

☞ We are requested to publish the following extract from the New York Observer, and the accompanying remarks :

**Judge Clayton** — Judge Clayton quotes the Bible in support of the doctrine of passive obedience, in support of the duty of christians to submit to human government in all cases whatsoever! We can find no other meaning in that part of his remarks in which he replies to the plea of the missionaries. The state of Georgia had passed a law requiring all white men residing in the Cherokee territory to take the oath of allegiance. The missionaries refused to take this oath on the ground of conscientious scruples. They believed that Georgia had no right of jurisdiction in the Cherokee territory; and that an oath of allegiance would be an oath to support her in her usurpation. How does Judge Clayton reply to this plea? He contends that the missionaries, notwithstanding their conscientious conviction that the power claimed by Georgia is an usurpation, (for if he does not mean this, he means nothing to the purpose) are still bound on christian principles to take the oath. He says that Holy Writ requires us "to submit ourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; that it enjoins upon the citizen "to keep the king's [State's] commandment;" that it directs "to render under Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," that it declares "whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God," and finally he comes out with his doctrine fully and explicitly in the following sentence :

To my mind, and I would feign believe to every dispassionate man, there is no good reason for running upon the severe penalty of the law, and foolishly defying its consequences. It cannot be excused upon any principle of sound religion or a rational and discreet desire to serve the cause of piety, for surely that religion which requires us to "render tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor," never could demand such resistance to laws of the land, as would incur in the delinquent a forfeiture of all the enjoyments of liberty, and impose in their stead all the hardships of an ignominious slavery.

We are surprised that any man in this country calling himself a christian, and especially any man holding the station of a judge, should manifest such ignorance of the genius of christianity and of the whole tenor of the Bible, as Judge Clayton discovers in his application of the texts quoted above. We presume that there are few Sunday scholars in Georgia, certainly there are few children of ten years of age in this part of the country, who cannot show Judge Clayton that he has totally mistaken the meaning of these passages; and that the Bible abounds with examples of holy men, who not only made "such resistance to laws of the land" as incurred "the forfeiture of all the enjoyments of freedom, and imposed all the hardships of an ignominious slavery," but who resisted even in the face of death in its most horrid form. Why were Shadrach, Meshech and Abednego thrown into the burning fiery furnace? Because they refused to obey a law of Nebuchadnezzar their king. Why was Daniel thrown