

I will not <sup>here</sup> stop to point out that this opinion is false on the face of it. There is 2  
a religious establishment & endowed by law, a state church, and a law of jurisdiction whereby  
the crown is tied to that legal Church & Religion. Past this, I will pass over.  
Let us take the argument thus. All civil & political interests ought to be represented.  
Do believe nothing deprives you of civil & political interests therefore the civil & political  
interests of those who believe nothing ought to be represented.

I will now again pass over the fallacy that to believe nothing is a civil & political  
right or interest. If it be a right or interest at all it is in the ~~other~~ order of religion  
not of politics. And to say that the civil & political interests of unbelievers must be  
represented by unbelievers is as logical as to say "Who drives fat oxen must himself  
be fat." Civil & political interests may be represented by Catholics, Christians, or Jews  
if their interests of the representative be identical with the interests of the  
represented: or if they be <sup>personally chosen</sup> conscientiously faithful to his constituents in civil  
political matters. Religion is excluded by the hypothesis <sup>both</sup> from the representation  
of the represented. An unbelieving town does not need an unbelieving member  
to represent its civil & political interests, for religion <sup>is not one of them.</sup> ~~does not enter into them~~: much  
less their religious interests for they have none.

Yet all this confusion lies hid in the arguments of those who contend for the  
absolute separation of religion from politics.

These however are inconsistencies with which we need not waste our time. The main & true issue is this. Does the law of England at this moment require religious belief <sup>natural or revealed</sup> of any kind as a condition a qualification for the office & duties of a legislator?

The existence of the Oath, & <sup>the</sup> affirmation (which two religious bodies alone are admitted is a sufficient ~~proof~~ <sup>proof</sup>). They differ in form but not in obligation. They both imply moral responsibility and a belief in a supreme legislator <sup>who</sup> require the law of England <sup>at this moment</sup> require at least this religious belief of Quakers Moravians, & Jews as a condition to making our laws.

But we are told that unbelievers take the oath & make the affirmation therefore we ought to abolish it, & require only a promise of civil allegiance to the Crown & to the Law.

I will suppose that the oath & religious affirmation are both abolished, and a civil promise only to exist. Let us appreciate the change.

- First - all revealed religion is thereby excluded.
- Secondly all natural religion is likewise excluded.

Lastly the "theistic" oaths or tests as they are called, by the Ball Mill Gazette of March 6, being abolished we explicitly declare that Atheists are fit & proper persons to make laws for Catholics, Christians, & Jews.

If it be said that the laws they make will not touch religion, but only civil & political interests I answer they will touch education, marriage, & divorce, and morals, & crimes against morals in a thousand forms.