

assumed, my friend's question became more precisely defined: *Whether I must not wish to be assured by a revelation that in the future life I should be exempt even from finite misery?*

No, I answered; this misery can be nothing other than a well-deserved chastisement; and, in God's paternal household, I shall gladly suffer the chastisement I deserve.

But what if the All-merciful wished to remit man's well-deserved punishment, too?

He will certainly do so as soon as the punishment is no longer indispensable for the improvement of man. I need no direct revelation to convince me of this. Whenever I transgress the laws of God, the moral evil [thereby engendered] makes me unhappy; and God's justice, that is, his all-wise love, seeks to guide me to moral improvement by means of physical misery. As soon as this physical misery, the punishment for sin, is no longer indispensable for my repentance [lit. change of mind], I am, without revelation, as certain that my Father will remit the punishment as I am certain of my own existence. And, in the opposite case, if this punishment is still useful for my moral improvement, I do not wish to be exempt from it in any way. In the state of this paternal ruler, the transgressor suffers no other punishment than the one he himself must wish to suffer were he to see its effects and consequences in their true light.

But, replied my friend, cannot God deem it proper to let a man suffer as an example to others; and is not exemption from this exemplary punishment to be desired?

No, I answered, in God's state no individual suffers merely for the benefit of others. If this should happen, this sacrifice for the benefit of others must confer a higher moral worth on the sufferer himself; it must also be important to him, for the sake of the inferior increase of his perfection, to have promoted so much good by his suffering. And if this is the case, I cannot *fear* such a condition; nor can I *wish* for a revelation [assuring me] that I shall never be placed in this condition of magnanimous benevolence which brings felicity to my fellow creatures and myself. What I have to fear is sin itself. In case I have committed a sin, the divine

punishment is a benefit to me, an effect of his paternal all-mercifulness. As soon as it ceases to be a benefit to me, I am assured that it will be remitted. Can I wish that my Father withdraw his chastising hand from me before it has had the effect it was meant to produce? If I request that God let a transgression of mine go entirely unpunished, do I know what I am requesting? Oh, surely this too is a quality of God's infinite love that He allows no transgression of man to go entirely unpunished. Surely

All-power is God's alone;

And love also is Thine, o Lord!

When Thou renderest to everyone according to his deeds.

Ps. 62:12-13.

That the doctrine of God's mercy was on this important occasion first made known to the nation through Moses, the Psalmist attests in another place, where he quotes from the writings of Moses the same words of which we are now speaking:

He showed His ways to Moses,

His doings to the Israelites;

All-merciful is the Lord, all-gracious,

Long-suffering and of great goodness.

He will not always contend,

Neither will He keep His anger forever.

He dealeth not with us after our sins,

Nor requiteth us according to our iniquities.

As the heaven is high above the earth,

So His love is toward them that revere Him.

As far as morning is from evening,

So far He removeth our transgressions from us.

Even as fathers have compassion upon their children,

So hath the Lord compassion upon them that revere Him.

For He knoweth our frame;

He remembereth that we are but dust, etc.*

(Ps. 103)

* The contents of this entire psalm are altogether of the utmost importance. Interested readers will do well to peruse it in its entirety with attention and to compare it with the above remarks. It seems evident to me that it was occasioned by this remarkable passage in Scripture and that it is but an outburst of fervent emotion, to which the poet was led by contemplation of this extraordinary event. Therefore, at the beginning of the psalm he summons his

Now I can summarize briefly my conceptions of the Judaism of former times and bring them into a single focus. Judaism consisted, or, according to the intention of the founder, was to consist of:

1. Religious doctrines and propositions or *eternal truths* about God and his government and providence, without which man cannot be enlightened and happy. These are not forced upon the faith of the nation under the threat of eternal or temporal punishments, but, in accordance with the nature and evidence of eternal truths, recommended to rational acknowledgement. They did not have to be given by direct revelation, or made known through *word* and *script*, which are intelligible only *here* and *now*. The Supreme Being has revealed them to all rational creatures through *things* and *concepts* and inscribed them in the soul with a script that is legible and comprehensible at all times and in all places. For this reason our much-quoted poet sings:

The heavens declare the majesty of God,
And the firmament announceth the work of His hands;
From one day this doctrine floweth into another;
And night giveth instruction to night.
*No teaching, no words,
Without their voice being heard.
Their choral resoundeth over all the earth,
Their message goeth forth to the ends of the world,
To the place where He hath set a tent for the sun, etc.*

Their effect is as universal as the beneficent influence of the sun, which, as it hurries through its orbit, sheds light and warmth over the whole globe. As the same poet explains still more clearly in another place:

From sunrise to sundown
The name of the Lord is praised.

_____ soul to the most solemn thanksgiving for the divine promise of his grace and paternal mercy: "*Bless, my soul, the Lord! Forget not all his benefits! He forgiveth all thine iniquities, He healeth all thy diseases. He redeemeth thy life from destruction, He crowneth thee with love and mercy,*" etc.

Or, as the prophet says in the name of the Lord: *From the rising of the sun to its setting, My name is great among the heathens, and in every place frankincense is presented unto My name, even pure oblations, for My name is great among the heathens.*

2. Historical truths, or records of the vicissitudes of former ages, especially of the circumstances in the lives of the nation's forefathers; of their having come to know the true God, of their way of life before God; even of their transgressions and the paternal chastisement that followed them; of the covenant which God concluded with them; and of the promise, which He so often repeated to them, to make of their descendants, in the days to come, a nation consecrated to Him. These historical records contained the foundation for the national cohesion; and as historical truths they can, according to their nature, not be accepted in any other manner than on *faith*. Authority alone gives them the required evidence; these records were also confirmed to the nation by miracles, and supported by an authority which was sufficient to place the *faith* beyond all doubt and hesitancy.

3. Laws, precepts, commandments and rules of life, which were to be peculiar to this nation and through the observance of which it should arrive at national felicity, as well as personal felicity for each of its individual members. The lawgiver was God, that is to say, God not in his relation as Creator and Preserver of the universe, but God as Patron and Friend by covenant of their ancestors, as Liberator, Founder and Leader, as King and Head of this people; and He gave his laws the most solemn sanction, publicly and in a never heard-of, miraculous manner, by which they were imposed upon the nation and all their descendants as an unalterable duty and obligation.

These laws were *revealed*, that is, they were made known by God, through *words* and *script*. Yet only the most essential part of them was entrusted to letters; and without the unwritten explanations, delimitations, and more precise determinations, transmitted orally and propagated through oral, living instruction, even these written laws are mostly incomprehensible, or inevitably became

so in the course of time. For no words or written signs preserve their meaning unchanged throughout a generation.

The written as well as the unwritten laws have directly, as *prescriptions for action* and rules of life, public and private felicity as their ultimate aim. But they are also, in large part, to be regarded as a kind of script, and they have significance and meaning as ceremonial laws. They guide the inquiring intelligence to divine truths, partly to eternal and partly to historical truths upon which the religion of this people was founded. The ceremonial law was the bond which was to connect action with contemplation, life with theory. The ceremonial law was to induce personal converse and social contact between school and teacher, inquirer and instructor, and to stimulate and encourage rivalry and emulation; and it actually fulfilled this mission in the early period, before the constitution degenerated and human folly again interfered to change, through misunderstanding and misdirection, the good into evil and the useful into the harmful.

In this original constitution, state and religion were not conjoined, but *one*; not connected, but identical. Man's relation to society and his relation to God coincided and could never come into conflict. God, the Creator and Preserver of the world, was at the same time the King and Regent of this nation; and his oneness is such as not to admit the least division or plurality in either the political or the metaphysical sense. Nor does this monarch have any needs. He demands nothing from the nation but what serves its own welfare and advances the felicity of the state; just as the state, for its part, could not demand anything that was opposed to the duties toward God, that was not rather commanded by God, the Lawgiver and Regent of the nation. Hence, in this nation, civil matters acquired a sacred and religious aspect, and every civil service was at the same time a true service of God. The community was a community of God, its affairs were God's; the public taxes were an offering to God; and everything down to the least police measure was part of the *divine service*. The Levites, who lived off the public revenue, received their livelihood from

God. They were to have no property in the land, for *God is their property*. He who must sojourn outside the land serves *foreign gods*. This [statement which occurs] in several places in Scripture cannot be taken in a literal sense. It actually means no more than that *he is subject to alien political laws which, unlike those of his own country, are not at the same time a part of the divine service*.

The same can be said of the crimes. Every sacrilege against the authority of God, as the lawgiver of the nation, was a crime against the Majesty, and therefore a crime of state. Whoever blasphemed God committed lese majesty; whoever sacrilegiously desecrated the Sabbath implicitly abrogated a fundamental law of civil society, for an essential part of the constitution was based on the establishment of this day. "*Let the Sabbath be an eternal covenant between Me and the children of Israel,*" said the Lord, "*a perpetual sign that in six days the Eternal, etc. . . .*" Under this constitution these crimes could and, indeed, had to be punished civilly, not as erroneous opinion, not as *unbelief*, but as *misdeeds*, as sacrilegious crimes aimed at abolishing or weakening the authority of the lawgiver and thereby undermining the state itself. Yet, nevertheless, with what leniency were even these capital crimes punished! With what superabundant indulgence for human weakness! According to an unwritten law, corporal and capital punishment could not be inflicted unless *the criminal had been warned by two unsuspected witnesses with the citation of the law and the threat of the prescribed punishment*; indeed, where corporal or capital punishment were concerned, the criminal had to *have acknowledged the punishment in express words, accepted it and committed the crime immediately afterwards in the presence of the same witnesses*. How rare must executions have been under such stipulations, and how many an opportunity must the judges have had of avoiding the sad necessity of pronouncing a sentence of death over their fellow creature and fellow image of God! *An executed man is, according to the expression of Scripture, a reproach to God*. How much the judges must have hesitated, investigated, and considered excuses before they signed a sentence

of death! Indeed, as the rabbis say, any court competent to deal with capital offenses and concerned for its good name must see to it that in a period of *seventy* years not more than one person is sentenced to death.

This clearly shows how little one must be acquainted with the Mosaic law and the constitution of Judaism to believe that according to them *ecclesiastical right* and *ecclesiastical power* are authorized, or that temporal punishments are to be inflicted for unbelief or erring belief. *The Searcher for Light and Right*, as well as Mr. Mörschel, are therefore far removed from the truth when they believe I have abolished Judaism by my rational arguments against ecclesiastical right and ecclesiastical power. Truth cannot be in conflict with truth. What divine law commands, reason, which is no less divine, cannot abolish.

Not unbelief, not false doctrine and error, but sacrilegious offenses against the majesty of the lawgiver, impudent misdeeds against the fundamental laws of the state and the civil constitution were punished; and these were punished only when the sacrilege exceeded all bounds in its unruliness, and came close to rebellion; when the criminal was not afraid to have the law quoted to him by two fellow citizens, to be threatened with punishment and, indeed, to take the punishment upon himself and commit the crime in their presence. Here the religious villain becomes a sacrilegious desecrator of majesty, a state criminal. Moreover, as the rabbis expressly state, *with the destruction of the Temple, all corporal and capital punishments and, indeed, even monetary fines, insofar as they are only national, have ceased to be legal*. Perfectly in accordance with my principles, and inexplicable without them! The civil bonds of the nation were dissolved; religious offenses were no longer crimes against the state; and the religion, as religion, knows of no punishment, no other penalty than the one the remorseful sinner *voluntarily* imposes on himself. It knows of no coercion, uses only the staff [called] *gentleness*, and affects only mind and heart. Let one try to explain rationally, without my principles, this assertion of the rabbis!

But why, I hear many a reader ask, why this prolixity to tell us something that is very well known? Judaism was a hierarchy, an ecclesiastical government, a priestly state, a theocracy, if you will. We already know the presumptions which such a constitution permits itself.

By no means! All these technical terms cast the matter in a false light, which I must avoid. Invariably, all we want to do is to classify, to fit things into pigeonholes. Once we know in which pigeonhole a thing is to be placed, we are content, however incomplete the concept we have of it may otherwise be. But why do you seek a generic term for an individual thing, which has no genus, which refuses to be stacked with anything, which cannot be put under the same rubric with anything else? This constitution existed only once; call it the *Mosaic constitution*, by its proper name. It has disappeared, and only the Omniscent knows among what people and in what century something similar will again be seen.

Just as, according to Plato, there is an earthly and also a heavenly Eros, there is also, one might say, an earthly and a heavenly politics. Take a fickle adventurer, a conqueror of hearts, such as are met with in the streets of every metropolis, and speak to him of the *Song of Songs*, or of the love of erstwhile innocence in Paradise, as Milton describes it. He will believe that you are raving, or that you wish to rehearse your lesson as to how to overwhelm the heart of a prude by means of Platonic caresses. Just as little will a politician à la mode understand you if you speak to him of the simplicity and moral grandeur of that original constitution. As the former knows nothing of love but the satisfaction of base lasciviousness, the latter speaks, when statesmanship is the subject, only of power, the circulation of money, commerce, the balance of power and population; and religion is to him a means which the lawgiver uses to keep the unruly man in check, and the priest—to suck him dry and consume his marrow.

This false point of view, from which we are in the habit of regarding the true interest of human society, I had to remove from

the eyes of my reader. For this reason, I have not called the object by any name, but sought to represent it with its properties and determinations. If we look at it directly, we shall see in true politics, as a philosopher said of the sun, a deity, where ordinary eyes see a stone.

I have said that the Mosaic constitution did not persist long in its erstwhile purity. Already in the days of the prophet Samuel, the edifice developed a fissure which widened more and more until the parts broke asunder completely. The nation asked for a visible king as its ruler, a king of flesh and blood, perhaps because the priesthood had already begun to abuse the authority which it had among the people, as Scripture reports about the sons of the High Priest, or perhaps because the splendor of a neighboring royal household dazzled the eyes. In any event, they demanded a king such as all other peoples have. The prophet, aggrieved by this, pointed out to them the nature of a human king, who had his own requirements and could enlarge them at will, and how difficult it was to satisfy an infirm mortal to whom one has transferred the rights of the Deity. In vain; the people persisted in their resolution, obtained their wish and experienced what the prophet had threatened them with. Now the constitution was undermined, the unity of interests abolished. State and religion were no longer the same, and a collision of duties was no longer impossible. Still, such a collision must have been a rare occurrence, as long as the king himself not only was of the nation, but also obeyed the laws of the land. But let one follow history through all sorts of vicissitudes and changes, through many good and bad, God-fearing and godless regimes, down to that sad period in which the founder of the Christian religion gave this cautious advice: *Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God what is God's*. Manifest opposition, a collision of duties! The state was under foreign dominion, and received its orders from foreign gods, as it were, while the native religion still survived, retaining a part of its influence on civil life. Here is demand against demand, claim against claim. "To whom shall we give? Whom shall we obey?" Bear both burdens—went the advice—as well as you can; serve two masters

with patience and devotion. Give to Caesar, and give to God too! To each his own, since the unity of interests is now destroyed!

And even today, no wiser advice than this can be given to the House of Jacob. Adapt yourselves to the morals and the constitution of the land to which you have been removed; but hold fast to the religion of your fathers too. Bear both burdens as well as you can! It is true that, on the one hand, the burden of civil life is made heavier for you on account of the religion to which you remain faithful, and, on the other hand, the climate and the times make the observance of your religious laws in some respects more irksome than they are. Nevertheless, persevere; remain unflinchingly at the post which Providence has assigned to you, and endure everything that happens to you as your lawgiver foretold long ago.

In fact, I cannot see how those born into the House of Jacob can in any conscientious manner disencumber themselves of the law. We are permitted to reflect on the law, to inquire into its spirit, and, here and there, where the lawgiver gave no reason, to surmise a reason which, *perhaps*, depended upon time, place, and circumstances, and which, *perhaps*, may be liable to change in accordance with time, place, and circumstances—if it pleases the Supreme Lawgiver to make known to us His will on this matter, to make it known in as clear a voice, in as public a manner, and as far beyond all doubt and ambiguity as He did when He gave the law itself. As long as this has not happened, as long as we can point to no such authentic exemption from the law, no sophistry of ours can free us from the strict obedience we owe to the law; and reverence for God draws a line between speculation and practice which no conscientious man may cross. I therefore repeat my earlier protestation: Weak and shortsighted is the eye of man! Who can say: I have entered into God's sanctuary, gauged the whole system of his designs, and am able to determine its measure, goal, and boundaries? I may surmise, but not pass judgment nor act according to my surmise. If in things human I may not dare to act contrary to the law on the mere strength of my own surmise and legal sophistry, without the authority of the lawgiver or cus-

today of the law, how much less may I do so in matters divine? Laws that depend on the possession of the Land [of Israel] and institutions governing it carry their exemption with them. Without Temple and priesthood, and outside Judea there is no scope for either sacrifices or laws of purification or contributions to the priests, insofar as these depend on the possession of the Land. But personal commandments, duties imposed upon a son of Israel, without regard to the Temple service and landed property in Palestine, must, as far as we can see, be observed strictly according to the words of the law, until it shall please the Most High to set our conscience at rest and to make their abrogation known in a clear voice and in a public manner.

This is obviously a case of "what God has joined together man may not tear asunder." Even if one of us converts to the Christian religion, I fail to see how it is possible for him to believe that he thereby frees his conscience and rids himself of the yoke of the law. Jesus of Nazareth was never heard to say that he had come to release the House of Jacob from the law. Indeed, he said, in express words, rather the opposite; and, what is still more, he himself did the opposite. Jesus of Nazareth himself observed not only the law of Moses but also the ordinances of the rabbis; and whatever seems to contradict this in the speeches and acts ascribed to him appears to do so only at first glance. Closely examined, everything is in complete agreement not only with Scripture, but also with the tradition. If he came to remedy entrenched hypocrisy and sanctimoniousness, he surely would not have given the first example of sanctimoniousness and authorized, by example, a law which should be abrogated and abolished. Rather, the rabbinic principle evidently shines forth from his entire conduct as well as the conduct of his disciples in the early period. *He who is not born into the law need not bind himself to the law; but he who is born into the law must live according to the law, and die according to the law.* If his followers, in later times, thought differently and believed they could release from the law also those Jews who accepted their teaching, this surely happened without his authority.

And you, dear brothers and fellow men, who follow the teachings of Jesus, should you find fault with us for doing what the founder of your religion did himself, and confirmed by his authority? Should you believe that you cannot love us in return as brothers and unite with us as citizens as long as we are outwardly distinguished from you by the ceremonial law, do not eat with you, do not marry you, which, as far as we can see, the founder of your religion would neither have done himself nor permitted us to do? If this should be and remain your true conviction—which we cannot suppose of Christian-minded men—if civil union cannot be obtained under any other condition than our departing from the laws which we still consider binding on us, then we are sincerely sorry to find it necessary to declare that we must rather do without civil union; then that friend of mankind, Dohm, will have written in vain, and everything will remain in the melancholy condition in which it is now, or in which your love of mankind may think it proper to place it. It does not rest with us to yield on this matter; but it does rest with us, if we are honest, to love you, nevertheless, as brothers, and to beseech you as brothers to make our burdens as bearable as you can. Regard us, if not as brothers and fellow citizens, at least as fellow men and fellow inhabitants of the land. Show us ways and provide us with the means of becoming better men and better fellow inhabitants, and permit us to be partners in enjoying the rights of humanity as far as time and circumstances permit. We cannot, in good conscience, depart from the law, and what good will it do you to have fellow citizens without conscience?

"But, if so, how will the prophecy come true that someday *there will be only one shepherd and one flock?*"

Dear brothers, who have the best intentions toward mankind, do not allow yourselves to be deluded! In order to be under the care of this omnipresent shepherd the entire flock need neither graze in one pasture nor enter and leave the master's house through a single door. This is neither what the shepherd wants nor advantageous to the prosperity of the flock. Is it a case of mistaking ideas or deliberately seeking to confuse them? One puts it

to you that a union of faiths is the shortest way to the brotherly love and brotherly tolerance which you kindhearted people so ardently desire. There are some who want to persuade you that if only all of us had one and the same faith we would no longer hate one another for reasons of faith, of the difference in opinion; that [in such a case] religious hatred and the spirit of persecution would be torn up by their roots and extirpated; that the scourge would be wrested from the hand of hypocrisy and the sword from the hand of fanaticism, and the happy days would arrive, of which it is said *the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard beside the kid*, etc. The gentle souls who make this proposal are ready to go to work; they wish to meet as negotiators and make the humanitarian effort to bring about a compromise between the faiths, to bargain for truths as if they were rights, or merchandise for sale; they want to demand, offer, haggle, obtain by hook or by crook, surprise and outwit until the parties shake hands and the contract for the felicity of the human race can be written down. Many, indeed, who reject such an enterprise as chimerical and impracticable, nevertheless speak of the union of faiths as a very desirable state of affairs, and sadly pity the human race because this pinnacle of felicity cannot be reached by human powers. Beware, friends of men, of listening to such sentiments without the most careful scrutiny. They could be snares which fanaticism grown impotent wants to put in the way of liberty of conscience. You know that this foe of the good has many a shape and form: the lion's fury and the lamb's meekness, the dove's simplicity and the serpent's cunning; no quality is so foreign to it that it either possesses it not or knows not how to assume it in order to attain its bloodthirsty purposes. Since, through your beneficent efforts, it has been deprived of overt power, it puts on, perhaps, the mask of meekness in order to deceive you; it feigns brotherly love, effuses human tolerance, and secretly forges the fetters which it means to place on reason, so that it may hurl it back again unawares into the cesspool of barbarism, from which you have begun to pull it up.*

* Atheism, too, has its fanaticism, as sad experience teaches. True, it might

Do not believe this to be a merely imaginary fear, born of hypochondria. At bottom, a union of faiths, should it ever come about, could have but the most unfortunate consequences for reason and liberty of conscience. For supposing that people do come to terms with one another about the formula of faith to be introduced and established, that they devise symbols to which none of the religious parties now dominant in Europe could find any reason to object. What would thereby be accomplished? Shall we say that all of you would think just alike concerning religious truths? Whoever has but the slightest conception of the nature of the human mind cannot allow himself to be persuaded of this. The agreement, therefore, could lie only in the words, in the formula. It is for this purpose that the unifiers of faiths want to join forces; they wish to squeeze, here and there, something out of the concepts; to enlarge, here and there, the meshes of words, to render them so uncertain and broad that the concepts, regardless of their inner difference, may be forced into them just barely. In reality, everyone would then attach to the same words a different meaning of his own; and you would pride yourselves on having united men's faiths, on having brought the flock under a single shepherd? Oh, if this universal hypocrisy shall have any purpose whatsoever, I fear it would be intended as a first step again to confine within narrow bounds the now liberated spirit of man. The shy deer would then be sure enough to let itself be captured and bridled. Begin only by binding the faith to symbols, the opinion to words, as modestly and pliantly as you please; only es-

never become rabid unless compounded by *inner* atheism. But that *external*, overt atheism can also become fanatical is as undeniable as it is difficult to understand. As much as the atheist, if he wishes to be consistent, must always act out of *selfishness*, and as little as it seems to accord with selfishness when he seeks to propagate atheism and does not keep the secret to himself, one, nevertheless, has seen him preach his doctrine with the most ardent enthusiasm, become enraged and, indeed, launch persecutions if his preaching did not meet with a favorable reception. And zeal is frightful when it takes possession of an avowed atheist, when innocence falls into the hands of a tyrant *who fears all things but no God*.

tablish, for once and for all, the articles: then woe to the unfortunate, who comes a day later, and who finds something to criticize even in these *modest, purified* words! He is a disturber of the peace. To the stake with him!

Brothers, if you care for true piety, let us not feign agreement where diversity is evidently the plan and purpose of Providence. None of us thinks and feels exactly like his fellow man; why then do we wish to deceive each other with delusive words? We already do this, unfortunately, in our daily intercourse, in our conversations, which are of no particular importance; why then also in matters that have to do with our temporal and eternal welfare, our whole destiny? Why should we make ourselves unrecognizable to each other in the most important concerns of our life by masquerading, since God has stamped everyone, not without reason, with his own facial features? Does this not amount to doing our very best to resist Providence, to frustrate, if it be possible, the purpose of creation? Is this not deliberately to contravene our calling, our destiny in this life and the next?—Rulers of the earth! If it be permitted to an insignificant fellow inhabitant thereof to lift up his voice to you: do not trust the counselors who wish to mislead you by smooth words to so harmful an undertaking. They are either blind themselves, and do not see the enemy of mankind lurking in ambush, or they seek to blind you. Our noblest treasure, the liberty to think, will be forfeited if you listen to them. For the sake of your felicity and ours, *a union of faiths is not tolerance*; it is diametrically opposed to true tolerance! For the sake of your felicity and ours, do not use your powerful authority to transform some *eternal truth*, without which civil felicity can exist, into a *law*, some *religious opinion*, which is a matter of indifference to the state, into an *ordinance of the land*! Pay heed to the [right] *conduct* of men; upon this bring to bear the tribunal of wise laws, and leave us *thought and speech* which the Father of us all assigned to us as an inalienable heritage and granted to us as an immutable right. Should, perhaps, the link between *right* and *opinion* be too prescriptive, and should the time not yet be

ripe for abolishing it completely without courting damage, try, at least, to mitigate as much as you can its pernicious influence, and to put wise limits to prejudice that has grown gray with age.* At least pave the way for a happy posterity toward that height of culture, toward that universal tolerance of man for which reason still sighs in vain! Reward and punish no doctrine, tempt and bribe no one to adopt any religious opinion! Let everyone be permitted to speak as he thinks, to invoke God after his own manner or that of his fathers, and to seek eternal salvation where he thinks he may find it, as long as he does not disturb public felicity and acts honestly toward the civil laws, toward you and his fellow citizens. Let no one in your states be a searcher of hearts and a judge of thoughts; let no one assume a right that the Omniscient has reserved to himself alone! If we render unto *Caesar* what is *Caesar's*, then do you yourselves render unto *God what is God's! Love truth! Love peace!*

* Alas, we already hear the Congress in America striking up the old tune and speaking of a *dominant religion*.