

J. M. Williams

**ANSWERS
TO
OBJECTIONS
TO THE
PROPOSED
CHRISTIAN
AMENDMENT**

"Kiss the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him."

Ps. 2

Nearly every Christian instinctively assents to the proposition that Jesus Christ ought to be acknowledged in every department of life. That he is Lord over all may be said to be universally conceded by His followers. And yet, when it is urged that we ought to become specific and acknowledge Christ openly in our civic affairs, not a few, though they love our Lord sincerely, seem to hesitate. "We should be glad to see His Name written in our fundamental law," they say, "were it not for this, or that, or the other." This leaflet is issued with a view to clearing up not only the commonest, but, as appears to us, the most seemingly serious objections that are offered in opposition to the recognition of the authority and law of Jesus Christ in the Constitution of the United States.

To begin with, men will often say that to write the Name of God or Jesus Christ into our Federal Constitution would not make us a Christian nation. As a mere assertion, of course, the statement is true. The trouble is that it loses sight of the only means by which such an end could be accomplished. The name of Jesus Christ cannot be written into our Constitution until, as a matter of fact, the vast majority of the people of the United States become loyal followers of our blessed Lord, and then, as a consequence of that experience, demand, out of the fer-

veny of a genuine love, that His Name shall find an honored place in the program of government which we "ordain and establish" for the regulation of our national life. Ordinarily a man does not profess to be a Christian until he becomes a Christian. Similarly, it is not likely that the United States will make the profession until it shall have experienced the reality. Once having experienced the reality, however, it surely ought to acknowledge the fact. The object of the present movement is to create the Christianity—to create it, that is to say, where it does not exist—and in addition, to arrest the attention of millions of Christians who, through inadvertency, have not become aware that our national Constitution knows neither God nor Jesus Christ. Dr. Timothy Dwight, the President of Yale, said in 1812, "We formed our Constitution without any acknowledgment of God, without any recognition of His mercies to us as people, of His government, or even His existence. The Convention, by which it was formed, never asked, even once, His direction or His blessing upon their labors. Thus we commenced our national existence, under the present system, without God." We are in precisely the same situation yet. Governmentally we are trying to get along without God and without Jesus Christ. The question is—Are the Christians of this land willing to have it so? We think they are not. At all events, if they are, our aim is to create that profound moral

sentiment, that irresistible religious conviction, that will be satisfied with nothing short of Christianity, in the very essence of it, in the innermost heart and life of that corporate entity which we call the State; for we know that in such a case—and only in such a case would it be desirable—the State will not be slow to recognize its Lord and replace His present civic "crown of thorns" with a civic crown of glory.

But some one will say, "The Jew might object." Well, suppose he does. It would not be the first time in history that the Jew has said, "We will not have this man to reign over us." Is it possible that the objector would have this nation of ours assume the attitude of the Jew toward Christ? The Jew cried, "Crucify Him, Crucify Him." And anyway, why should we go to the Jew for lessons in statecraft? Has the Jew been the empire builder of the Christian era? The Jew destroyed his own nation by rejecting Christ; shall we follow the Jew's example to save the Jew's feelings? Would even that save his feelings? Have the Jew's feelings been the object of much consideration since he said, "Away with Him." Jesus of Nazareth was a Jew. We propose to give the highest honor to One who clothed himself with Jewish flesh and blood. Why should the Jew object if the Gentile be willing? It is impossible to be neutral. Which side shall we take? Let it be clearly understood once for all that the present proposal is not in any

sense an attempt to force Christianity either on the Jew or on anybody else. It is a proposal that our nation, in its corporate capacity, shall accept Jesus Christ as its King. Admittedly the nation will have to become Christian in point of fact before this can be done. If, then, the nation should become in fact a Christian nation, why should the Jew or any one else object to its making a public profession to that effect? Has the Jew any right to find fault with me, if I, on accepting Christianity, proceed at once to confess my love for Jesus Christ and openly own my allegiance to Him? But the state is under the same obligation. The real objection of the Jew, when we burrow to the bottom of it, is primarily an objection to the thing in itself, then, after that, an objection to its full and open avowal. But the thing in itself is the noblest civic ideal conceivable. A genuine Christian nation, composed of more than a hundred million souls, sincerely accepting Jesus Christ as its Sovereign and Guide, and gratefully acknowledging His Name above every name—that, in reality is what the Jew objects to. The Jew objects to Christianity anywhere and everywhere. Are you on his side? The proposed Christian Amendment, to be sure, will awaken opposition. But what of it? Every worthy ideal does that. The Jew like all other opponents will have to be won, of course. But nothing good and laudable is impossible. It is for us who are Christians

to get to work and do it. And if we should be able to win all other classes, outside of the Jew, first, and should thus become a Christian nation without the Jew's acquiescence, would we not in this way be furnished with the crowning argument for approaching the Jew? The Jewish Messiah, as the word itself implies, was to be King. "The government" was to be "upon His shoulder." If we really have the immortal interests of the Jew at heart, let us do our uttermost to have Christ the Lord, the "blessed and only Potentate," honored and obeyed in our civic life, and acknowledged as our Sovereign in our fundamental law, that we may make the argument for the Hebrew mind conclusive and complete, and bring the Jew to the feet of Jesus.

Even yet, however the question may be raised—**Can this be done without in the meantime infringing on the rights of the Jew?** Would not the acknowledgment of Christ disfranchise the Jew? Would it not embarrass him, if he were elected to office, to have to swear, on assuming his duties, to carry on the government according to a Federal Constitution which honored Christ? Frankly, it doubtless would. Under such conditions he might be so conscientious as to be obliged to decline the office. But let us remember that the nation is greater than the man. Would the nation be likely to be the loser if the requirements for office were framed in such a way as to bar out anybody

and everybody who could not swear to exercise the functions of government in the spirit of loyalty to Jesus Christ? After all, the state does not exist merely in order that anybody, regardless of character, may hold office. Why, a man who is only thirty-four years old cannot be President. The good of the state demands that he shall be at least thirty-five. The discrimination may be more or less of a hardship for the men who are under the limit, but it is regarded as an incalculable blessing to the rest of our hundred millions. So too, in a still more intrinsic sense, would it be an inestimable blessing if none but men who could conscientiously swear allegiance to Jesus Christ could be inducted into office not only in this, but in any other land. The good of the state is the paramount consideration.

Incidentally also, how about the Christian? If the Jew cannot conscientiously vote or hold office under a Constitution that honors Christ, how can a Christian conscientiously do the same under a Constitution that ignores Him? Is the Jew the only man in this country that is to be regarded as having a conscience? There is no use in side-tracking; the thorough Jew and the thorough Christian cannot agree on the question of honoring Jesus Christ. There is no middle ground. One of the two has to have his way. But the very genius of our government is that the majority shall rule. Shall a little group of between two and three million Jews, then,

prevent over seventy-five million Christians—for it would take approximately three-fourths of the people to ratify the Christian Amendment—from recognizing nationally their most intimate Friend, their inseparable Companion, their incomparable Teacher, their omnipotent Saviour, their unerring Guide, and their loving and beloved Sovereign, the Prince of Peace? The Jew has no right to ask us who love our blessed Lord to be untrue to Him in any sphere.

Moreover it is the prevalence of the spirit of Christianity in the United States that makes this land a refuge for the Jew. Why, then, should he object to Christianity in its final triumph in the realm of state? We have even now a larger expression of Christianity in our national life than any other nation in the world. Why does the Jew prefer America to any other nation? Why is it so hard to create enthusiasm among the Jews for the Zionist movement? If our nation were to become thoroughly Christian would the Jews all emigrate to Jerusalem for conscience sake? Not immediately. And if they would—Brewers and their customers, far outnumbering the Jews, objected to the Eighteenth Amendment but it was passed and is now a law of the land. What about the Brewer? The question should not be, "What about the Jew?" but "What about the country if the Jew has his way?" Christianity is the only hope of the country and it is the only hope of the Jew.

Shall the rule of the majority, applicable in everything else, be abortive when we come to deal with the most vital issue which any nation under the sun has ever had to confront? The State should no more hesitate to become Christian and publicly confess itself to be such than an unregenerate man should. Why not honor Christ and let the Jew take care of himself? A Christian nation would furnish the Jew as well as all other opponents of Jesus Christ, if they were willing to live peaceably, the finest and most advantageous place of habitation on the earth. No honorable person has anything to fear from Christianity, whether it be in a man or in a nation of men.

Once more, however, the question is asked—Would not this attempt to Christianize the nation be a practical reversion to the obsolete doctrine of the union of Church and State? Well, what Church, for example? There is quite a variety of denominations—for instance, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, the Baptist, the Congregational, the Lutheran, the Episcopalian. With which of these denominations, or of any others, would the United States be united in case it became a Christian nation? All these denominations believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and yet **they** are not united. The union of church and state does not and cannot come into the question at all. Back of the Church stands Christ. Back of the State stands Christ. Only when a Church, as an institu-

tion, acknowledges the Lord Jesus Christ fully and unreservedly, and orders its life accordingly, does it approach the divine ideal for the Church. Also, only when a State as a separate institution, acknowledges the Lord Jesus Christ fully and unreservedly, and orders its life accordingly, does it approach the divine ideal of the State. Christ is not so limited that He can work through the one institution but not through the other. Each organism works, and will keep on working, in its own sphere, in the expression of its own nature, in the fulfillment of its own functions. But when the State becomes Christian, each, in its own way, will become a channel for the realization of the spirit, the ethics, the teachings, the ideals, the authority and the law of Jesus Christ in the life of man. There is no reason why Christ should be barred out of the State. The two are not synonymous. Not the **union**, but the **separation**, of Church and State is the cardinal doctrine of the advocates of national Christianity.

Nor would there be any danger of confusion in the actual administration of affairs. To raise any ecclesiastical question under such a regime would be just as impossible as it is today. Suppose that the Preamble of the United States Constitution acknowledged Christ. Suppose that the oath of office prescribed for the President required the President to swear in the name of God. Suppose that the "religious test" clause, in keep-

ing with these provisions, should then read: No religious test, other than sworn allegiance to this Constitution, shall ever be required of any officer. Under such conditions a man, coming forward to take the oath of office, would not be asked any questions about his Church, or even his religion. The Constitution would be before him. It would be a Christian document. Thus, loyalty to the Constitution would be not simply the supreme test: it would be the only test. There could be no place whatsoever for ecclesiastical complications.

Once more. A feeble brother quotes John 18:36—"My kingdom is not of this world," and declares that Christ means that His kingdom is not in this world, nor over this world, in fact has nothing to do with this world.

If that were true about one third of the Bible would be meaningless. Does anyone suppose that Jesus Christ, in a sentence, gave the lie to all the prophets had spoken concerning Him and His kingdom? Not every one can read Greek, of course, but the man that cannot read Greek ought to be willing to accept the evidence of men who both read it and understand it. Godet, the most penetrating and judicious commentator on the Gospel by John, says on this passage:—"The expression *ek tou kosmou* (of this world) is not synonymous with *en to kosmo*

(in this world), for the kingdom of Jesus is certainly realized and developed here on earth; but it does not have its origin from earth, from human will and earthly force." (Italics his.) There is nothing in this passage, or in any other passage, that limits the extent of the authority of Jesus Christ as Lord of all, or that excuses anyone on earth, in any relationship of life, any king or judge, any state or nation, from the obligation to recognize His sovereign power and obey His law.

In spite of all objections, whether these or others, let us make our nation Christian. The supreme question is—would Christ object?

There can be no valid objection to doing what the eternal and sovereign God says all nations must do.

"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."

Ps. 22

"All nations shall call Him blessed."

Ps. 72

Additional copies of this pamphlet
and other literature on this subject may
be obtained free of charge by address-
ing

THE WITNESS COMMITTEE

119 Federal St., Pittsburgh, Pa.