself so much as the seal of God upon his ministry. He can give up silver and gold and houses and lands and parents and wife and children, if he can only have that. Just here is the difference between Elijah and Obadiah with whom this chapter opens

### OBADIAH.

It is evident to begin with that he was a saved man. We read in verse three. "Now Obadiah feared the Lord greatly." But he did not serve the Lord; he served Ahab. He was "the governor of his house." (V. 3.) Now Jesus did not say, "Ye cannot serve one master and be saved by another" Because you can if that "other" is Christ. The thief on the cross served the devil all his life and was saved by Christ in the last hour. It is a poor business and a risky business, but, considering the infinite grace of Christ, it can be done.

But Jesus did say, "Ye cannot serve two masters." And so Obadiah did not serve God; he served Ahab. He "feared the Lord greatly," and served Ahab continually.

### IGNOBLE ONE HUNDRED.

But what about those prophets that Obadiah saved? "When Jezebel cut off the prophets of the Lord," he "took a hundred prophets and hid them by fifty in a cave, and fed them with bread and water." Was not that serving God? No, it was not. Why not? Because the prophets were not worth saving. How do we know that? Because you could shut them up "by fifty in a cave," when the land was full of idolatry from Dan. to Beersheba.

### DYNAMITE.

If those men had had upon them the power of God, you could no more have shut up "fifty in a cave" in times like that, than you could shut up Jesus Christ in a rock tomb. He arose. Paul says (in Rom. 1:3) "He was declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead." The word translated "power" is "dunamis." From which we have our word "dynamite." "He was declared to be the Son of God with "dynamite." For when the spark of life touched his sleeping body, "Behold, the earth did quake, and the rocks rent, and the graves were opened," and it was well for this world that he wasn't buried any deeper. And as he was "declared to be the Son of God with dynamite," these one hundred hidden by "fifty in a cave" are declared to be the prophets of God without "dynamite." "Prophets!" A prophet is a man who speaks for God, not a man who hides his head.

"Dynamite?" Putty, I guess. No need to "handle with care" Store any quantity in one place. They would not explode; not they.

## SAVING AND LOSING.

Jesus said, "He that saveth his life shall lose it." These one hundred saved their lives and they lost them. They are one hundred nobodies. We do not even know their names. They had no more influence in the world than a hundred sticks of wood. And Obadiah thought he was doing such a work, tiptoeing out there with bread and water.

## PRAYER MEETINGS.

I suppose they had prayer meetings. Certainly. And prayed God that "in his own good time and way" he would cast idolatry out of Israel. As though it wasn't "the Lord's good time" that very minute. And as though the "Lord's good way" of using men with backbones would leave them either part or lot in the matter. Perhaps they would even humble themselves betimes and confess that they were not worthy of their high and holy office. Who knows?

## SILENT INFLUENCE.

Obadiah was in his right crowd when he was with those fellows. No doubt he meant to have some kind of good influence with Ahab in regard to the false gods. Silent influence, I suppose he called it. He would say to himself, "I will have an opportunity to speak to Ahab some day, and I'll try to say a good word. We must not be too rabid." Here he is after these years, and no nearer to speaking than at the first, in fact a good deal farther from it. When we meet him at the opening of the chapter he is leading mules. And whose mules? Ahab's mules. A man like Obadiah has no influence either silent or otherwise. A dead Elijah a dead Paul, a dead Jesus, has a silent influence that flows through this world like a mighty river. But an Obidiah amounts to nothing either living or dead. He has need to pray two prayers. First:—"Lord, since thou hast saved me, make me thy servant." And Second:—Elijah's prayer, "Let it be known that I am thy servant."

## TOADYING.

One of the most pitiful sights in the world is the American Church trying, Obadiah-like, with one hand to serve a Christless government and with the other to serve the Christ who has been cast out. Think of how the Church led the mules for the government in the slavery business. With her open Bible toadying around after the government, declaring that human slavery was a divine institution, and that the everlasting God for the first time in history was against the down-trodden and oppressed. And when in the sixties the thunders of God's wrath became so terrible that the government refused to go forward, and in spite of the pious assurances of her false prophets broke the chains and let the oppressed go free; the Church had to fall over herself getting over to the side of God and human-



ity. In his life of Wendell Phillips, Carlos Martyn says, "This chapter in the history of American Christianity is fitted to wring tears from the eyes of angels."

But now the government is out of the slavery business and into the saloon business. Of which Mr. Howard of Rochester says truly, "The licensing of the liquor traffic by the government of the United States is the greatest crime in history since Judas Iscariot sold the son of God." And does the Church hesitate and draw back? Mr. Woolley, in his lecture on "My own Country," says, "Ninety-eight per cent. of the Christian voters of America are going in for the government policy, saloon business and all." And when (and may God hasten the day) the government has stopped this business, or this business has stopped the government. one of which shall be so surely as there is a God, the church shall have added one more chapter to the history of her infamy. "Is Israel a servant? Is he a home-born slave?" Is there no royal blood in the veins of the Church at all? Is there no dignity in the service of God? Is not the spiritual Israel as a prince to have "power with God and with men." "Where is the Lord God of Elijah?"

III. His petition concerning his work. "And that I have done all these things at thy word." Think of what an unpopular prophet Elijah was and we can understand this petition.

#### UNPOPULARITY.

Elijah was as cordially hated on earth as he was loved in heaven. Three years and six months without rain at the word of Elijah. He locked the windows of the sky and put the key in his pocket and went his way. There is no danger of overdrawing the picture of what that meant. Not a blade of grass was left on hill or dale. Stables were empty, for the cattle had all died. Farms were deserted. Going along the country roads you could see white skeletons lying every here and there over the brown fields. And as this gradually came to pass and men saw their cattle pushing each other around the dry troughs, and lowing day and night in their distress until death brought quiet, and then falling down in heaps and dying, what fearful resentment would rise against Elijah. Obadiah said to Elijah, "As the Lord thy God liveth there is no nation or kingdom whither my Lord hath not sent to seek thee: And when they said, He is not there, he took an oath of the kingdom and nation that they found thee not." God said he had seven thousand who had not bowed to Baal. But there wasn't one of them who had intimated even to Elijah that he endorsed his policy. Probably very few of them thought that Elijah was right. Some of them might say, "Well, I believe that Elijah is a good man, but if that is God's way of working, I'd like to know."

#### ASSURANCE.

However we must not think that Elijah had come to doubt of his own

ministry. There never was a purer example of what Paul calls "the riches of the full assurance." From ever Elijah comes into this chapter he acts like a king. When he meets Obadiah, "Go tell thy Lord Ahab, "Behold, Elijah is here." And when Ahab meets Elijah with that challenge, "Is it thou, thou troubler of Israel?" with what splendid courage he flings back those words into the teeth of the king, "It is not I that have troubled Israel, but thou and thy father's house." And when before all Israel upon Mt. Carmel he met the priests of Baal; and the sun having slowly mounted to his zenith these sun worshipers (for Baal is the god of the Sun) are every moment expecting the answering fire to fall; that vast crowd waiting in breathless attention while the priests are engaged in fervent prayer, Elijah is not able even to take them seriously. It is so weak to him that it is absurd." And it came to pass that at noon Elijah mocked them and said, "cry aloud, for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked."

And then it came to the moment for Elijah. He said to all the people come near unto me, and he rolled the twelve stones together for an altar, and put the wood in order and the bullock on the wood. "Now, he said, bring water," and they brought four barrels. And he said, "Do it again," and they did it the second time. And he said, "Do it the third time," until the water was dripping from every stick of wood and running over the stones, and the ground and the trench was filled. And now, having come to the crisis of his life and of his ministry, he stepped forward to the altar. And as those four petitions flew from his lips swift to the ear of God, "the fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the sacrifice, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench," and when all the people saw it, they fell on their faces and said, "The Lord, he is the God; the Lord, he is the God."

And Elijah said, "Take the prophets of Baal, let not one of them escape. And Elijah brought them down to the brook Kishon and slew them there." Through that whole day, there does not seem to have been in the heart of Elijah even the shadow of a doubt. "He walked with God." "He reigned in life."

#### GETHSEMANE.

No, he did not doubt. But Elijah was a man subject to like passions as we are, and when all the world and the Church hated him so that they would have killed him, and when even the faithful remnant misunderstood and disbelieved, and thought that he was a troubler, and that they would get along better without him, even the lion heart of Elijah found it a cross almost too heavy to bear. And under the juniper tree he prayed God that he might die. It was the agony that had burned in his soul through a lifetime of solitary faithfulness, which now cried to God for the seal of heaven's

approval upon his work. "“Lord God of Abraham, Isaac and of Israel, let it be known this day that I have done all these things at thy word.”"

IV. His petition concerning his people.

"And that this people may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast turned their heart back again." We are apt to think of Elijah as a hard stern man, forgetting that "the bravest are the gentlest," and that a man may be utterly uncompromising, and yet of a loving and lovable disposition. Such was Elijah. It is wonderful to see with what loyalty he turns to Ahab now when he can be true to him as king without being false to God.

LOYALTY.

If Elijah had been a self-seeking man, he could at that moment have dethroned Ahab. He became his most loyal supporter. They were all wearied with the labors of the day. Elijah said to Ahab, "Get thee up, eat and drink." So Ahab went up to eat and to drink, but Elijah went up to the top of Carmel, and he cast himself down upon the earth, and put his face between his knees, and while he prayed his servant watched from the mountain's summit for the first sign of the coming of the mercies of the Lord. And when there was nothing, he said, "Go again;" and so seven times until, at last, "Behold there ariseth a little cloud out of the sea, like a man's hand."

I see Elijah's mighty stride as he turns down the mountain. And he said to the lad, "Go up now, say unto Ahab, prepare thy chariot, for there is a sound of abundance of rain." And as the king's chariot swept into view, the hand of the Lord was on Elijah and he girded up his loins and went before all Israel in token of loyalty to the humbled king. He ran before the chariot of Ahab, eighteen miles, to the entrance of Jezreel. May the God of the Fathers, the God of the faithful, the God of the Covenants keep us faithful to our covenants until our testimony shall be honored and the victory won. And then, the day of protesting over, with what gladness may we run before the royal chariots, of our own America.

The Rev. F. M. Foster, Ph. D., New York City, was introduced and gave the following address:

**“All True Reform Principles Lead to the Position Against Swearing to Carry on Government According to a Law That Leaves Out Christ.”**

A mighty storm, lashing a tumultuous sea, and blackening the heavens, caught a vessel in its teeth. The captain had to sail by the compass. The needle guided him upon the rocks, and the ship went down. Afterwards, a diver brought up, among other things, that compass, when all was explained. A sailor, cleaning about it, had broken off the mere point of a knife blade. The merest trifle! but the ship went down! There are those who are wont to speak of the lack of all Christianity in the National Constitution as a trifle and who think that those who call attention to it are making much of a small matter, but we are here to say that the ship of state, sailing without sun or star in a dangerous sea, is depending on a compass whose needle is deflected, by an unscriptural political philosophy, and she is driving for the rocks! We present no apology for insisting that that compass be corrected: and, until it is done, we decline to fire the engines!

“All true reform principles!” There are so-called reform principles which are not “true” nor are they reforming in their nature. The canvass preceding the elections in New York last fall, had much to do with the theory of reform. The cry, morning, noon and night, was Reform! Reform!! Reform!!! Deliver our city! Down with Tammany! Reform! An onlooker who attended one of the mass meetings, at which thousands were crushed within, and thousands were crushed without, said, the hero of the evening was the candidate for District Attorney, William Travis Jerome. When he entered the building the vast audience came screaming to its feet, climbed on the chairs, cried and shouted and roared, as did the Ephesians of the great goddess Diana, until human nature could carry the frenzy no

farther, and sank down exhausted! A stranger would have supposed that Mr. Jerome was a mighty deliverer from some awful enemy! But what? He stood, as plain as words could say it, and types could print it, for an open saloon on the Lord's day! He stood in bold and defiant opposition to the Lord God Almighty! He led the charge against Sinai! Ministers preached, prayed, and beseeched men to help him. And so blinded were the people, and infatuated with their leader, that they swept him on to victory.

This they called "reform!" "Tell it not in Gath. Publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice; lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph!" The last election was the greatest disaster to the cause of righteousness that New York has seen in many a day. This kind of reform has a national graveyard at the end of it. We are not here to discuss it, further than to show, by illustration, that it is not based upon "True Reform Principles," named in the subject assigned.

But what are true reform principles? The mist and haze, and shall we not say, ignorance, here are great. A wordy battle, in the public press of New York, has been going on these months, the one side boldly affirming that the state has nothing to do with moral law, and that whatever the people wish they should have. The other side, rejecting with equal emphasis the principle that the state is bound by the divine law, is not quite satisfied to cast aside all moral safeguards. They stumble in the darkness, but turn up, finally, on the wrong side. There has been, during the last one hundred years, nearly continuous retrograde movement. In our large cities, and in many smaller ones, the public conscience is becoming more and more debauched. Trains on the Sabbath; mails on the Sabbath; visiting and entertaining on the Sabbath; papers on the Sabbath; theaters on the Sabbath; street cleaning on the Sabbath; excursions and rioting on the Sabbath; entertainments in church, under guise of worship on the Sabbath; all these are now so common that when you insist on the divine law, you are regarded as a "misfit," stared at as a crank, or frozen with sarcasm! There is not a reform that touches effectively any one of the above named sins! We say, effectively! They are simply overwhelming the Church of God! !

When Major General Hooker was in command, the Army of the Potomac was reviewed by President Lincoln. Fully sixty thousand men were in line—infantry, cavalry, artillery and wagon-trains. As the artillery saluted the President, the mule trains took fright, and, in spite of quartermasters, wagonmasters and teamsters, went thundering down upon the well-ordered lines pell-mell, almost as bad as a Confederate charge! How the panic-stricken mules did "Whee-haw"

and the army-wagons went "rattlety-bang," that day on the Stafford plains! A great deal of the reform work of the present day is like the charging of those mule-trains. Nobody is hurt! and in an incredibly short time the lines are re-formed—mules and all!

There is Reform! Reform!! Reform!!! They can be measured by the yard, and the money spent, by bushels. But the successful reforms can be counted on the fingers of one hand—not enough to save the City of Sodom.

The cause cannot be that the righteous are not interested. They are. They work, they pray, they pay. What is the matter? This leads to our subject, I. They are, in general, attempting to reform evil without Christ. II. They swear to maintain the very thing they are trying to reform. With reference to the first, we say, with all the emphasis at our command, that reform without Christ is a failure! Satan is too wise; has too many resources; is too powerful. He is entrenched in the unregenerate heart. He is the prince of this world, the ruler of the powers of darkness. For man to attempt to dislodge him, to despoil him, to drive him out is like a baby fighting an enraged lion. Christ has given fair warning; "Without Me ye can do nothing." The reforms of the present day are, in nearly every case, attempts at reform without Christ. He is dropped out somewhere along the line. A few years ago, the Sabbath reform got befogged and began building on the foundation of a civil Sabbath, practically ignoring the divine commandment. The foundation sank so fast that the reformers had to jump for their lives! A civil Sabbath, under the Constitution of the United States, means the kind of Sabbath the majority wish. It surrenders Sinai and God. These left out, what majority has the right to say, "Cease working on the first day of the week!" There is no law without Christ. There is no Sabbath but from Christ! He alone has authority to give law to the creature which He has made, and to the state which He has instituted. Man will finally recognize no other authority as binding. Conscience will not respond to man's commandment, but it will respond to the authority of Almighty God.

A few weeks ago, we received circulars, petitions and arguments from the New York Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging the legislature not to submit the question of opening saloons on the Lord's day to popular vote. In all these blanks, arguments and petitions, there was not one reference to God, or the slightest hint that there is a divine Ruler whose law is to be obeyed. Such methods of reform ignore the only One that can give reform—the Lord Jesus Christ!

At a general ministers' meeting, New York, five or six years ago, called for the purpose of considering the press and the Sabbath, speaker after speaker stated, in reply to a minister who was foolish enough to say that the Fourth Commandment should be brought to the attention of publishers of such papers, that the Fourth Commandment had nothing to do with the matter; that to bring it into the question would be unjustifiable and hurtful. What was the result? A Committee of Ministers was appointed to confer with the editors, which Committee, as soon as it could appropriately do so proceeded to die, and was buried without funeral services. Remarkable? No! A reform that does not stand on the Commandment of Almighty God as its basis is doomed to failure! Where God does not go forth with the armies of Israel, they suffer defeat, which is speedily turned into disastrous, awful rout! The cause of right is so repugnant to the wicked that it must be supported by the artillery of heaven and the hosts of Almighty God. When will we learn that this is true—"Without Me ye can do nothing!" "Through God we shall do valiently, for He it is that shall tread down our enemies." "In the name of our God, we will set up our banners." We will have reforms by judgments, but we will not have peaceable reforms until we realize that they depend upon the co-operation and leadership of Christ; and not until His people, openly, avowedly, and triumphantly declare, seven days in the week and three hundred and sixty-five days in the year, that the reform is begun and carried forward at His Commandment. This is the true principle of reform, and all true reform principles proceed on this line.

The II. is like unto it, viz.: The Christian cannot swear to uphold or administer government by a sinful principle or law. The multitudes that fall down slain because they swear, to uphold the very thing which they acknowledge is wrong, is marvelous to behold! Usually, however, any attempted activity, under such conditions, results in what might be called "Reform paralysis." The symptoms of this disease are not always noticeable at the first. Then, zeal is fairly going to waste. But presently as the matter is better understood, ardor cools, and indifference is manifested. The subject is in the first stages of "reform paralysis!"

What is the matter? The matter is the man sees that he has sworn to uphold the very thing which he condemns as a sin against God. A straight look into the eye of such facts will do one of two things: It will make a man stop swearing, or, it will make him stop reforming. Reforms, in so far as they have to do with morality and the acknowledgment of the divine law, are public declarations that sin exists. Sometimes these sins lie in statutory, sometimes in Con-

stitutional law. If sins exist in the statutory law the legislator has, ignorantly or intentionally, transgressed his instructions, and has enacted law contrary to the Constitution. His mistake is corrected by the courts. But when a law is found to be constitutional, that law becomes practically an integral part of the Constitution.

Art. VI, Sec. 2, reads: "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof shall be the supreme law of the land." Laws of the United States which deal with traffic in liquors, being made in pursuance thereof, are a part of the Constitution, and to this law the voting citizen swears. The law ordering out the mail trains on the Sabbath, is for the same reason a part of the Constitution, and the Christian who votes swears that it shall be maintained. Every Christian who votes swears that post-masters shall open their offices on certain hours on Sabbath. We know the moral character of the Constitution of the United States by the money which, by law, is harvested from the liquor traffic, just as you know the character of the man who runs a saloon or who receives dividends from it. Christians would be horrified to be partner in a saloon. But if the corporation be a large one, say, seventy-five million of people, conscience is satisfied! Christians would not think of carrying on business on the Lord's day. But if the company be big enough, say seventy-five million of people, they will swear by the great Name of God that that business shall go on!

We are justified in confidently affirming that the Constitution contains unscriptural provisions, gives being to, and upholds wrong and sinful laws, and he who swears to it, swears to uphold rebellion against Almighty God. This is a most serious matter. Swearing to uphold these sins paralyzes conscience and effort to amend the Constitution. This explains why so few push the Christian amendment. And herein is the reason why reform associations usually take down this headlight, and hang it at the tail of the train. And it furthermore explains why the rebellion against God set forth in the Constitution is, in this day, rarely emphasized! !

Prohibitionists make addresses which stir the soul; while, at the same time, they are trying to put a man at the head of the greatest liquor concern in the world.

We insist upon two things: I. God does not require such inconsistency. II. God will not bless such inconsistency. It is unreasonable to suppose that God will bless a man's efforts to reform a condition which he swears to uphold.

This conclusion can be safely affirmed. The reform which does not emphasize the sin of that which it wishes to remove, and does not emphasize the point at which men come in touch with it, is superficial;



it will never touch the conscience; does not deliver men from sin; nor does it make them better. For he who professes that a matter is right, and yet, goes on doing the contrary, and swearing that he will do it, is adding to his guilt. "He that knew his Lord's will and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes."

The demonstration is complete! The argument is irrefutable! True reform principles lead to the position against swearing to administer government by a law which ignores Christ.

Furthermore, men act on this general principle in politics. At one time the "silver" question caused many Democrats to leave the Democratic party. They would not aid in helping their party into power, since it had espoused that political heresy. Republicans have left their party and have refused to aid in keeping it in power, because some one principle, which they did not believe was espoused. Prohibitionists have left both Republican and Democratic parties, because neither of them stands for temperance. These are dissenters, and they ask nobody's pardon. They decline to administer government on those lines.

Now, refusing to administer the Constitution of the United States, because it has objectionable provisions, is one and the same principle with the Democrat refusing to administer the Republican platform, the Republican, the Democratic and the Prohibitionist, either of them. It is saying we will not administer that Constitution ourselves or through our representative. If it is honorable for the Republican to stand for what he believes; for the Prohibitionist to stand for what he believes; so is it equally honorable for the Covenanter to refuse to administer the government on the basis of the father of all platforms, the Constitution of the United States. And the ground for his action is, not some difference of view as to tariff, or the coinage of silver, but because this great national platform has refused to accept the great, Scriptural Commandment, denied the authority of Almighty God over the nation, His right to give law, and the duty of the nation to obey His will.

Some may ask, well, what would become of us if all took your position? I ask, what will become of us, if they do not? Just one week ago, a young man, hardly out of his "teens," of good family, was found dead in a Raine's law hotel, where he had registered, with a young girl, a few hours before. The pastor of the family stated, in an address last Friday evening, that the morals of the community were such as to cause most serious alarm; that the facts, as he knew from personal knowledge, "which reached the public, were not nearly so voluminous, as they might well be made, not nearly as ugly, as de-

formed, as monstrous as they can be and may be painted." The churches are losing their religion, the homes their piety, and the morals of the community are sounding depths never before explored! It is the logical result of government without God! I ask our friends, with God's law routed at nearly every point, with wickedness coming in like a flood, with our sons and daughters as the price, I ask them how much longer must the experiment continue?

The Rev. W. P. Johnston, D. D., President of Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa., gave an address on the theme:

**“Christian Citizens Should Hold Consistently  
for the Highest Christian Ideal of  
Civil Government.”**

Ruskin says that men's proper business in this world can fall mainly into these two divisions; (1st) “To know themselves and the existing state of things they have to do with; and, (2nd), To mend themselves and the existing state of things so far, as either are marred or mendable.” Our being here is itself a matter of some significance. It shows that in our view a mending is needed in certain things, and be tter still that we believe that they can be mended. There is neither indifference nor despair. The aim in view is important enough to call out the best efforts of best men, and such promises of success in effort as to make men optimistic.

Now I wish to give in a few particular some reasons why Christian citizens should hold consistently for the highest Christian ideal of civil government.

I. Because our Lord has put this ideal before the eyes and minds of men in His Word. It is safe to say that in the reading of this Book, two things lie side by side—the first one is that things, as good men see them, society as organized, is not as they would wish it to be—coupled always with the picture of what it is to be—the bad precedes—the good succeeds; as Browning puts it: “Grow old along with me, the best is yet to be, the last of life for which the first was made; our times are in His hands who saith: ‘A whole I planned. Trust God, see all, nor be afraid.’” If the men of the Hebrew race are to be credited with nothing else, they did this at least—left on record what society would yet be under Immanuel. They did two things: (1) They gave in word the honor belonging to Christ. (2) Good to men if the honor was given. I will not quote—do not need to—the words of Abraham,

Jacob, Daniel, and others until John, who tells us that "the Tabernacle of God shall be with men and He will dwell with them." You cannot praise God in the Psalms of David without finding tributes to Him "who is to reign from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth." That is to be in sentiment with the men who have lived nearest God.

II. The best men of all times and lands have had this ideal. It was a fever in their veins; remained so till they could tell men what was yet to be. The future was fair to see. Virgil lays tribute to Pollio (Eclogue IV.) telling him what is to be—not now, will be—that the Iron Age is to end and "ac aurea gens surget toto mundo" and the Golden Age shall arise, shall arise, through the whole world," "the great months begin to advance" in that day, "serpens occidet," the serpent shall die. "O offspring of Gods, approach thy dignities for the time has come." Aristotle taught that there was to be the restoration not only of the personal but of the social life of man.

"Every state is such by nature for what a thing is when its being is completed that we call its nature." Milton says: "Come forth out of thy royal chambers, O Prince of the Kings of the Earth. Put on the visible robes of thy Imperial Majesty. Take up that unlimited scepter which thy Almighty Father hath bequeathed Thee, for now the voice of the bride calleth Thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed."

Bernard says: "It is not enough that I should be pardoned and saved—that is a worthy desire for an immortal being, but I must recognize more than this, I am a member of the Kingdom of Christ and a citizen of the City of God. There ought surely to be a consciousness within me corresponding to that position—ought to be affections that will associate me in spirit with that larger history, in which my own is included and which will make me long that the Kingdom of Christ should come and the City of God be manifested."

Mulford says: "The goal of history is in the fulfillment of the highest political ideal. It is the end of the toil and conflict of humanity. Towards this the nations move in the fulfillment of the life of humanity." It is something to be in line with the best men of the best nations that have been at all.

III. Because ideals in themselves have great value. Ideals have always been the world's masters. One of our own essayists has said that "the self in us that thinks and judges and knows is always in advance of that other self which wills and acts and does." Hamilton Wright Mabie says: "It is impossible to do a great piece of work unless one can form an image of it in advance, unless one can see it as it will appear." The perfection of the whole is possible if the worker can keep the whole before him. That is what we are to do.

Sharp says: "The idea of the good is the cause of science and of truth. It gives to all objects of knowledge, not only the power of being known, but their being and existence." Plato says: "The purpose of education is to turn the soul around in order that the eye of the soul may be directed to the right quarter. That glimpse will make men to hunger after truth and despise all lower goods."

IV. We have been educated up to, and after this ideal. Have been put in trust with it. We are in a measure like to the boy at Holland dyke—who found a leak in the night time. He could keep it in safety with his one hand, if he stayed with it. He stayed with it. No other in the Universe of the Lord to do it, if he did not stay with it. He stayed with it.

There came to my house within three weeks a gentleman to see about putting a nephew in college—Classical Graduate. We had a little talk about the Biddle Brothers. Capital Punishment. He said he accepted it, and said, "of course, you do," and then went on to say: "You people hold a theory, but I don't know that I could go so far, but I rather admire the people who can. It would be a bad thing if no people would stand for divine law in civil government." That is worth keeping in mind. Paul says: "Avoid profane and vain babblings. Keep that which is committed unto thee." Our Lord stands alone. He cannot divide honors. You cannot give Him what He wants in the church and allow Baal in the state. One law is for all and everywhere. Such truth stands for its inherent value. Self-sufficient, self-centered, self-developing. Knowledge of important truth is power, it is disciplined power. As in the natural world, it is close, accurate, precise, painstaking, obedient, "rooted and grounded." If the law of gravitation is to be accepted anywhere, it is to be, everywhere; if by one soul, by all souls; if it is to rule a ball that a boy throws, it is to rule the planet; if it is to rule this round world, it is to rule that that weighs a pound or measures an inch. There is great value in a theory, especially if it concerns the state. That is too big a thing to be wrong. If you have clear conviction on great truth, you have what puts power in your hands—it increases your potentialities. You are not walking in a path with eyes blinded. You know where you are going. You know what is at the end of the road. You can have anticipations. You can live in hope. You have ideals, born of truth. You have the experiences of all the years that confirm faith. We cannot give up a theory that means so much. You must keep the name of the town to be reached on the guide post. It tells people the truth. All that see it, may not go, but when people get ready to go, they will all know where the town is, and by what road it can be reached. **Keep open.**

V. All records of the past go to show that movements preceded by such ideals will succeed. The knowledge of truth is power. That is the formula under which science for 300 years has won its victories. That that is presented must be the truth, must be in accordance with the whole scheme of things with all their uniformities, and the whole world of rational beings will avow it. How will it end? It will never end with you; it will go from one to another till by and by men will join hands and encircle the globe. All the questions that men may ask as to themselves can be answered by those who have answered the questions that pertain to their Lord. Garrison found God's truth as to one thing, and he proclaimed it, with nothing to aid, no associate save a negro lad, he stood up to tell twenty millions of people that they were wrong. In a little while he had made their indifference to be fury; turned the icebergs of apathy into flame (as Farrar puts it) and he lived to read the Emancipation of the dear Lincoln. That same dear Lincoln said to men, one of whom preached in this city, if not in this house, that he had lived to see the rights of men secured in this land, and he hoped that he might live to see the day when the rights of God, for which the delegation prayed, might be also won. (Mr. Alexander). There will be no danger to this land or any land if its sons, some of them only, be true to their convictions. This faith in what is to be in store, will be as a fire in the hearts of men. It is fire in the heart of the volcano that clothes the side of the mountain with gardens for the life of hamlets. But that fire must not die out else the gardens will die. Movement in the stream not only saves the stream from corruption, but sends it on to those who have never drank of its waters. May the currents be kept in motion, the good currents, meant for the good of men. The generation just preceding destroyed slavery. Please God, may the present one destroy intemperance or some other wicked thing. When I was a lad in Harrison county, O., near the river, many a morning when I came down, I would find my mother and the servant woman getting the warm food for blacks that had been brought in in the early hours. That group of men and women did their duty then. May it be ours, dear friends, to have as our mission something greater, that reaches farther than the help of men; that larger aim of good that embraces all the others, involves them all, includes them all—that is to others what the root is to every branch; what the fountain is to all streams, an aim that will put us in line not only with all great souls that have lived, but with Him who is Himself the light of all our life and whom all the angels adore. When He was among men whom He came to save, He was asked "if He were a King." He said He was born to be that, for this

cause He came into the world to bear witness unto this truth." That truth embraces every good thing we ought to do for God or for men; except for it there would be none of them at all. You know it takes just one color bearer for a troop—only one, but there must always be one. If this one falls, another must lift the standard—always something for the eyes of the men who follow. God allows it to you and to me that we shall be among those who are in the columns of advance—of that Army of God that has entered on the campaign that is to result in the conquest of the world.

Of all the great words of the great poet none mean more than those with regard to the knight that set out to find the "dark tower"—all others had failed. He had gone as he thought to the limit of endurance. He was ready to lie down to die, yet the tower was there to see, if only the cloud would lift from the face of the sun. "There rang in his ears the names of all the lost adventurers, there their ghosts stood, ranged along the hills to view the last of me—a living frame for one more picture—in a sheet of flame I saw them and I knew them all. And yet dauntless the slughorn to my lips I set and blew—"Childe Roland to the dark tower came." We won't fail now when the "City of God is about to come down from God out of heaven for men."

February 25, 1902.





Photomount  
Pamphlet  
Binder  
Gaylord Bros., Inc.  
Makers  
Syracuse, N. Y.  
PAT. JAN 21, 1908

BX8991  
.C5

Christian citizen-  
ship conference

Generated at Library of Congress on 2024-02-09 02:07 GMT / <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/1mu.300000112853464>  
Public Domain, Google-digitized / [http://www.hathitrust.org/access\\_use#pd-google](http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd-google)

ALF Collections Vault



3 0000 112 853 464