

AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONALISM
VOLUME II: RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES
Howard Gillman • Mark A. Graber • Keith E. Whittington

Supplementary Material

Chapter 7: The Republican Era – Individual Rights/Religion/Establishment

Proposed Constitutional Amendments on Religious Establishments

Many Americans responded to increased religious diversity in the United States by proposing constitutional amendments. The most important of these constitutional amendments, the Blaine Amendment, would have prohibited states from establishing any religious sect and prohibited state money from being given to sectarian schools. President Grant endorsed the amendment. The House of Representatives passed the amendment, but the measure failed by two votes to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate. Several other amendments were proposed at this time. The National Reform Organization sought a constitutional amendment that would make the United States officially a Christian country. The National Liberty League sought a constitutional amendment that would more strictly separate church from state.

When reading the following excerpts defending these different amendments, think about the Protestant/Catholic divide in American constitutional politics. To what extent are all three amendments different Protestant responses to increased religious diversity in the United States (and an increased number of Catholics)? How do you imagine the small number of Jews (and other tiny religious minorities) reacted to these amendments? To what extent were the religious amendments directed at the rise of secularism as well as Catholics? Was the Constitution capable of responding to this increased religious diversity?

President Ulysses Grant, "Seventh Annual Message"

As this will be the last annual message which I shall have the honor of transmitting to Congress before my successor is chosen, I will repeat or recapitulate the questions which I deem of vital importance which may be legislated upon and settled at this session:

...
Second. No sectarian tenets shall ever be taught in any school supported in whole or in part by the State, nation, or by the proceeds of any tax levied upon any community. Make education compulsory so far as to deprive all persons who can not read and write from becoming voters after the year 1890, disfranchising none, however, on grounds of illiteracy who may be voters at the time this amendment takes effect.

Third. Declare church and state forever separate and distinct, but each free within their proper spheres; and that all church property shall bear its own proportion of taxation.

Fourth. Drive out licensed immorality, such as polygamy and the importation of women for illegitimate purposes. To recur again to the centennial year, it would seem as though now, as we are about to begin the second century of our national existence, would be a most fitting time for these reforms.

The Blaine Amendment, House Version¹

No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by taxation in any State for the support of public schools or derived

¹ 4 *Congressional Record*, 44th Cong., 1st Sess. (1876), 5246.

from any public fund therefore, nor any public lands devoted therefor, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect or denomination; nor shall any money so raised or lands so devoted be divided between religious sects or denominations. This article shall not vest, enlarge, or diminish legislative power in Congress.

*The Blaine Amendment, Senate Version*²

No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under any State. No public property, and no public revenue of, nor any loan of credit by or under the authority of the United States, or any State, Territory, District, or municipal corporation, shall be appropriated to, or made or used for the support of any school, educational or other institution, under the control of any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination, or wherein the particular creed or tenets of any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination shall be taught and no such particular creed or tenets shall be read or taught in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by such revenue or loan of credit; and no such appropriation or loan of credit shall be made to any religious or anti-religious sect, organization or denomination, or to promote its interests or tenets. This article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Bible in any school or institution; and it shall not have the effect or impair rights of property already vested.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to provide for the prevention and punishment of violations of this article.

SENATOR FREDERICK FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey³

...

There are only two principles involved in this article for the amendment of the Constitution, as passed by the House or as now amended by the Senate:

- I. That there shall be no establishment of religion or prohibition of the free exercise thereof, and that there shall be no religious test as a qualification to office in the several States of the Union.
- II. That the people shall not be taxed to promote the particular creed or tenets of any religious or anti-religious sect or denomination.

...

There is, sir, no room for two opinions on the two propositions that religion and conscience should be free, and that the people should not be taxed for sectarian purposes. The whole history of our country, from its origin to the present day, establishes and fortifies these positions. And nothing can be clearer than that these fundamental rights should be secured in a constitutional ordained expressly to "establish justice" and to "secure the blessings of liberty."

...

Mr. President, it has been said that this amendment will prevent religious instruction in our prisons and other institutions supported by the public revenue. The clause which is relied upon to maintain that position is this:

And so such particular creed or tenets . . . of any religion or anti-religious sect or denomination shall be read or taught in any school or institution supported in part by [public] revenue.

Sir, does that prohibit religious instruction in prisons? Does it prevent religious instruction anywhere? If the visit to those who are sick and in prison is for the purpose of reading to them or of

² Ibid., 5580.

³ Ibid., 5561–62.

teaching them the particular creed or tenets of a religious or anti-religious sect or denomination, this article does interfere with it, and is designed to. Institutions supported by the money of all persuasions, even though they be prisons, are not to be made schools for teaching presbyterianism, or catholicism, unitarianism, or Methodism, or infidelity, or atheism, and this article says so. But this article goes no further. There is nothing in it that prohibits religion as distinguished from the particular creed or tenets of religious and anti-religious sects and denominations being taught anywhere.

That pure and undefiled religion which appertains to the relationship and responsibility of man to God, and is readily distinguishable from the creeds of sects; that religion which permeates all our laws, which is recognized in every sentence against crime and immorality, which is invoked in every oath, which is reverentially deferred to every morning at that desk and on like occasions at the capitol of every State of the Union; that religion which is recognized by our Presidents and governors every year in the thanksgivings of the people, to which one-seventh part of the century which has just closed has been devoted; that religion which is our history, which is our unwritten as well as our written law, and which sustains the pillars of our liberty, is a very, very different thing from the particular creeds or tenets of either religionists or infidels. And this article places no unhallowed touch on that religion. While we punish the violations of the oath or moral obligation, it would be monstrous by affirmative legislation to restrict religious instruction. . . .

Again, some one has said that he thought the Bible was a religious book. That remark arises, sir, from the provision in the article of amendment that sectarian creeds are to be excluded, but that this provision shall not be construed to exclude the Bible. Let me say that the saving clause in favor of the Bible is just, because it is a religious and not a sectarian book.

[W]e are told that there are different translations of the Bible. True, and yet there is but one Bible; that is the revelation from on High. There are various translations, and the excellence of this article is that it prevents the exclusion of any. Nothing in this article shall be construed to exclude either the Douay or the King James version. I am for the broadest toleration, but I would never agree to a constitutional amendment that would exclude from the schools the Bible. The Constitution should neither say that it should or should not be read in the schools. To attempt either would be to mingle politics with religion, which all would deprecate. Make the Bible a political ensign, and a party spirit such as clustered around the white and red rose would be aroused, in which perhaps there would be no more piety than there was in the spirit that animated Richard the Lion-hearted and his followers when they rallied around the cross, or Saladin and his Mohammedan hordes when they fought for the crescent.

Into such a conflict, having forsworn all idolatry, even though the Bible be on the shrine, I will not enter. "Put up thy sword, my kingdom is not of this world," is the injunction of our religion. But this article of the Constitution must not exclude it unless we come to the conclusion that the narrative of the creation, that the maxims of Solomon, that the logic of Paul, and those truths that have lighted up the future to unnumbered generations, are injurious to public morals?

Mr. President, where shall we go for public morals? If you must exclude the Bible you must banish all our literature or expunge it, for it would be the height of folly to say that it is lawful to drink from the conduits which human hands had made, but not from the pure fountain. Where shall we go? To the Koran? To Confucius? To the Mormon book of their lord? To the vain philosophy of the ancients? To mythological fables? No sir; the people of this country want that book alone. The Constitution must not touch it. It is to be forced upon no one and the Constitution is to make it unlawful to read it nowhere.

*National Reform Association, Proposed Constitutional Amendment*⁴

⁴ National Reform Association, *Proceedings of the National Convention to Secure the Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States* (Philadelphia, PA: Christian Statesmen Association, 1874), 5.

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, recognizing the being and attributes of Almighty God, the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, the law of God as the paramount rule, and Jesus, the Messiah, the Saviour and Lord of all, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

*Reverend T. P. Stevenson, "The Ends We Seek,"*⁵

...
... [W]e seek no union of Church and State. Not only do the promoters of the movement unanimously disclaim any such design, but it is never to be expected as a legitimate fruit of their work. The principle of this movement is, that the nation should acknowledge and serve God for itself, and not through the medium of any church establishment. The true relations of Church and State are prescribed by God, who is the author of them both. If both obey His law they can no more come into improper relations with each other than two planets can come into collision while both obey the law which binds them to one center. Why do any of you, my friends, deprecate a union of Church and State? The highest answer which can be given, and the one which includes all others, is that such an arrangement is contrary to the will of God. What then have you to fear from a movement whose sole aim is to lead the nation to acknowledge its obligation to the will of God? But if the relations of Church and State are left to be determined by shallow considerations of expediency, or by political intrigue, we have everything to fear. Through the immense largesses it receives from corrupt politicians, the Roman Catholic Church is, practically, the established church of the city of New York. These favors are granted under the guise of a seeming friendliness to religion. We propose to put the substance for the shadow, to drive out the counterfeit by the completer substitution of the true.

Further, what we propose is nothing of a sectarian character. It will give no branch of American Christians any advantage over any other. Its advocates are gathered from all branches of the church, not excluding those who prefer to be called "Liberal" rather than Evangelical, from whose ranks some of its ablest supporters have come.

I. I strike a responsive chord in every heart before me when I say that, first of all our movement aims to preserve the Christian institutions which have descended to us from our fathers. It is the settled policy of the enemies of Christianity to deny the fact, and to disparage the importance, of any connection which exists between the American government and the Christian religion. It is worth while to look for a moment at the proofs of such connection. Nothing but the teachings of Christianity makes any distinction between the first day of the week and other days. Yet that day is distinguished from all others by the statutes of every State in the American union, with only a single exception. Contracts made on that day are void. Legal processes cannot, on that day, be issued or returned. Trade and labor on that day are restrained by law. For all secular purposes it is a *dies non*, in the eye of the law. This is a fact of immense moral and religious value. No man can estimate the advantage to religion and the public morals from our civil Sabbath. No man who has not studied carefully the condition of countries where no Sabbath exists can forecast the evils of that day – whose coming may God forefend – when these restraints shall be lifted away; when the sharp competition of trade shall incite to unremitting labor and traffic; when the avenues of employment shall be more and more closed against Sabbath keeping men, and the keen temptations of such a state of affairs shall seduce our sons and daughters to disregard the day of rest.

The nation has from the beginning maintained public acts of civil worship in accordance with the Christian religion. The national Congress and all the State Legislatures are regularly opened with prayer. No Constitutional Convention, so far as known, has ever failed to invoke divine assistance by prayer, with the unfortunate exception of the Convention that framed the Constitution of the United States. Public Fasts and Thanksgivings are proclaimed by our state and national Executives. It is a very shallow

⁵ Ibid., 26–30.

view of the significance of these observances, which would say either that they are unmeaning forms, expressive of no sentiment in the heart of the nation, or that the nation worships by these acts some vague, uncertain power, and not the God of the Christian Scriptures.

Further, Public instruction in the Christian religion has always been maintained by the nation for all classes under its care. Three classes, at least, of the population are thus cared for. The first is a very large class, almost half of the whole people—the children of our schools, numbering fourteen millions and taught by two hundred and twenty thousand teachers. In all these schools, except where infidelity and Romanism have prevailed to cast the Bible out, the Christian Scriptures are read daily as the Word of God. Our text books are largely filled with selections from Christian literature. Christian morality is inculcated in the schools. He knows little of the workings of the human heart who disparages the importance of the impression thus made on the children of the republic. The men in our army and navy, and those under restraint in our jails and houses of correction, for all of whom Christian chaplains are provided by the government, are the other classes to whom I refer.

To these considerations I might add that the Christian law of marriage and divorce underlies our legislation on the social relations; that the names of God and Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit are guarded against blasphemy by our laws; that the oath, usually in some Christian form, is employed in all our courts of justice, and in all departments of the Government. These facts prove that the American Government was founded by the people as the organ through which the nation might enforce Christian morality in all its borders; might call on its God in the day of peril or distress, and give him thanks in the hour of prosperity, and might teach the name and the fear of God to its future citizens.

[Stevenson then discussed proposals made by the National Liberty League, see below]

The intelligent and consistent infidels who make these demands are not the whole army now moving to the assault on our Christian institutions. Every open violator of the Sabbath is to be counted in their ranks. Every railroad corporation that runs its trains on the Sabbath is a part of their forces. Every Sunday paper is an organ of this crusade on our Christian institutions. Every man who opposes the Bible in the schools is enlisted under the same banner. The whole Roman Catholic Church joins in their movement, through its hostility to the Bible in the hands of the people. And last of all, they are reinforced by a great multitude of Christians who are willing to surrender everything for the sake of peace. Let no one say, There is no danger of their success. They are succeeding. Our Sabbath laws and laws against blasphemy are fast becoming a dead letter on our statute books. Our divorce legislation, in many States, is a reproach to the Christian name. In St. Louis and other places the Bible has been already excluded from the schools. The legality of the resolution of the Cincinnati School Board, prohibiting prayer and the reading of the Scriptures, has recently been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the State. They are succeeding everywhere, and where are Christian people aroused and united to withstand them? Is there not need of a standard around which we may rally the friends of our Christian institutions? of some wise, comprehensive, efficacious measure in the advocacy of which we may combine all Christian people and inspire them with the enthusiasm which foretokens success? Such a measure, we propose It is the only movement to-day which directly antagonizes the infidel assaults on the Christian features of our government.

...

... The Constitution of the United States is the charter of our national government. It ought to cover and authenticate all acts of the government. It ought to express truly the actual character of the nation. Otherwise there is danger that what is not so protected will be regarded as unconstitutional, and the Constitution be used to overturn what it is its high office to conserve.

...

American institutions are studied with increasing attention in Europe. But they study mainly the National Constitution—not the laws of the States. The relation of our Government to the Christian religion is not indicated in that instrument, and thus we are misrepresented to the world. Christian men in Europe fear republican ideas, because they are connected in their minds with the abandonment of national religion. We owe it to God and the Christian faith, we owe it to the cause of popular government, to disabuse their minds of this impression.

Finally, we seek through this Amendment to render due homage to Almighty God, to Jesus Christ, the Ruler of nations, and to the law he has revealed for our guidance. If this Amendment is necessary to preserve our Christian institutions, it is then a supreme duty to God. If it is necessary to indicate to the world our Christian character, let us beware lest we fall under the censure of those who refuse to confess Christ before men. Is the Almighty God our Ruler? If he is, let us acknowledge him. Is Jesus Christ the providential ruler of the world, the dispenser of our blessings and chastisements, and able to save and to destroy? Gratitude and prudence combine to induce us to acknowledge him. Is the Bible supreme law for nations? Let us enthrone it where no man who professes loyalty to American institutions will be able to scoff at its authority.

...

*National Liberty League, Proposed Constitutional Amendment*⁶

SECTION I.—Neither Congress nor any State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or favoring any particular form of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or permitting in any degree a union of Church and State, or granting any special privilege, immunity, or advantage to any sect or religious body, or to any number of sects or religious bodies; or taxing the people of any State, either directly or indirectly, for the support of any sect or religious body, or of any number of sects or religious bodies; 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.

SECTION 2.—No religious test shall ever be required as a condition of suffrage, or as a qualification to any office or public trust, in any State. No person shall ever be deprived of any of his or her rights, privileges, or capacities, or disqualified for the performance of any public or private duty, or rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity, in consequence of any opinions he or she may hold on the subject of religion. No person shall ever be required by law to contribute directly or indirectly to the support of any religious society or body of which he or she is not a voluntary member.

SECTION 3.—Neither the United States, nor any State, Territory, municipality, or any civil division of any State or Territory, shall levy any tax, or make any gift, grant, or appropriation, for the support, or in aid, of any church, religious sect, or denomination, or any school, seminary, or institution of learning, in which the faith or doctrines of any religious order or sect shall be taught or inculcated, or in which religious rites or practices shall be observed; or for the support, or in aid, of any religious charity or purpose of any sect, order, or denomination whatsoever.

SECTION 4.—Congress shall have power to enforce the various provisions of this Article by appropriate legislation.

*National Liberty League, "Patriotic Address of the National Liberal League to the People of the United States."*⁷

...

... The dominant purpose of their hearts and the proud achievement of their hands were the foundation of a free commonwealth on the *self-evident equality of all men with respect to their natural rights*. . . No one man, no one class of men, can show any natural right to rule the rest, except the right which is *might*, and that right is tyranny, usurpation, immorality, wrong. From this absolute absence of any natural right to rule mankind, whether as lodged in one or in a few, results the *self-evident equality of all men* in the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That magnificent and inspiring principle is the soul of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution to which it ultimately led: it was the soul of the Revolutionary War, has been the soul of all our subsequent history, and will be the soul of all our future greatness. . . .

⁶ National Liberty League, *Equal Rights in Religion* (Boston: MA, National Liberty League, 1876), 5.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 163–69.

Now a free Commonwealth thus conceived and established, a national Constitution thus framed and ordained, presuppose the separation of Church and State; they can exist only by virtue of this principle; they must perish if ever this principle should be abandoned. . . . What does it mean? That the natural intelligence and moral sense of mankind, no matter what may be their views on the subject of religion, are adequate to all the proper purposes, functions, and powers of civil government; that it is never necessary to step outside of the circle of natural human faculties "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." These are the objects, and the only ones, which the Constitution was framed and ordained to secure; and the principle of the separation of Church and State means that they can be secured by the faculties which inhere in simple humanity, as such, — nay, more, that they will be defeated by permitting the Church to interfere with the workings of a civil government based on faith in the *sufficiency* of these universal and natural human faculties to protect all the interests of society. Such a government as this is a purely secular one; that is, it confines itself strictly to the secular objects above enumerated, and remands the whole subject of religion to the people in their individual capacity. It can establish no national Church and have no national religion; it favors none, it persecutes none, it recognizes none; it deals only with the political interests of the people, and has nothing to do with their religious interests further than to maintain their religious liberties and protect their equal religious rights. That is what the principle of total separation of Church and State means; and that is the general theory taken for granted in every line of our national Constitution. Without it, there could be no "government of the people, by the people, for the people"; without it the liberties of the individual, the natural rights of man, would vanish altogether. So long as the State exists by the sole will of the people, the people's liberties are self-protected and therefore safe; but so soon as it becomes in any degree, directly or indirectly, dependent on the Church, the people's liberties in that same degree must depend on the will of those who govern the Church. What fate in that case awaits the people's liberties, history with terrible plainness tells.

...
1. The Constitution of the United States is built on the principle that the State can be, and ought to be, totally independent of the Church: in other words, that the natural reason and conscience of mankind are a sufficient guarantee of a happy, well-ordered, and virtuous civil community, and that free popular government must prove a failure, if the Church is suffered to control legislation.

2. The religious rights and liberties of all citizens without exception, under the Constitution, are absolutely equal.

3. These equal religious rights and liberties include the right of every citizen to enjoy, on the one hand, the unrestricted exercise of his own religious opinions, so long as they lead him to no infringement of the equal rights of others; and not to be compelled, on the other hand, by taxation or otherwise, to support any religious opinions which are not his own.

...
5. Christians possess under the Constitution no religious rights or liberties which are not equally shared by Jews, Buddhists, Confucians, Spiritualists, materialists, rationalists, freethinkers, sceptics, infidels, atheists, pantheists, and all other classes of citizens who disbelieve in the Christian religion.

...
11. No religion can be true whose continued existence depends on continued State aid. If the Church has the truth, it does not need the unjust favoritism of the State; if it has not the truth, the iniquity of such favoritism is magnified tenfold.

...
If these propositions are true . . . we respectfully submit to you that they merit the attention of every enlightened and patriotic statesman, and of every just and large-minded citizen. They show that, as a nation, we are not to-day living in harmony with our own great national idea. . . . The principle of secular "government of the people, by the people, for the people," must be eventually abandoned, or eventually obeyed more faithfully. The issue touches the very existence of our political system, which cannot long survive in open violation of the very ideas which gave it birth. By exempting church property from taxation; by supporting chaplains out of the public treasury; by appropriating public funds for

sectarian institutions; by permitting Bible-reading and other religious services in the public schools, and thus perverting the public school system, for which all alike are taxed, into an instrument of religious propagandism by only a part of the people; by appointing religious fasts and festivals in the name of the government; by using the judicial oath instead of simple affirmation; by enforcing on the entire public the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, and by various other practices too numerous to mention,—we unite Church and State, and fail to carry out the essential principle of the Constitution. The Church is thus permitted to seize the whole power of the State, and compel large classes of citizens to contribute involuntarily to the support of religious opinions which are not their own. That is the result of all State favoritism to any particular religion; and it cannot be reconciled with the fashionable professions of regard for religious liberty.

All these real but unacknowledged connections of Church and State constitute at the same time private wrongs, public immoralities, and public dangers. They are private wrongs, felt to be such by rapidly-increasing multitudes of citizens, because they compel men to pay public homage to a faith which is not their own, and thus wound them deeply in their conscience and their self-respect. They are public immoralities, because they violate the great laws of justice, freedom, and equal rights, which are the very soul of political ethics. They are public dangers, because they sanction sectarian usurpations, inflame sectarian ambitions, and powerfully tempt to new sectarian encroachments; because *they* create an accumulating mass of precedents for trampling under foot the broad principle of the total separation of Church and State on which our whole government is founded; because they habituate the people to a semi-ecclesiastical administration of the State, breed fanatical plots against religious liberty and equal religious rights, and chafe thousands of our best and noblest citizens with a consciousness of religious oppression; in fine, because they sow the seeds of petty brawls in many places over politico-religious questions which ought never to arise, and because they have already brought the country face to face with an issue of terrible gravity, in our national politics, touching the future relation of the Church to the public school system. . . .

...
With these facts and principles before us, we have voted in convention to petition Congress to recommend to the several States for adoption such a “Religious Freedom Amendment” to the Constitution as shall effectually separate Church and State in fact as well as in theory, and protect all individual citizens in their equal religious liberties and rights. We now appeal to you to give your support to this great measure by your signatures, your voices, and your votes; and we present these brief reasons for our appeal :—

1. The “Religious Freedom Amendment” is not in any sense a change of the Constitution or an innovation either with regard to its spirit or its special provisions. On the contrary, it is a measure in precisely the same spirit as now pervades the Constitution, being based on the identical principle which, as we have shown, everywhere underlies it,—a measure which will only give greater extension to this principle, and make it supreme in the governments of the several States as well as in the national government.

2. The proposed amendment, being designed solely to preserve and perfect the existing secular character of the Constitution, is a thoroughly and wisely *conservative* measure, in the very best sense of the word. It aims, not to undermine, but to confirm and strengthen and enlarge what already exists.

...
4. The proposed amendment is an eminently timely measure to bring forward now. The public school amendment of the Hon. James G. Blaine, already proposed in Congress and evidently destined to come up for action before long, is a compromise between the ecclesiastical and the secular theories of government; if passed, it will not have the effect of secularizing the public schools, but will leave undisturbed the chief evil to be reformed. The welfare of the country demands that no studied ambiguity should be permitted in a Constitutional amendment on this subject; and no amendment which, like Mr. Blaine’s, will keep the Bible in the schools, and thereby fail to separate Church and State in the public school system, ought to be adopted. . . .

5. . . . We therefore hold that the “Religious Freedom Amendment” is the only measure which can permanently eliminate the Church question from party politics, because it is the only measure which can

settle that question in harmony with the Constitution. Does not true statesmanship point to its early adoption?

Fellow-citizens, we must go backward or forward; to stand still is as impossible for nations as for men. Two Constitutional amendments are offered to you for your choice, embodying two opposing principles between which human ingenuity will search in vain to find a mean. One fatally entangles the State with the Church, and plunges this young republic into all the bitterest embarrassments of the Old World. The other proclaims the absolute emancipation of the State from all these embarrassments, and sets her forever free, with her face to the future. The one violates the whole spirit of the Constitution, strikes a deadly blow at the very heart of Liberty, and foredooms the nation to a career from which it may well shrink back aghast. The other carries the Constitution up to a higher and nobler fulfilment of its own matchless ideal, makes Liberty and Love kiss each other, and sets the crown of a resplendent destiny on the nation's brow. One or the other, by the irresistible logic of ideas and events, must in some form be ultimately incorporated in our fundamental law: when, and how soon, it is for you, the people of the United States, to say. But our duty is discharged. Our cause is still that of our forefathers, whose great Declaration of Independence echoes forever "through the corridors of time"; and here, on the hundredth anniversary of that mighty word, we as solemnly declare the STATE'S TOTAL INDEPENDENCE OF THE CHURCH. Will you ratify this new word of freedom?



OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS