STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP

II.

The True Idea of the State

By the REV. DAVID HALESFÉR, D.D., LL.D.

In studying the principles and duties of Christian Citizenship it may be well to begin with a definition of the words, "nation," "state" and "government."

The first of these three words, "nation," is from the Latin verb "nasci," "to be born.

Word "nation," and refers to the origin of the civil or political being, suggesting also the solution of its constituent elements by birth. This term stands closely connected with Aristotle's famous definition of man as "he breathes a political animal." [See his "Politics," Book I, ii. 9.] This has been followed by many celebrated writers, such as Bluntschli, who says der Staat ist der Mensch, "the state is man." The bearing of all this on the origin of the state will be considered in another study. For the present it is sufficient to say that the word "nation" gives the idea of a social or collective civil or political being grounded in man's nature, born with man, and found wherever the generations of mankind are born into the world.

The second word "state" from the Latin verb "stare," "to stand" or "to endure," expresses more
particularly the permanence or continuity of the political being. The generation of mankind with which the nation has its birth passes away, but the state remains. Louis XIV. of France, arrogantly applying to himself what political writers in his own country had said, the state is mine," ventured to affirm, "c'est moi," "I am the state," but when dying he explained, "I pass away, but the state shall endure." This term "state" has a twofold sense, particularly in our own country, where it is employed to signify one of the many commonwealths of which our Union is composed. In this sense the word begins with a capital. When not capitalized, the word "state" is generally used as synonymous with the word "nation," as in the sentence, the United States form a single state. The term "state" seems preferable and is the one generally used by writers on political science for the nation with its organized government.

The third term, "government," is from a Greek verb meaning, "to steer or direct." It is applied literally to the steering or controlling of a boat, "GOVERNMENT," and then figuratively to the directing or controlling of the ship of state. The government of a state or nation is not the nation or state itself. It may pass away like a reigning monarch, to be succeeded by another government. Not only did the monarch Louis XIV. pass away, but the French monarchical government ceased to exist, while the state or nation of France still endures as a republic.

Thus the nature of the true idea of the state from God. In other words, the Creator has implanted in mankind the true idea of the state. In this way the state, like the family, is a divine institution, and civil government, like marriage, an ordinance of God. The di
tively appointed order of things in man's nature, had no evil interposed, would have developed the state in the course of human history according to its true idea.

Writers on political science have distinguished between the concept and the idea of the state. Perhaps a clearer distinction would be between the state as an historical fact and the state conforming to its true idea. Any actual state may be termed as by Bluntschli, "die politisch organisierte Volksperson eines bestimmten Landes [the politically organized public person of a definite land]," ("Lehre vom modernen Staat," vol. I., p. 24), or as by Prof. Burgess of Columbia University, "a particular portion of mankind viewed as an organized unit" ("Political Science," vol. I., p. 51); and it may be affirmed that the concept of a state, or its principle of unity, is that particular phase (36)
of human nature, and of human need, which at any particular stage in the development of that nature, is predominant and commanding. But that is the conception of a state and not the true idea of the state. It is the concept or true idea of what any state may actually be, but not the ideal state. And hence the study of all the states that have ever existed in human history cannot furnish us with the true idea of the state. It is the record of history as well as the teaching of revealed theology, that the state as well as individual man and the family has fallen from the idea originally implanted in man's nature.

History serves as a warning against corruptions of the state, and enforces the duty of discovering amid departures from the divinely appointed nature of things the true idea of the state. (Compare Dorrn's "Christian Ethics," section 33a.) Revealed moral law affords the needed supplement to the light of nature in attaining to the true idea of the state. The law of God who made man and imbedded the state in his nature is given in both nature and revelation. The Holy Scriptures of the Christian religion must be studied along with the history of nations in order to grasp fully and clearly the idea of the Christian state, which in man's fallen condition is the true idea of the state. A very considerable part of the most trustworthy history of ancient nations is found only in the Sacred Scriptures. And throughout the Word of God large portions of legislation, poetry, prophecy and doctrinal teaching apply directly to the state. No wonder Milton has honored the Holy Scriptures, "As better teaching The solid rules of civil government In their majestic, unaffected style Than all the oratory of Greece or Rome; What makes a nation happy and keeps it so, What ruins kingdoms and lays cities flat." (Paradise Regained, Book iv., 345.)

The ideal state of the perfect future will have learned from history and the natural and revealed laws of God the true idea of its constitution and administration. It will be helpful to try to analyze the idea of the state. What elements may be noted as included in it? "The analysis of the idea of the state. A Social Being. The state a social or collective being. It is made up of individuals dwelling together in a community of life. An old Latin proverb reads, "unus homo nullus homo (a man alone is not truly man.) When the triune Jehovah made
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man in His own image. He made him a social being. The social nature of man is thus a proof of the trinity of persons in the godhead. Aristotle's "political animal" would not be the highest type of animal creation were it not for its pre-eminent social nature. The word political implies dwelling together in the social bonds of a city or other civil community.

2. The state is an organized society. Bluntschli says, "der Staat ist die organisierte Menschheit"; again, "der Staat ist die politisch organisierte Völkerwesen." That is, "the state is organized humanity—the organized national person." It is not a mass-metting. Much less is it a collection of individual parts held together by external pressure. It is not like a flock of birds or a swarm of bees. It is not a mere physical organism. Herbert Spencer's political theory finds a complete analogy between civil society and a physical being. (See Social Statics, p. 9.) But the organism of the state is not one that sickens and weakens and dies a natural death. It is a self-conscious organism which need know no decadence, except in the violation of the law of its true idea. "There is no fatal necessity, no iron decree coming down from between mountains of brass, compelling the certain decline and disastrous fall of nations. Many a Samaria has fallen nowhere, but not one without a crime." (Dr. J. R. W. Sloan, in "Christian Statesman" of Sept. 2, 1867.) As the old Roman senator Cicero affirmed of the state, "it is constituted to be perpetual." Hence,
of the state. The true idea of the state can never admit an inferior to its sovereignty. That would mean two coincident political organizations controlling one and the same national domain, a condition necessarily subversive of national unity and life. Closely related to this is

5. **Sovereignty.** The state is vested soverigny. That is, no external earthly power is over the state. Deprive a state of its sovereignty, and it ceases at once to be a state. There can be international tribunals whose decisions will influence the conduct of a state. And a sovereign state may limit itself; but if limited by any other earthly power it has lost its sovereignty. This element in the true idea of the state emphasizes the necessity of national subjection to divine law. The true idea of the state teaches sovereignty under the Supreme Ruler. A declaration of national independence like that of our revolutionary fathers should acknowledge dependence on God.

6. **The state is a Moral Personality.** A fuller discussion of this point will follow in a special study. In connection with the sovereignty of the state it should here be remarked in passing that the immediate subjection of a sovereign power to divine law makes that power itself the interpreter of that law. It may avail itself of aid from other sources in reaching an accepted application of God's law to its own conduct; but as a sovereign state, with no earthly superior, it must finally interpret and apply that law for itself. This it is competent to do only as a true moral person. (For a pretty full discussion of this point, see "Manual of Christian Civil Government," pp. 368-369.)

Bluntschli, *Quoted.*

"The state is a moral person, that is, a being which can and ought to be conscious of its duties, and which for the fulfillment of these duties is responsible before God and mankind." (Bluntschli's "State," p. 14.)

"The individual becomes a person in the nation, and this involves the existence of the nation as also a person, for personality, as it is formed in relations, can subsist only in an organic and moral relationship—a life which has a universal end... The condition of the being of the nation, as the power and minister of God in history, is in its moral personality." ("The Nation," by Mulford, pp. 21, 22.)


Other references will be found on particular points in the course of these discussions.
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III.

The Origin of the State

By the REV. DAVID McALLISTER, D.D., LL.D.

(For fuller references to helpful literature on the present topic, see at the close of the preceding study on "The True Idea of the State." Special references on particular points will be found in the course of the following discussion. All who would make a study of the origin of the state should carefully review the preceding article.)

Writers on political science differ widely in their views of the origin of the state. It would not be profitable in this study to consider all these different theories; but a brief discussion of some of them is important, as it will help to a clearer idea of the true origin of the state. What may properly be called the four chief theories of the origin of the state will be here considered: 1. That the state originated as a necessity evil, 2. That it is the product of history, 3. That it is of divine origin. The last of these theories, it will be seen at once, conflicts with the view already given of the true idea of the state. It (38)
is believed that a candid examination of all
these theories will confirm the statement that
the last one embraces every element of truth
in the other three, and that no one of
these three, or any of the various modifications
of them, can be harmonized with the facts of
political science and the true idea of the insti-
tution of the state.

1. The first theory is

THE SOCIAL COMPACT that the state has its
origin in a social comp.

act. This theory was
first propounded by the celebrated infidel writer
Hobbes in a work called "Leviathan," an im-
personation of the tremendous power of gov-

derment. This was afterward modified by
Locke in his treatise on "Government." A cen-
tury after Hobbes the no less celebrated French
infidel, Rousseau, developed the theory into its
most widely accepted form in his book entitled
"Du Contrat Social."

What gives to Americans a more than ordi-
nary interest in this theory is its wide accept-
ance in our own country at the time of the
founding and adopting of our national written
constitution. Notable among its able advocates
was Thomas Jefferson, who, as that profound student of our Constitution, Von Holst,
says, "grew intoxicated even to madness" with the
political philosophy of Rousseau, while resid-
ing in Paris. (See "Constitutional History of the
United States," vol. 1, p. 33.)

Before Jefferson succeeded Franklin as our
minister to France his influence as a disciple
of Rousseau had been widely felt at home, and
the social compact theory had found expression
in some of our State Constitutions, notably that
in most respects excellent fundamental law of
Massachusetts, of 1779, which says, "the body
politic is formed by a voluntary association of
individuals. It is a social compact." (See
Hough's "American Constitutions," vol. 1, 627.)

According to Rousseau and his disciples the
compact or contract is between individuals,
coming out of a so-called state of nature freed-


from all government. This act of association
produces a moral and collective body; . . . this
public person . . . takes now the name republic
or body politic. ("Du Contrat Social," book I,
chapter 6.)

History records no
such contract as the

PURITAN CONSCIENCE. It was a mere fancy, ab-

series in itself and rejected by all the oldest
writers on civil government in all civilized
lands as without foundation in the facts of his-
tory. (See in addition to the authors named in
the general references, Maine's "Ancient Law,"
209; also his "Popularity of Government," 134-137;
Willoughby's "Nature of the State," 79-84.)

A Written Constitu-
tion more than a

Compact.

The written constitution of a state or na-
tion may, in a certain
sense, be termed a

compact. But this

compact or contract as to the form of gover-

[17] 2
ment and the distribution of governmental powers is made by the state instead of the state having its origin in it. Thus a formal constitution, considered as a compact, cannot create the state. The state, on the other hand, makes the compact. Besides, such a fundamental instrument is no mere compact. It is more. It is an authoritative ordinance of the political body already existing. This is the teaching of Bancroft, Webster, and Justice Wilson whose President Roosevelt has so cordially endorsed. (See article on "James Wilson," by Lucien H. Alexander, Esq., in the North American Review, Mid-November number, 1906, page 926.)

The social compact

This theory theory was logically and succinctly used in the effort to justify secession. If the nation originated as a compact into which certain parties entered, why might not the same parties dissolve the compact? If they could in this way make the state, why could they not, if unable longer to agree, in the same way unmake it? Had the North as well as the South been willing to consider the union, would that have justified the wrong of secession? There was a national life back of all contracts, a sacred trust to be unalterably maintained at any cost from generation to generation. The war of the rebellion was practically the uprooting of the social contract theory from the best political thinking of our country. "This theory," says Prof. John Fiske, of Harvard University, "was once famous, and exerted a double influence on political history, and it is still interesting in the same way that spinning-wheels and wooden tripes and powdered wigs are interesting, but we now know that men lived in civil society, with complicated laws and customs and creeds for many thousand years before the notion had ever entered anybody's head that things could be regulated by contract." ("Civil Government in the United States," 1883.)

An element of truth

Eleveny of Truth distorted into error

IN THIS THEORY may be seen in this as in almost every false theory. In one aspect civil government, as the Bible teaches, is an "ordnance of man." (See 1 Peter 2:11.) The governments of states are organized by men. Human agency is at work in the development of the actual states or nations of history, and in the framing of their governments. Defects are noted and steps are consciously taken to remedy them by changes in organization. In this sense, civil government is an ordinance of man, and peace is found for social contracts, or constitutions as they may be called, written or unwritten, and for their amendment. But that is a very different matter from ascribing the origin of the state as an institution to any compact, political, social or otherwise.

2. The theory that Necessary Evil

The state originates as

THEORY, a necessary evil. The most eminent and most consistent advocate of this theory is Het-
of government is true only of criminal law—that "its existence in any shape is a sign of man's imperfection." ("Historical Essays," 4th series, 335.) The "minister of God" must be a terror to evil-doers in order to be a praise to them that do well. (Romans 13:4.) He is sent by God for this double purpose. (1 Peter 2:16)

A sufficient refutation of this theory is given by a quotation from the preamble to our National Constitution, in which, as also in our State Constitutions generally, the beneficent ends of civil government are stated. These are "to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." These and their governments, even when very imperfect, seek these objects and in greater or less measure generally attain them. The state is a blessing to mankind, and the worthy civil ruler "a minister of God for good." (Romans 13:4.)

The only proper application of this theory is to the state's punishment of crime. Criminal law with its severe penalties may be said to be a necessary evil. In this sense, as the Scriptures declare, "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners." (1 Timothy 1:9.) What Prof. Freeman says of its existence in any shape is a sign of man's imperfection." ("Historical Essays," 4th series, 335.) The "minister of God" must be a terror to evil-doers in order to be a praise to them that do well. (Romans 13:4.) He is sent by God for this double purpose. (1 Peter 2:16)

A sufficient refutation of this theory is given by a quotation from the preamble to our National Constitution, in which, as also in our State Constitutions generally, the beneficent ends of civil government are stated. These are "to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." These and their governments, even when very imperfect, seek these objects and in greater or less measure generally attain them. The state is a blessing to mankind, and the worthy civil ruler "a minister of God for good." (Romans 13:4.)

The only proper application of this theory is to the state's punishment of crime. Criminal law with its severe penalties may be said to be a necessary evil. In this sense, as the Scriptures declare, "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners." (1 Timothy 1:9.) What Prof. Freeman says of its existence in any shape is a sign of man's imperfection." ("Historical Essays," 4th series, 335.) The "minister of God" must be a terror to evil-doers in order to be a praise to them that do well. (Romans 13:4.) He is sent by God for this double purpose. (1 Peter 2:16)

A sufficient refutation of this theory is given by a quotation from the preamble to our National Constitution, in which, as also in our State Constitutions generally, the beneficent ends of civil government are stated. These are "to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." These and their governments, even when very imperfect, seek these objects and in greater or less measure generally attain them. The state is a blessing to mankind, and the worthy civil ruler "a minister of God for good." (Romans 13:4.)

The only proper application of this theory is to the state's punishment of crime. Criminal law with its severe penalties may be said to be a necessary evil. In this sense, as the Scriptures declare, "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners." (1 Timothy 1:9.) What Prof. Freeman says of its existence in any shape is a sign of man's imperfection." ("Historical Essays," 4th series, 335.) The "minister of God" must be a terror to evil-doers in order to be a praise to them that do well. (Romans 13:4.) He is sent by God for this double purpose. (1 Peter 2:16)

A sufficient refutation of this theory is given by a quotation from the preamble to our National Constitution, in which, as also in our State Constitutions generally, the beneficent ends of civil government are stated. These are "to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." These and their governments, even when very imperfect, seek these objects and in greater or less measure generally attain them. The state is a blessing to mankind, and the worthy civil ruler "a minister of God for good." (Romans 13:4.)

The only proper application of this theory is to the state's punishment of crime. Criminal law with its severe penalties may be said to be a necessary evil. In this sense, as the Scriptures declare, "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners." (1 Timothy 1:9.) What Prof. Freeman says of its existence in any shape is a sign of man's imperfection." ("Historical Essays," 4th series, 335.) The "minister of God" must be a terror to evil-doers in order to be a praise to them that do well. (Romans 13:4.) He is sent by God for this double purpose. (1 Peter 2:16)

A sufficient refutation of this theory is given by a quotation from the preamble to our National Constitution, in which, as also in our State Constitutions generally, the beneficent ends of civil government are stated. These are "to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." These and their governments, even when very imperfect, seek these objects and in greater or less measure generally attain them. The state is a blessing to mankind, and the worthy civil ruler "a minister of God for good." (Romans 13:4.)

The only proper application of this theory is to the state's punishment of crime. Criminal law with its severe penalties may be said to be a necessary evil. In this sense, as the Scriptures declare, "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners." (1 Timothy 1:9.) What Prof. Freeman says of its existence in any shape is a sign of man's imperfection." ("Historical Essays," 4th series, 335.) The "minister of God" must be a terror to evil-doers in order to be a praise to them that do well. (Romans 13:4.) He is sent by God for this double purpose. (1 Peter 2:16)
as the Patriarchal Theory." Once more: "Society in primitive times... was an aggregation of families." (See "Ancient Law," 115, 121, and throughout chapter 5; see also Maine's "Village Communities," 15 and following pages.)

Other eminent authors hold in substance the Family Theory. to this theory. (See "The State," sections 4, 13, 119, by Prof. Woodrow Wilson, of Princeton University.) Section 23 of this work, however, harmonizes better with the theory of the divine origin of the state in man's nature, than it affirms of the state that "in its origin it was spontaneous, natural, twin-born with man and the family." This is the view of the able Spanish writer, Prof. Posada, who says, "La familia y la sociedad son contemporáneas [the family and society are contemporary]"—that is, in their origin. (See "Derecho Político," vol. 1, 14.) This author has published also a special treatise entitled, "Teorías modernas acerca del Origen de la Familia, de la Sociedad, y del Estado [Modern Theories concerning the Origin of the Family, Society and the State]," in which he contends at length that the state does not originate from the family as from a germ, but that in the development of the family into a grouping of families, becoming wider and wider, we have the primitive form of the state. (Compare Starch, "La Famille Primitive," 9. 10.)

Sir Henry Sumner Maine, while attempting to draw his proof from the Scriptures, admits that they favor a higher germ of the state. He says: "The families of Jacob and Esau separate and form two nations; but the families of Jacob's children hold together and become a people. This looks like the innate germ of the state or commonwealth, and of an order of rights superior to the claims of family relation." (See "Ancient Law," 130.) The above admission suggests the true relation of Family and State. The former is within and under the latter. A mere aggregation of families, or the indefinite extension of a family, may develop a horde or tribe but not an objective state and much less the institution of the state. Single families, aggregations or extensions of families, come properly under an authority from first to last above them all. Says Prof. Willoughby, of Johns Hopkins University, "It is only by the necessarily primitive character of the patriarchal authority, and the extent to which the state in its early period of development recognized the power of the father, and utilized his authority for the obtaining of many of its aims, that confidence is given to the idea that the state developed from the family. So dissimilar are the aunts of the two institutions, that the one could not have owed its origin to the other."

SCRIPTURES DO NOT SUSTAIN THIS THEORY. Maine, while attempting to draw his proof from the Scriptures, admits that they favor a higher germ of the state. He says: "The families of Jacob and Esau separate and form two nations; but the families of Jacob's children hold together and become a people. This looks like the innate germ of the state or commonwealth, and of an order of rights superior to the claims of family relation." (See "Ancient Law," 130.) The above admission suggests the true relation of Family and State. The former is within and under the latter. A mere aggregation of families, or the indefinite extension of a family, may develop a horde or tribe but not an objective state and much less the institution of the state. Single families, aggregations or extensions of families, come properly under an authority from first to last above them all. Says Prof. Willoughby, of Johns Hopkins University, "It is only by the necessarily primitive character of the patriarchal authority, and the extent to which the state in its early period of development recognized the power of the father, and utilized his authority for the obtaining of many of its aims, that confidence is given to the idea that the state developed from the family. So dissimilar are the aunts of the two institutions, that the one could not have owed its origin to the other."
separation of the state in its origin and sovereignty from God and his moral law, lies the essence of political secularism or political atheism. It is this theory that has led even Prof. Burgess to declare, "we must hold to the principle that the state can do no wrong." ("Political Science," vol. I, 57.) In the organization of states in the progress of history the political scientist by this theory finds no place for God. "Man through history has been the sole, immediate force in the accomplishment of this." (Ibid, 64.) The state, like the atheistic individual, is thus "without God and without hope in the world." The disproof of this secular idea will find its appropriate place in the proof of the divine origin of the state.

The Secular Historical Theory represents a school of political science which affirms that "from their own inherent nature, divine or moral sanctions can have no application to political matters." (See "Nature of the State," 54, 55.) According to this, the state originates in human history without any relation to the laws of God and the rules of morality. The bearing of this on the source of the state's authority will be considered in the next study of this series. That discussion will aim to show that in this

other. The family never was and never can become a subject of public law. Its interests are necessarily private." ("Nature of the State," 20, 21.)

No collections of individuals as such can be a political unit. It is only a mass-meeting. So no expansion of a family, nor any aggregation of families can produce the political being. The individual and family, as such, belong to relations essentially private. It follows that if only the individual and family spirit and will are found in active operation in human life, then, however numerous the individuals or families, the existence of the state as a collective being with a common spirit and united will in public and political matters would be inconceivable. (Compare Bluntschli's "Geschichte der neueren Staatswissenschaft" [History of the more recent Political Science], 348; also Jellinek's "Gesetz und Verordnung [Law and Order]," 192.)

Prof. Willoughby represents a school of political science which affirms that "from their own inherent nature, divine or moral sanctions can have no application to political matters." (See "Nature of the State," 54, 55.) According to this, the state originates in human history without any relation to the laws of God and the rules of morality. The bearing of this on the source of the state's authority will be considered in the next study of this series. That discussion will aim to show that in this.
The above distinction between the institution of the state, and an actual state originating in the development of human history, admits an element of truth in the historic form of the historical theory. States more or less closely conformed to the institution or the ideal state have appeared in history by a process which, for them, may be properly termed originative. But both of them all, even the very earliest of them, is the state as an institution in the human case of which we have the history. And either the new existing states will be conformed to this institution of the state, or they will pass away as others have passed away, and new ones modeled after the true idea of the state will take their place. It is the office of all political science worthy of the name, not only to trace the rise and development of states in history, but to teach the principles by which all existing states may attain to full conformity with this true idea of the state, or with what political science terms the state as an institution.

4. The state is of divine origin. This theory is in perfect harmony with the true idea of the state. And just so far as political scientists believe in the Creator and in God in human history at all, they find it difficult to formulate and discuss their so-called historical theory without one or less distinct admissions of the divine origin of the state. For example: Prof. Burgess admits that “the principle of the historical genesis of the state does not stand opposed to the doctrine of the divine origin of the state when that doctrine in rationally conceived; it includes it, and makes it the starting point in the evolution.” (“Political Science,” vol. I, 62.) Again he admits that “the Creator of man implanted the substance of the state in the nature of man.” (Ibid 63.) Once more: That the “basis and point of departure” is man’s nature, and “that the Creator of that nature is, therefore, the originator of the subjective state,” another phrase for the institution of the state. (Ibid 63.)

It is not verbal quibbling with this author to ask if his admissions, “when rationally conceived,” do not disprove his own theory? Do they not fix the genius or origin of the state at man’s creation, and then make the act of the Creator in implanting the state in man’s nature the “starting-point,” or the “point of departure,” of its being? This gives us nothing less than the theory of the divine origin of the institution called the state, and sets in its proper place the process of historical “evolution” in the rise and development of the different states of the past and present. Historical evolution or development necessarily implies a preceding origin.
And this is the teaching of the Christian
Tneouv. Scriptures as to the
origin of the state. It
is God's creation. Its government is God's or-
dinance. God is the author
of all national
life, giving existence in the development of history
to each particular state or nation, assigning to
each its own rightful territory and its own
period in history. (See Deut. 8:19; Psalm
96:9; Acts 17:24-28.) Hence it is the divine
prerogative to take away
national life for na-
tional sins, as
well as to destroy
and maintain
that life. (See Jer.
19:10.)

This theory of the
CONSISTENCY
of the state's divine
origin is perfectly consistent with itself and with
a correct view of history. It maintains what
Prof. Willoughby lays so much stress upon,
that the actual manifestation and operation of
the institution of the state has been left to
human agencies. ("Nature of the State," 52.) It
affirms no less earnestly than Prof. Burgess
that the state is made objective in institutions
and laws in the various nations of the world
in the progress of history, and this through
human consciousness and human wills. ("Polit-
ical Science," vol. 1, 62.) But all this takes
place under the Creator who is also the Lord
of all human history. This added thought of
the God of creation and providence is all that
Pres. Woodrow Wilson's statement in a sec-
tion already partly quoted needs to make it sat-
sfactory: "Once having arisen, government
was affected and profoundly affected by man's
choice; only that choice entered, not to origi-
nate, but to modify government." ("The
State," Section 23.) This theory of the state
is slightly treated
as a theological
document. But it is
none the less political
as well. It belongs to
the sphere of the political being. Nor is this
political truth seen in its completeness until we
accept the full Bible revelation as to the origins
of the actual states, which come into being in
the progress of human history under the ex-
ecutional rule of Jesus Christ. The state as an
institution suffered in man's fall. It needs as
well as the individual and the family the sav-
ing work of the Lord Jesus. All authority is
given to Him for the salvation of man. He
administers the divine government over nations
as King of kings and Lord of lords. He is the
God of history. And therefore the actual states
of history that come into being from age to
age...
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STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP
The Ultimate Source of the State's Authority.

By the Rev. D. McAllister, D.D., LL.D.

According to the definition given in a preceding study, the state is possessed of all-comprehensive and exclusive political authority. And this authority over all within its territory it exercises as a sovereign power, or a power without any earthly superior.

This supreme and sovereign authority of state's authority, the state is no more "a theory. It is a matter of fact. "The state takes charge of the persons and of personal conduct. It defines crime. It makes its prohibitions and commands the measure of the lawful and the right. Hence, it raises or lowers, makes consistent or inconsistent, the standard of public morals, whether it disclaims any such intention or not. It employs force to an unlimited degree. It punishes by the infliction of pain in any amount it may deem necessary. It banishes, it imprisons, it puts to death." (Prof. Taylor Lewis in Paper before the Cincinnati National Reform Convention of 1872. See Proceedings, page 40.)

Even writers who seem disposed to minimize political sovereignty are constrained to admit that we find a superior or supreme power in every state, as a matter of fact. There may be questions as to whether this sovereignty
is always exercised or not; whether it always
serves obedience or not; and whether under
it a willing obedience may not rather be
evident than an unwilling obedience compelled.
(See Prof. Goldings, of Columbia University
in his article on "Sovereignty and Govern-
ment," in Political Science Quarterly for
March, 1906, pages 10 and 23.) But back
of all such questions is the admitted fact
of "this tremendous power of the general
and authoritative will," in other words, the sov-
erignty or supreme authority of the state.

This authority also is a necessity. Power by the state is
a necessity of its existence. Without it, the state would cease to
be a state, and would fail of the ends for which it exists. This necessity, involved in the
definition of the state, affords proof that such supreme and sovereign authority must be
 traced to a source above the state itself. Oth-
erwise the state becomes an irresponsible mon-
sia—a terrible Leviathan, such as Hobbes
has represented it to be.

The question should here be carefully
mediated. Society draws between the
ultimate source of the
state's authority and its ultimate source. The
supreme power of any state, or its sovereignty,
rests on the people of that state, not as a
mass, but as the controlling part of the con-
stituent elements of the political organism.
Through this human channel or mediate
source the authority of the state passes into
the government and it is fitting that the so-
everign people should enact constitutional or
fundamental law for the control of the gov-
ernment in all its departments, legislative, ju-
dicial and executive. In this fundamental law,
as distinct from the statutory enactments of
the legislative department of the government,
the will of the sovereign people finds expres-
sion; but this human sovereignty should duly
acknowledge the divine sovereignty of the
Lord of all. With such due acknowledgment
of the ultimate divine source of the state's au-
thority, not as an empty form, but as a con-
trolling principle, there will be less danger of
an abuse of such unlimited power. It is only
in case of such sincere acknowledgment, ex-
pressing the conviction and controlling pur-
pose of a nation's life, that the state becomes
"least likely to do wrong," or if wrong is done,
most likely able to correct it. And thus chil-
rens can conscientiously "render to Caesar the
things that are Caesar's and unto God the
things that are God's," without any conflict.
(See Luke 20:25.) In this way also there will
be less likelihood of citizens having to choose
to obey God rather than man. (See Acts 4:19; 5:29.)

If the people are the
ultimate source of
society, political authority
ought to be vested in those
constituent elements of the
political organism.
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as supreme law, what the state may or can do becomes, for it, right, provided only that its acts are in harmony with its accepted ultimate standard of right. The state has the power to do a certain thing, and the people will that this thing shall be done, and that determines the whole question of right and wrong. The might makes the right. This philosophy cannot hold, it is universally conceded, in reference to the individual or the family. Can it hold any better in the case of the state?

**AND AUTHORITY IS BASED ON FORCE.**

God, that political authority rests on force. For example: "The essential characteristic of all government, whatever its form, is authority... And the authority of governors, directly or indirectly, rests in all cases ultimately on force... Government, in its last analysis, is organized force." (Prent. Woodrow Wilson, "The State," section 1154.) To the same effect, from another standpoint, says Prof. Burgess: "Of course the state may abuse its unlimited power over the individual, but this is never to be presumed. It is the human organ least likely to do wrong, and therefore we must hold to the principle that the state can do no wrong." (Political Science, vol. 1, 156.) Still another writer says: "It is in fact quite superfluous to show in this age that from their own inherent nature, divine or moral sanctions can have no application to political matters. That compulsion by which we are seeking, and which is described as political, is a compulsion that is backed by outward human physical force, and its sanctions have reference to actual fear of physical evil." (Prof. Willoughby’s "Nature of the State," 54, 55.)

In examining these statements it is important to define terms clearly. "Force" is simply physical might. It is the actual ability to do something or compel something to be done. "Power" is often used in the same sense of mere physical force. Sometimes, on the other hand, as in the King James translation of Romans 13:1, it is the equivalent of "authority." This word properly represents the Greek term in Romans 13:1 and Matthew 22:21. It means rightful power; a right of compulsion backed by something more than force; power resting on the eternal and unchangeable principles of right. So-called "authority" without this foundation is nothing more than brute force. It may be found in a band of robbers. It may be permitted in the providence of God like any other evil or wrong. (Compare John 19:15, 11.) Pharaoh's power to crucify our Lord was the mere physical force and compulsion of an unjust ruler. Can that be a basis for the authority of the state? And yet would not the basis of authority in the following definition answer just as well for the mere force of a gang of highwaymen?

"A state is a numerous assemblage of human (6)
beings generally exempting a certain territory amongst whom the will of the majority, or of an ascertainable class of persons, is, by the strength of such a majority or class, made to prevail against any of their number who oppose it." (F. C. Holland, "Elements of Jurisprudence," 6th edition, p. 48.)

Prof. W. Hough by his "Practical Examiner" view of the state's authority by an illustration that would separate the whole field of morals from the proper sphere of the political being. By a large quadrangle he represents the entire field of human conduct. About half of this quadrangle represents that part of human conduct not enforceable by law. This he terms the field of morals or ethics. A portion of the other half of the large quadrangle represents conduct capable of enforcement, and the rest of this half represents what is morally enforced. What is thus morally enforced by the state's authority, or what may be so enforced is said to be outside of the laws of morality. That is, the authority of the state, in its proper sphere of action, is not based upon or derived ultimately from the divine law of morals or the Supreme Moral Ruler, but rests on the supernatural power of the state itself. (See "The Nature of the State," 113, 114.)

This illustration holds how far this is seen as to different grades of morality, or classes of conduct of the subjects of the state's authority. Some of these actions, as in the worship of God, are not enforceable by the state. But the state in its proper sphere is itself a moral being and therefore make moral law; and by the law of morals it must determine what in human conduct is enforceable by law and what is not. That itself is a moral question. The portion of the quadrangle representing what is actually enforced may, with changing circumstances, take in less or more of the portion representing what is enforceable. This wider enforcement or narrower limitation of what the state actually enforces in a question of political expediency, but none the less of moral responsibility of the state under the law of its divine Creator and Ruler. This is not a change of moral law itself in the changing circumstances of man. The divine law of morals revealed in nature and in fuller measure in the Scriptures is eternal and immutable. And it is one and the same law.

While moral law is the application and penalty of Law.

Great absolutely eternal and unchangeable, its application and its penalties may vary with the varying circumstances of man. Death has been properly inflicted for stealing; food amidst the perils of a polar expedition. And military necessity may call for a much severer penalty in time of war; for the remissness of a guard or sentinel than that with which it would properly be much more severely punished in times of peace. The full light of the Gospel of Christ, wherever it is enjoyed, calls for changes not
in the moral law of God, but in its application and enforcement. This is a principle of the divine government to which Paul called the attention of Athenian philosophers, when, speaking of different nations and the idolatries of some of them, he said: "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now [when the light of Christ's Gospel has come to them] he commands all men everywhere to repent." (Acts 17:30.) And from this divine example this principle may well have its application in the exercise of the state's authority. What at one time is enforced by the state should at another time be enforced. And what at one time is enforced by one penalty may or should at other times be enforced by other penalties more or less severe. And this discrimination is the duty of the state under moral law, with a view to the highest welfare of those under its authority. This is the field of practical statesmanship. And this exercise of the state's authority is the wisdom of a true conservatism combined with the greatest measure of assured progress, in what the divine law of nature and the Christian religion requires. Should not the state therefore acknowledge this divine law and base its authority upon it?

Nothing can be clearer than our Lord's teaching on this point. The mono-
gamous law of the marriage relation is a part of divine, unchangeable moral law. (See Genesis 1:27; Matt. 19:3-6.) The breaking of this relationship on insufficient grounds of divorce is properly forbidden by the authority of the state. Such actual enforcement of conduct was the original duty of the state, and in days of Christian enlightenment is now its moral obligation. But in days of ignorance and moral deterioration this matter passed out from the sphere of the actually enforced. But that did not remove Moses as a lawgiver, nor the modified Hebrew political law of the marriage relation, from the sphere of morals under the divine law for human conduct. (See Matthew 19:9; Mark 10:9.)

To remove any part of human conduct from subjection to the divine law of morals is practical atheism. Hence, to secularize the state by making its proper sphere of action independent of moral and the Divine Giver of that law, is to make the state practically atheistic. And as a matter of course, in such a secular or atheistic state an appeal to "the Higher Law," or the divine law of morals, is out of place. On this secular theory of the state's authority, Wm. H. Seward's appeal to "the Higher Law" in our National Congress, during the discussion of the unquestionably moral subject of human slavery, was logically regarded as an impertinence. (See Seward's Works, vol. 1, 60, 74, 108, 130.) There can be no consistent appeal to that law in any question of public morals, such as Monomaniac, divorce, temperance, moral impurity, or the Sar-

...
lack, unless God himself be acknowledged as the ultimate source of the state's authority. The French Revolution of over a century ago illustrated the logical outcome of ignoring God's authority in government. The nation forgot God and denied him and his moral law, and was turned into a nation's hell (see Psalm 9:17) of unrighteous blood. The connection of cause and effect is here easy to trace, for "there are passions sleeping in the human breast that, in the open air of normal life, will always awake and overthrow the vessel of freedom, if they are not quelled by one Eye."

On this whole subject of the state's authority the Word of God is most explicit: "There is no power (no rightful authority) but of God. The powers that be (existing political beings blessed with rightful authority) are ordained of God. Hence the ruler who exercises this authority is "the minister of God." (See Romans 13:1-3.) "All power (rightful authority) is given unto me in heaven and on earth," says the Lord Jesus. (Matthew 28:18.) A host of passages may be cited in proof of this truth. (See 1 Cor. 15:27; Eph. 1:21, 22; John 17:26; Rom. 14:19; Phil. 2:9-11; Heb. 2:8; 1 Peter 3:22; and many other references.) The state is under Christ as "King of Kings." (1 Tim. 6:15; Rev. 17:14; 19:16.) In him are the personal Wisdom of God, "kings reign and princes decree justice;... princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." (Proverbs 8:15, 16.) All rulers are required to give due homage to the Son on pain of perishing for disobedience—"when his wrath is kindled but a little." (Psalm 32:2.) Thus the state's authority derived ultimately from God is to be exercised under the acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ. (Compare the writer's "Manual of Christian Civil Government," 145-153.)

Man cannot make Law Muster DRIVE. Law. The old Romans understood this. They used the word "legislative"—from "lex," "law" and "loco" with its derivative "loco," "to be," and not "lexis," "to make." Law is divine. It is for man to bring it to bear by his authority on the subjects of human government. This divine law revealed originally in nature, is more fully revealed and in adaptation to all men's needs in his fallen condition, in the Sacred Scriptures of the Christian religion.

Paul refers to the law written in the hearts of men generally (Romans 2:15), and revealed in the works of creation (Romans 1:20), by which men destined of the light of the Gospel of Christ shall be judged. This law, in its civil aspect, has been defined as "that common, universal, divine and good rule of reason which governs creatures combined in a natural association." (Pusey's "Theory of Civil Government," 30.)
of Law and Civil Society," 79.) As Prof. Willoughby says, such "natural laws (or law of nature as a summary word) from their inherent nature, must necessarily be moral laws, and moral laws only. They may serve to represent what should be, but not what is. When they obtain actual acceptance and enforcement at the hands of a political power, they become ipso facto civil or positive laws." (The Nature of the State," 105.) All this is true. But so far as it means proving that such a law has no application to the life of men in political relations, it implies the very contrary. It is a moral law, and man is ill all his relations a moral being. If the state's authority does not rest ultimately on such a law, it can make no appeal to reason and conscience. (Comp. Prof. Giddings' article cited above, p. 12.) But being under the moral law, the state has a moral character and accountability. It has moral ends, and is a true moral power. The Creator who gave the state its being as a moral person gave it this original law of nature. God's Word assures us that man was created perfect. We do not need now to prove this truth. It may be admitted as the teaching of the prevailing religion of our country. If man had remained in the image of his Creator, and the state had continued as God first gave it being in man's perfect nature, that law of nature would have been sufficient for its needs. Actual states coming into existence in the course of human history would all have realized in obedience to this law the true idea of the state. But this has not been the course of history.
be light and there was light." The same divine
Reader who gave the light of nature supplemented this revelation of small light by the
further revelations of his Word. This is the ac-
cepted truth of Christianity which in these dis-
cussions may properly be taken for granted.
And this veiled revelation of moral law, in
perfect harmony with the law of nature, con-
stituted for men in all relations of human life
their supreme rule of conduct. It must, there-
fore, be supreme law for most organized in-
nations or states in all moral questions of that
department of human life. And the Divine
Giver of this law must be the ultimate source
of the state's authority in its moral sphere of
action. This is what Sir Win. Blackstone
means when he says: "Upon these two foun-
dations, the law of nature and the law of revo-


tu!, tion, dispose all human laws; that is to say,
no human laws should be suffered to contra-
dict either." (Commentaries, 4th edition, vol. 1, p. 23.)

If political authority is seen in the light of a
higher law, a supreme source, then it is not
worth the holding by such a supreme standard, the ship
of state is adrift without compass or rudder in a stormy sea.
Such a supreme standard and test is given to the state in the law of
Christian morals. The state is itself to inter-
pret and apply this test, and any law given in this way
is not to be construed by such a supreme standard, the ship
of state is adrift without compass or rudder in a stormy sea.
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able acknowledgment and in fact, "a kingdom
of our Lord and his Christ."
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portance of this study, and for the sake of
students who wish to follow it up with care
and who can have access to good public lib-
raries, a somewhat extensive list of authors is
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1. On sovereignty or supreme political
authority in great—Jenius's "Constitutional
Conventions," 17-25. Coke's "Constitutional
Limitations," 1, 2. (Also his "Principles of
Constitutional Law," 29-32. 31-32. Laski's
"Cyclopedia of Political Science," under
words "authority" and "sovereignty," 01. 1,
and 111. Wood's "Political Science," vol.
2, section 79, 79. Bigelow "Political Sci-
ence," vol. 1, 54. 56, 75. Willmott's "Mature
Politics," section 79, 79. 75. Roots "Con-
Blumenschein's "Outlines of "Politics of the
State," part 1, chap. 4, sections 1 and 2. His "American
Statesmen," vol. 11, chapter 175. Maier's "In-
cluded Morality," Lectures 8 and 9. Lounsbury's
"Constitutional Questions," 409-421. Also his
"State and its Limits," and "Anexit and
Modern Liberty," 2, 319, 313-197. [All in
French]. Auber's "Juristic Political," vol. 1,
chap. 6. Van Mols's "Encyclopedia of Po-
itical Science," German, 113-121. See also
on the "Constitution," section 207-209. Benjamin
Constant's "Cours de Politique Constitution
nelle," [Course of Constitutional Political], vol.
1, chapter 1. Lord Brougham's "Political
Philosophy," vol. 1, 91-94. Prof. Prosby's
"Directives Political," vol. 1, book 8, chapter 1
and 2.
2. On sovereignty in one man nation—
Story on the "Constitution," section 215, 321,
(p. 125)

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP

VI.
The Institution of Civil Government.

BY R. C. Herr, D.D.

Why do men live together in civil societies? Why do we obey the laws of the State? Why do we pay taxes to support civil government? Is it because we want, or because we should? Where does the right of the "powers that be" to place limits upon human liberty? How does civil government come into being?

These are questions which all good citizens should be able to answer. Yet comparatively few ever give them serious thought. They have accepted civil government as a fact without considering its origin or its right to be. Few of those who are called to fill official positions ever consider the sacredness of their positions. Many writers on civil government either ignore these fundamental questions or give unscientific and unhistorical answers. By some the historic origin of civil governments past and present is confounded with the origin of that supreme authority with which governments are clothed. A clear distinction must be here made. The study of the first is little
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is not able to account for the beginning of things. It can do no more than trace their development after they have begun. Whatever truth there may be in theories about the evolution of society, and states and governments, there must have been a political suzerain to men to start with. Professor Burgess, of Columbia University, contends this in the following quotation: "If the theologian means by his doctrine of the divine origin of the state simply that the Creator of man implanted the substance of the state in the nature of man, the historian will surely be under no necessity to contradict him." (Political Science and Constitutional Law, Vol. I., pp. 39-60.) Professor Woodrow Wilson, of Princeton University, makes the same concession when he says of civil government that "in its origin it was spontaneous, natural, twin-born with man and the family." (The State, p. 14.)

The second problem requiring attention is the historical development of sovereign civil societies occupying territory with distinct boundaries. Here is a wide field for the legitimate application of the principle of evolution to political science. Boundaries. Here is a wide field for the legitimate application of the principle of evolution to political societies, race, language, religion, history, civilization, and commerce should be given special prominence. Of all these religious doctrines great nations have ever had the largest influence in both creating and preserving social unity. The Hebrew nation is a typical case. God's part in the development of that people is shown in His promise to make of Abraham a great nation and in His superintending care at every step of their development. He used the family as the means of numerical increase. The family soon became a clan, the clan became twelve tribes, and these tribes became a nation. Various forces were at work in this process, and the people themselves were responsible agents. The United States of America furnishes another instructive example. First a few colonies were planted. Under the controlling hand of God these increased in population and power and were united into a compact national body. The agency of men is seen at every step of the way toward national freedom, but these steps would not have been taken were it not for the guidance of God. Authority from God was necessary to justify those steps. He fixed national boundaries and gives sovereign rights (Acts 17:36). One of the most important of all political questions arises in this connection. And yet it is one that is either answered incorrectly or not answered at all by many students of political science. They give much thought to the question as to the
location of political authority or sovereignty, not comparatively little to the question of the ultimate source of that authority. As to that ultimate source only two general views are possible. It must be either human or divine. Various theories are held as to the method whereby authority has been bestowed or has come into being, but no writer has undertaken to show that there can be any other ultimate source from which it can possibly spring. The position here maintained is that Almighty God is the ultimate source of all authority and power in civil affairs. It may be said that God is the source of all the power possessed by any creature good or bad, that the physical force of wicked men, that even the power of the devil himself, was given originally by God. It is not in any such general sense that the statement is here made with respect to civil government. A distinction must be made between authority and power. The latter is often used without the former. It is one thing to use power which came originally from God; it is another thing to use it as God authorized. As Supreme Ruler God has bestowed upon men the prerogative of rulership in a subordinate sense, and that prerogative is rightly exercised through civil government. The authority of civil government must come from God if it exists at all, as is clear from a view of its vastness.

VASTNESS OF AUTHORITY

There are various forms of voluntary associations sometimes sway legislatures by means of financial or other influence. Sometimes they set at naught the authority of the State and undertake to be a law to themselves. But not one of them has been so bold as to usurp the penal functions of civil government. None but anarchists will deny that such functions exist. "It punishes by the infliction of pain to any amount it may deem necessary. It banishes, it imprisons, it puts to death." Of all the associations known among men civil government is the only one recognized as rightfully using such vast power. If the right to use it exists it must come from a source high enough to bestow it. An examination of the various theories that trace it to a human source only will reveal their utter inadequacy. What is known as the Social Contract theory has long been popular. According to this theory there was a time when there was no civil government. Men existed in a so-called state of nature with the right to get and to hold whatever they were able. This state of nature was a state of continual strife. Growing weary of it, men formed a covenant with one another to surrender part of their natural rights on condition that the rights not surrendered should be protected. The surrendered rights were bestowed upon some one man or a body of men, and that man or body of men became sovereign ruler.

It has often been shown that no such state of nature ever existed, and history makes no
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Yet even Blackstone, who has been followed by many other writers, resorts to this fiction to illustrate the origin of civil authority and the obligation to render obedience to law. (Vol. I., Book I., 123.) But it is clear that individuals cannot surrender what they do not possess. It cannot be shown that men in a state of nature or any other state possess the right to take their own lives. To surrender this right to civil government is not therefore possible. Yet the right seems to be vested with respect to some classes of criminals. The only source of that investiture is the Divine Author of life. The same conclusion is reached when we consider the geographical boundaries of civil authority. There is a geographical necessity correlation between civil government and the land occupied by the people under its authority. Nations will resist unto blood the effort to divide their territory. The greatest war of modern times was waged to prevent the division of the United States into two nations. On the theory of contract that war was unjustifiable. Men may dissolve any covenant which they have formed. This theory encourages rebellion and leads to the dissolution of the civil authority which it aims to create.

This theory fails also to explain the authority of civil government over individuals who never assented to the contract. Contracts are external to individuals. The theory requires that each one for himself make a surrender of certain rights. No one can make the surrender for another. One generation cannot make it for succeeding generations. Criminals refuse assent to the contract. On what ground are they punished? Why are we compelled to pay taxes even though we should take the ground that we never assented to the contract establishing civil government, do not need it and do not wish to help bear its burdens? Evidently the theory of contract is a theory of anarchy instead of a theory of civil government. Either civil authority is from God or it is not rightful authority at all.

The historical theory of the origin of the state now so popular teaches that political authority resides, not in individuals, but in the body of the people, and that it has been evolved or developed with the development of the state. Some advocates of this theory admit that the substance of the state was implanted in men by the Creator, but others take no account of such creative act and seek to explain everything political or the evolution theory. According to this view force is the foundation of civil government and its acts are devoid of moral quality. Even those advocates
of it who recognize the hand of the Creator in making man a political being, sometimes overrule His superintending care in the development of nations, and find no place in their systems for His delegation of authority and power.

Going back of all political contracts made by men in ordaining constitutions of government; following the stream of political history to its fountain head, we find a divine source for all rightful civil authority. We are to be in subjection to the powers that be for this reason. "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be ordained of God. Therefore be not ye afraid: the power withstandeth the ordinances of God; and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. And woe unto them that do evil, ye have not fear of the power? Do that which is good, and ye shall have praise of the same; for He is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, he afraid; for He beareth not the sword in vain; for He is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause ye pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very thing" (Rom. 13:1-6).

It now becomes necessary to show how the authority of civil society has been bestowed. Certain theories which maintain its divine origin are wholly at fault in their explanation of the manner in which it has been delegated. Robert Filmer, in his work entitled "Patriarch," argues for the divine right of monarchy on the basis of the original grant of authority to Adam. He contends that "not only Adam, but the succeeding patriarchs, had, by right of fatherhood, royal authority over their children," that "this lordship, which Adam by command had over the whole world, and by right descended from him, the patriarchs did enjoy, was as large and ample as the absolute dominion of any monarch hath hitherto since the creation," that is, "inviolable dominion of life and death, making war and concluding peace," that "kings, in the right of parents, succeed to the exercise of supreme jurisdiction." When the theory is maintained in this form it is made to teach the divine right of kings and to uphold all kinds of tyranny. Students of American history will remember that many of the American colonists were reluctant to join the rebellion against the British government because of their acceptance of that form of the theory.

Thomas Aquinas held that "the State, through which earthly aims are attained, must be subordinate to the Church. Church and State are as of two swords which God has given to Christendom for its protection; both
of them, however, are given by Him to the Pope and the temporal sword by him handed to the ruler of the State. Thus the Pope alone receives his power directly from the Almighty, the Emperor's power indirectly through the Pope's hands." One would need to travel far, at least in this country, to find an advocate of either of these forms of the divine theory. Instead of a divine right vested in either kings or popes, there is a divine right vested in the people which they in turn delegate to the government.

Our last topic is the actual constitution of civil government by the sovereign people. Nowhere in a nation's THE CONSTITUTION history is the free agency of men more manifest. Nowhere is there greater necessity for recognizing the agency and authority of God. Government should be constituted with a consciousness not only of power but also of right. Men are workers together with God. Civil government is God's ordinance because He makes nations and delegations to the people, their political authority (Rom. 13:1-7). It is an ordinance of men because men are free agents in its actual formation (1 Peter 2:13).

While power or might is essential to the establishment of civil government, it must not be confused with right.

MIGHT WITHOUT LAW: The unauthorized use of might is tyrannical. To justify such use men sometimes resort to the dangerous political heresy that might makes right. On the other hand, authority without power to maintain it, in the present state of the world, would be a useless possession, for law cannot in many cases be enforced without it. At the beginning God announced His grant of authority to men (see Genesis 1:28). But in all that both the power and the authority of each nation come with its historical growth and development, and both are from God. The location of sovereignty can now be easily determined. It is evident that it is not located in any race of kings nor in the line of popes, but in the people. But this doctrine gives no warrant for the common expression that every citizen is a sovereign. At best this can be nothing more than a figure of speech. What is each citizen a sovereign? Not of the whole country nor of any section of it. Each citizen is a political being, but his political nature is social and requires combination with other political beings who are his equals. In every nation, there are many who can take no part in political affairs because of youth, age, or other infirmity. There are some who by reason of crime have forfeited their right to be reck- oned with the sovereign people. But that social political body known as the People, or the Nation, or the State, is the political sov- ereign, and there is room for only one sov- ereign in each nation.

While men are voluntarily and freely in the formation of civil government, there are limit- ations to this freedom.

LIMITATIONS OF HUMAN FREEDOM: They are not free either to have or not to have civil government. Re-
Theory. Thus, instead of affording a basis for true political authority, it logically justifies every conceivable act, whether such act tends to uphold or overthrow the existing state of rule. (The Nature of the State, p. 22.)

It might be said in reply that even if this theory should be so construed as to justify whatever it is, it is difficult to see in what respect it would be worse than the theory of Professor Willoughby, who denies that the state needs any moral sanctions for what it does, governs merely by force, and appeals only to fear of physical evil. (Nature of the State, pp. 49, 53, 127.) He makes a very important admission, however, when he says that from this theory it follows that political rule of some sort is divinely justified. "This is essential and is more than follows from any other theory. But the theory does more than this. It furnishes a criterion for determining whether and how far existing civil governments are constituted on a sound political basis; it furnishes a test for deciding whether or not men who bear rule possess proper moral qualifications; it furnishes a standard for righteous judgment concerning all the acts of the state. The learned professor has failed to grasp the full and proper significance of the divine theory as advocated by its best exponents."

This theory should be accepted by all citizens and made a controlling factor in their political conduct. It should be interpreted as a guide to conduct and government, as a basis for all government. It is taught in the sacred Scriptures; it is advocated by the best minds in political science; it is illustrated in the political history of the world; it embodies all that is true in all other theories; it plants civil government on a solid basis; it furnishes a high standard of citizenship; it makes for national righteousness.
STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP

VIII.

Christ's Government of the Nations.

BY M. R. C. WYETH.

In the preceding Study it was shown that there is a three-fold relation between nations and the Lord Jesus Christ. He is their Prophet from whom they learn their origin, their end, the laws by which they are to be guided, and the conditions of their prosperity and perpetuity. He is their Priest through whom they may obtain pardon for national sin. He is their King under whose sceptre they rise and fall, and by whom they are moulded for the accomplishment of the divine purposes.

It is sometimes asserted that while Jesus Christ is the rightful Ruler of nations, He is not yet in possession of that right, that His enforcement is yet in the future, and that the rulership of the nations is now in the hands of Satan. In support of this view the prevalence of iniquity in public life is urged. It is maintained that when Christ begins to reign all such iniquity will vanish. But this argument proves too much. If it proves that Jesus Christ is not now ruling the nations it also proves that the Father Himself has abdicated or has been deposed. God, in His wisdom, allows sin to prevail for a time and its prevalence and power are perfectly con-
sistent with the fact that Christ is now on the

throne.

It is urged, however, that the Scriptures promise the subjugation of all nations to Christ as some future period, and the beginning of His reign is identified with this complete sub-
jugation. But this is so identity as to make His reign with its beginning, and to assert that it
does not begin till one of the chief objects
has been accomplished. The Scriptures teach that it is under and by virtue of His reign that
nations are to be brought into willing submis-
sions to His sovereign.

It is worthy of note that many of the Scrip-
ture texts which prove the authority of Christ over the nations prove that He is even now
their rightful Ruler and that they ought to bow to His. The tenses of the verbs employed to describe Our Lord's authority are not without significance. All things are not
under Him; all authority hath been given unto
Me; He is the Prince of the kings of the
earth; He is King of kings; nations and rul-
ers are commanded to be wise and to bow
the knee. What is yet future is the willing submission of the nations. He is already
enthroned and is using His authority for the
accomplishment of His purposes.

Christ's Present Exercise of Authority
over Nations.
It is a manifest fact that, whether nations
know it or not, Jesus Christ is now exercising
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authority over them. In
Hostile Nations the exercise of this au-

t hority He no restrained
them as to prevent the
destruction of His own cause. If the question
of the maintenance of revealed religion among
men were simply a question as to the relative
strength of its human friends and foes Christ-
ianity would have long since perished. If it
were possible to prevent the destruction of
Christianity, the nation of Christ was stronger

by a thousand fold when they were ended than
when they began. For nearly two thousand
years civil powers have strenuously opposed
the kingdom of our Lord, but their opposition
has been unsuccessful. All history is proof of the
fact that Christ in the control Ruler of men and
nations. The argument does not rest upon a
few isolated facts or miraculous events. There
is a current of events, a trend of history, and
the channel and the pathway are mapped out
by the hand of the great King. Certain
epochs, however, may be mentioned, and cer-

tain remarkable events specified as marking
the course along which Christ is leading man-
kind. Among these may be specified the
worldwide proclamation of the gospel in the
days of the apostles, the fall of the Roman
Empire, the reformation period with its world
of important events, the Evasion of the
American Republic by Protestant Christians,
the overthrow of slavery in this and other
(187)
lands, the formation of various reformatory organizations whose special purpose it is to bear witness against the sins of nations, the present-day movement to evangelize the entire world.

That Christ is leading and controlling the movement for the world's speedy evangelization is apparent from the

Dramatic Opening for the fact that doors have been opened for the entrance of His ambassadors into all lands. The opposition of many nations and governments to the preaching of the gospel within their domain is matter of record. It is only in recent years that this opposition has in large measure ceased. Many thrilling stories are told in connection with the introduction and propagation of the gospel in heathen lands. In the former study special use was made of the Second Psalm in proof of the authority of Christ over the nations. Many events in connection with missionary work furnish luminous commentaries on that Psalm. Bear in mind that it represents Christ as the actual Ruler of rebellious, turbulent peoples, and that as a potter’s vessel they are to be dashed to pieces if they continue their opposition. In the earlier years of mission work in Turkey there was often bitter antagonism by the civil power. Persecution was not against all missionaries, and they were peremptorily ordered to leave the country. In that clime bore the pioneer Goddell, in his peculiar way, said: “The Great Sultan of the Universe can change all this.”

The missionaries brought the Lord to come down as in the days of old, and notice the mountains flow down at His presence. While their hands were yet filled in prayer the Sultan died, and a series of remarkable events followed, bringing disaster upon the Turkish forces. They saw an Almighty Hand uplifted to arrest the arm of iniquity, and they shared not in the persecution. A few years later similar events took place in connection with the work in Sinn. To all appearances the work of a third of a century was about to come to a disastrous conclusion. But appeal was made to the Ruler of nations, and again He who sits upon the throne attendeth forth His rod of iron and breaks in pieces like a potter’s vessel, the civil power. The king died and events occurred which changed the whole current of the nation’s history. But why multiply instances? History is replete with them. The chronicle of missionary events in the Orient, in Africa, in the South Sea islands, and all lands, is the chronicle of the reign of Jesus Christ over the nations, opening the way for the ambassadors of the Great King. (Divine Enterprise of Mission, by Dr. Arthur T. Pierson.)

But Christ’s authority is exercised not only in thus opening the way for the progress of the gospel; He uses nations and governments for the promotion of His cause. It is not necessary to defend the actions of so-called Christian nations in gain-
ing control in many heathen lands. Many wrongs have been committed in taking forcibly the territory of weak nations and in subjugating them to a position of subordination that the use made by Jesus Christ of the extensive power of some of these great nations for the protection and promotion of His cause must be noted. It should be borne in mind that the nations are given to Christ, that they are to be possessed by Him, that no nation has an inherent right to continue in rebellion or in the propagation of a false religion. While the cruelty and violence of the strong nations committed against the weak are to be condemned we should praise the wisdom and power of Christ in using even sinful nations to propagate His cause. Where the flags of such nations as Great Britain, the United States, Germany and some others float, the ambassadors of the King of kings are safe and can do their work without opposition. All this is striking proof that Christ reigns and affords luminous illustrations of the manner in which He controls the nations.

As the Ruler of nations Christ leads civil governments to suppress many evils which would hinder the work of the gospel. No one possesses sufficient data to enable him to calculate the destructive effects of the liquor traffic, the social evil, Sabbath-breaking and other public wrongs. Christian people must not be blinded to the failures of governments to do their full duty in these matters. Too often protection is afforded to the evils which ought to be overthrown. But criticisms of governments for failures should be tempered with judgment, and credit should be given for what is done. It is estimated that about thirty millions of the population of the United States are under prohibition laws. Every State except one has a Sabbath law. Many forms of vice are repressed, if not entirely suppressed, which would otherwise prove most disastrous to the work of saving souls. All this comes about through the exercise of Christ's authority over the nations. If Christian citizens co-operate as they should they can bring about many a political reform and forever still more striking proofs of the same truth.

As the Ruler of nations He is bringing them under the banner of universal peace. War is most destructive, not for the destruction of material things but for the destruction of spiritual interests. It is an evil which the Lord has often overruled for good, but we are promised a time when it shall cease. Christ is the Prince of Peace. "Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end." There never was a period when so much was said about peace between nations. Every conceivable argument is used to prove its advantages. The cost of maintaining an army and a navy, the destruction of life and property always attendant upon war; its demoralizing effects; and what is still more important, its wickedness as measured
by the Christian standard; these are some of the principal arguments employed. And they are having their effect, as is shown by the formation of the Hague Tribunal, the organization of numerous Peace societies and the holding of many Peace conventions. The Prince of peace is leading the nations in this peace movement.

As the Ruler of nations Christ uses them as instruments of His will to punish or even destroy one another.

NATIONS Sometimes it is better destroyed by Christ for the world that certain nations be destroyed. Sometimes it is even better for the nations that are destroyed. Death is not the worst thing that can happen to the individual, nor is overthrow the worst thing that can happen to a nation. To continue in existence cursed by unspoken vices and crimes is far worse than to pass out of this present state of being. God used Israel to destroy the Canaanites because their cup of iniquity was full, and it was best for the world and best for them that they cease to be. God used Assyria and Babylon to punish Israel for national sins. Assyria is the rod of God's anger (Isa. 10:5). Babylon is called the hammer of the whole earth with which many nations were crushed (Jer. 50:29). It is a nation that is addressed by the prophet in these remarkable words: "Thus saith my Lord the Almighty, the Holy One of Israel, his indignation is against all nations; he will come and destroy their earth and all that dwell upon it; he will make the earth dry as a perishable clay, it will not be restored for all the ages of time. They will be ashamed of their counsels; they have chosen the way which is not good, they choose the path of their feet. Their silver will become dross, their wine will be bitter as gall; they will be swallowed up in the pit of destruction, they will not pass out of it." (Jer. 51:17-23).

There is a railroad from Cripple Creek to Colorado Springs which drops more than four thousand feet in forty miles. At various points along the line are signs marked, "Do not block the track," If a train should break loose and come plunging down this fearful grade it might destroy a whole trainload of people below. But to avoid such a disaster, when a train foresees break loose the telegraph operator wires 'to the first derailing switch where the switchman throws it into the ditch or against the rocks, on the principle that it is better to destroy one train than two. Christ deals thus with nations.

Christ as the Lord of Providence and the Ruler of nations bestowed upon them all national blessings. It has been shown above that Christ gives national blessings in His providential government of nations. Christ uses them for His own wise purpose. He sets limits to their opposition and causes their wrath to praise Him. "He orders every political and social event and the entire evolution of civilization and associated human activity to the accomplishment of His supreme end." And Christ also bestows upon nations all their national blessings. Their wealth, their power, their progress, their achievements, all are bestowed by Christ as the Ruler of nations. This in pieces governors and deputies. And I will render unto Babylon and to all the inhabitants of Chaldea all the evil that they have done in Zim in your sight, saith Jehovah" (Jer. 51:20-22).
complaint of the prophet Hosea against Israel is that she did not know that her divine king "gave her the grain, and the new wine, and the oil, and multiplied unto her silver and gold, which they used for Baal" (Hosea 2:8). The entire history of Israel brings into prominence the truth that all national blessings are bestowed by Israel's divine King. But the argument that this King is none other than the Messiah is conclusive. It has already been given fully and need not be here repeated. Nations are therefore required to render thanks to God through Jesus Christ for these blessings. To ignore Him in national Thanksgiving proclamations is a grievous national sin of which the government of the United States is guilty. For fear of offending those who do not believe in Christ our rulers offend against Him at whose word nations rise and fall.

It is sometimes said by way of objection that when Christ was on earth He refused to disturb existing political relations, that He left civil rulers to attend to their own affairs, that He refused to act as judge in disputes between citizens (Matt. 22:16-22; Luke 12:13, 14). The objection infers that Christ's kingdom contains no relation to the kingdoms of the world and that in the preaching of the gospel there is no place for this and related questions. But our contention is not that Jesus is a judge or ruler in the State under its constitution and laws, as the objection implies, but that He occupies a position of supremacy over all States and civil rulers and has given base for the occupation of civil affairs which it is per- mission to disregard. His refusal to act as a ruler or judge in a subordinate position is in perfect harmony with the doctrine of His supreme Lordship over the nations.

If the problems of the United States while in some city of the Union should be asked to act the part of a judge in a case arising between citizens and should decline to act on the ground that he was not a judge in any local and subordinate court, his declination could not be used as proof that he was not the chief magistrate of the nation. Neither can Christ's refusal in the case above mentioned be taken as proof that He is not the Ruler of nations.

The Ultimate Power Concerning Nations.

There is no warrant in Scripture for believing that the present order of things is to continue indefinitely. On the contrary we are taught that the conflict between good and evil is to terminate with victory on the side of right. Nations are not to continue therefore in their attitude of indifference, assumed neutrality, or antagonism to Christ's claims.

The proper attitude of nations and govern- ments to Jesus Christ is one of the most dif- ficult of all religious subjects to present to the public mind. It is one of the most difficult for the average mind to consider with enthusiasm and without prejudice. What has been said already in this and the former study ought to prepare for a calm consideration of this mat- ter which is so vital to the welfare of nations
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and to the cause of Christ. Many otherwise intelligent Christians hold preconceived opinions of this whole matter, influenced largely by popular but false views as to the proper relation of nations to Christ and His religion, take the secular position, which is nothing more nor less than atheism in political garb. This political anti-Christ is one of the most potent agencies for evil that the devil has yet devised. But let us see what Christ's purpose is concerning the nations of mankind.

This purpose is made clear in what He has told us about His plan. That plan contemplates the realization of the kingdom of God on earth. It involves the destruction of all the works of the devil, the plucking up of every plant not planted by the Father (1 John 3:8; Matt. 11:13). A proper view of the covenant made with Abraham will aid greatly in getting a clear comprehension of the divine purpose concerning nations. In that covenant promise was made not merely of one great nation, but of many nations. Of these nations Abraham is called the first-born. Since Abraham's real seed are believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, the nations which were promised him are Christian nations sustaining a relation of loyal submission to Christ as King. As has been shown in a recent work by Oscar L. Straus, a Hebrew, there was no union of church and state in Israel. Neither was there any foolish attempt to banish religion from the civil sphere. (Origin of Republican Forms of Government, by Oscar L. Straus, pp. 101-117.) All these principles of free government of which we are a people proudly boast are borrowed from the Hebrew Commonwealth. The adoption of the principles of national Christianity so clearly taught in Scripture will complete our introduction into that Family of Christian nations which God is forming.

Scripture prophecy makes clear what the divine purpose concerning nations is. It is declared that Christ is to rule all nations as His inheritance. This does not mean merely that some of the people out of all nations are to become believers, but that the nations and governments themselves are to become His subjects, "All nations shall serve Him" (Ps. 72:11). The kingdom of the world is to become His kingdom (Rev. 11:15). The prayer taught us by our Lord and which is doubtless repeated thousands of times every day in all parts of the world, contains the beautiful prayer, "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." Doubtless many use this prayer without much thought as to its full significance. Perhaps none of us fully comprehends its meaning. A careful study of the kingdom as exhibited in Scripture will reveal the deep significance of the prayer. This kingdom was the subject of prophetic promise. It was the theme of the preaching of John, the forerunner of

...
Christ, of Christ Himself, and of all the spon-
des and evangelists. This kingdom is men-
tioned in the Gospels a hundred times. Pro-
memor Robert Ellis Thompson says, "The
Baptist and our Lord both began their mis-
ions by proclaiming, not a way of salvation
for individuals, but a kingdom of heaven—a new
order of society." (Divine Order of Human So-
ciety, p. 7). Whatever else may be included in
the Lord's prayer, this surely must be included.
The answer to this prayer will be realized in the
setting up of the City of God on earth. It will
result in the subjugaition of man's rebellion
wherever that rebellion has lifted up its head.
Christ did not teach us to pray for what He
did not intend to give.
The completeness of the work of redemption
throws light upon the purpose of Christ with
reference to nations. It is sometimes said that

POLITICAL
REDONPTION.

While the Church and
individuals are subjects of
redemption, nations are not, but that they share
incidentally in its benefits. It is more accurate
to say that man in his entire nature is the
subject of redemption. The political nature
shares in the benefits of Christ's saving work.
The whole man is saved. It is common to
think of men in the Church and in the family
of God apart from all political characteristics
and activities. But since man was made a pol-
itical being, and since the fall corrupted this
as well as all other parts of his nature, it fol-
lowes that redemption restores this as well as
all other parts of his nature. Surely rede-
ption does not eliminate the political from man.
He will remain a political being to all eternity.
This is the truth in the light of which certain
scriptural texts are to be explained. How else
can we understand the references in the "Holy
City" into which the kings of the earth bring
their glory and their honor, and in the light of which saved nations are to walk? (Rev. 21).

There are certain movements which indicate
the divine purpose as to nations. These are
organizaties having the avowed purpose of
belonging about the Chris-

Significant
Movements.

The
through these organizations
certain neglected features of the gospel are
pressed upon the attention of men. There are
principles of national Christianity which have
their application wholly in the civil and polit-
ical sphere. These are now proclaimed as
never before. Even in the sphere of political
life in nominally Christian nations there are
movements of like character gradually but
surely transforming these nations into the
kingdom of God. Sometimes it may seem that
the movement is backward instead of forward,
and it must be conceded that many insane
practices of public life may be quoted in proof.
Certain national sins are obvious becoming
more common and flagrant. But a view which
takes in the centuries will not fail to note won-
derful progress toward the realization of the
kingdom of heaven on earth. Along the shore
of a river there are often currents moving in the opposite direction from the main course of the river, but these do not prove that the entire stream is flowing backwards. Out a little from the shore there is a steady current flowing constantly and irresistibly toward the sea. Although there are back-flowing moral currents which discourage and alarm the shortsighted and the timid, yet there is a mighty, irresistible current flowing constantly toward the consummation of the divine plan and purpose which is the establishment of a redeemed, reconstructed society subject to Jesus Christ, the Lord of all. This is that Holy City, the New Jerusalem, which John saw coming down from heaven to earth.
X.
The Moral Personality of the Nation.

By T. H. Acheson, D.D.

The presentation of the theme of the Moral Personality of the State, or nation, follows appropriately one of the recent discussions in this series, on the Origin of the State. The nation is not the result of a social compact; nor a necessary evil; nor a mere historical development; but it is a creation of God. This creation is a moral person.

Let us look at the meaning of the term in this connection. Just what is meant by the nation's being a moral person? It is that the

Meaning of the Term. State has its own intelligence, consciousness, volition, responsibility, and conscience. It has character. It acts much as man acts. It can and does do right and wrong. It can receive reward and punishment from the hand of God. It is under moral law and is responsible to a moral governor.

A house is not a heterogeneous pile of stone,
bricks, mortar, boards, and shingles. It is an organization, or arrangement. A tree is not merely a number of elements of seed, soil, sunshine, and rain, but it is an organism. The nation is not an agglomeration of people living in the same country. England is something more than the people living within British territory. The United States is not merely 8,000,000 people living between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and the forty-ninth and twenty-fifth degrees of latitude, for it is something more. It is a huge moral personage. The nation has an existence somewhat different from that of the individuals composing it. It has an entity of its own. It is not a mass, a mob, a company, but a living unit. The etymology of the word "nation" suggests this great truth. It is from roscor, to be born; and a nation is something born in the providence of God. The truth that a nation is a moral being is plainly and repeatedly proven and illustrated in the Word of God. It is implied in the early record of King Abimelech of Geriz (Gen. 20) when the monarch asks: "Lord, wilt Thou slay even a righteous nation?" In the same connection he says to Abraham: "Thou hast brought on me and on my kingdom a great sin." In the fourth chapter of Leviticus we find that a sacrifice was to be offered for the priest, for the ruler, for any one of the common people, and for "the whole congregation of Israel." By the "congregation" we understand the nation to be meant. If a nation were only the whole number of individuals composing it, there would not be the same appropriateness in offering a sacrifice for the "congregation" in addition to one for the individual. The punishment that came upon the nation of Amalek (1 Sam. 15) is one of the most striking illustrations in the Scriptures of national responsibility. Amalek in the days of Saul is to be smitten for what Amalek had done long before against Israel when the latter came out of Egypt. Elihu in the book of Job clearly distinguished between individual and national responsibility when he says: "When he giveth quittance, who then can condemn? And when he hideth his face, who then can behold him? Alike whether it be done unto a nation, or unto a man." In Jeremiah (5:19) we read: "Shall I not visit for these things saith Jehovah; shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" A most striking passage is found in the eighteenth chapter of the same book: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy it; if that nation, concerning which I have spoken, shall turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if they do that which is evil in my sight, that they obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherein I said I would benefit them." Observe also how
God speaks concerning Moab, and Babylon, and Egypt, and Edom, and Ammon. Much philosophical proof also could be presented to strengthen the position that a nation is a moral being. John Philoppos is quoted as saying: "The modern conception of the state has long made it a moral person, capable of right and wrong, just as are the individuals composing it." Buntrock, in his "Theory Of The State," sees these words (p. 21): "We learn that it is a moral and spiritual organism, a great body which is capable of taking up into itself the feelings and thoughts of the nation, of uttering them in laws, and realizing them in acts. History attributes to the State a personality which, having spirit and body, possesses and manifests a will of its own." Browning, in his "American Republic," apparently recognizes the same general truth in the words: "Nations are only individuals on a larger scale. They have a life, an individuality, a reason, a conscience, and instincts of their own, and have the same general laws of development and growth, and, perhaps, of decay, as the individual man."

Müllendorf, in "The Nation," says: "The nation is a moral person, since it is called as a power in the coming of that kingdom in which there is the moral government of the world, and in whose completion there is the fulfillment of its vocation there is the formation of its character. The moral personality of the nation is determined in its consciousness; in its conscious purpose subsists its independence of other nations, that it is not to be necessarily what they are nor as they are. Its object is before it, which it knows as its own; its freedom is in working out of its vocation, and in its goal there is the satisfaction of its desire." Vattel, a French writer quoted by another, affirms that a nation or State "has its own affairs and interests; it deliberates and takes resolutions in common, and thus becomes a moral person, which has its own proper understanding and will, and is capable of obligations and rights."

The fact that the nation is a moral personality is easily illustrated from history. England is responsible, in considerable degree, for the opium traffic in China. The United States was responsible for the institution of slavery. It is responsible now for the liquor traffic, for godless divorce laws, for the Sabbath mail traffic. Spain was responsible for oppression in Cuba. The United States was praiseworthy for intervention in behalf of Cuba. Not only are the people who lived during the Civil War responsible for the great debt now incurred, but the nation is. Many of those now living in our country were born since the war, but they are held accountable as parts of the nation.
Treaty obligations between nations imply moral personality. One nation enters into agreement with another to do or refrain from doing certain things. To break a proper contract is nationally dishonorable. Punishment may swiftly follow. The treaty, moreover, holds from generation to generation because the nation continues to exist.

The nation continues though dynasties, rulers, and people change. England is the same nation that it was many centuries ago. Whether under the Plantagenets, the House of York, the Tudors, or the Stuarts, the nation has been the same. France has been France, whether under the Family of Valois, the House of Orleans, or the Bourbons. The United States is the same nation that it was one hundred years ago. The people now composing the nation will nearly all be dead within one hundred years. The nation may continue till the end of the world.

That the State is a distinct personality in the affairs of the world is evident in the language of the daily press, and in its cartoons. We see a picture of a fleshy gentleman in a silk hat and we say, not that this is the English people, but that he is "John Bull." The figure of a bear appears in the same cartoon, and we know it means Russia. Another character, in the same group, perhaps, is a man with high hat and striped pantaloons; and we know he is "Uncle Sam," not merely the American people, but our nation, the United States.

The truth of the moral personality of the nation lies at the basis of political philosophy and of national reformation. It makes such reform fundamental. It makes such reform full of meaning. National reformation means much more than the success of a political movement or of a political party. It means that the nation as a great moral organization must get right with God, in constitution and statute, in ruler and deed. The fact of the moral personality of the State shows how fundamental social reformation must be. It shows us the significance of national guilt, and the necessity for national repentance, national confession, national forgiveness and national reformation. It reveals to us the meaning of national righteousness. It shows us the deepest motives for national reformation. It puts political philosophy on a higher plane than mere humanitarianism. It affords us arguments immemorially stronger than those for what is merely wise and expedient. Obligation to God enters the field. The nation should prohibit the liquor traffic not only because the welfare of the people demands it, but because the moral personality of the nation is under obligation to oppose flagrant evil. The nation should stop the Sunday
mail not only to give its citizens a day for rest and worship, but because it is a sin for the nation to conduct such a system. The nation should enact a divorce law on the basis of Christ's law, not merely to protect the home, but because the nation cannot afford to disregard the law of God. The nation should provide for moral training in its public schools, not only because it needs righteous citizens, but because part of its divine commission is to guard and develop the morality of its people.

Moreover as a concluding thought let us observe that the moral person of the State must recognize the source of its authority, and rightly honor God; and as Jesus Christ is God's appointed King, the nation must also recognize Him as its rightful ruler.

The Supreme Court on the Moral Personality of the State.

It seems difficult for some minds to grasp the meaning of the term "The Moral Personality of the State." Exceedingly absurd criticisms of this form of expression are sometimes indulged in by this class of people, not knowing that they are passing judgment on one of the most profound of all philosophical forms of speech. Their difficulty arises either from a failure to understand the true meaning of the word "person" or from an erroneous idea of the State, or from both those sources. If among men there are no persons except individual members of the human race, it follows that combinations of men and women cannot be persons. But it is not allowable so to frame the definition of the term used in a discussion as to settle in one's favor the very question at issue. The fact that we are accustomed to apply the term person to single individuals of the human species fixes in many minds the significance of the term and it seems absurd, in their view, to apply it to a political body composed of millions of human beings. It is looked upon as a sort of mystical form of speech. It might be just as well to use other terms, when this is possible, to set forth the ideas intended, so as to avoid useless discussion as to the propriety of the use of this term. But it is a term whose use is sanctioned by all the political writers of note in all countries and ages. The Scriptures regard the human family in its entirety as a moral person, as well as each separate individual, family and nation. The term denotes existence in the sphere of God's moral government, submission to moral obligations imposed through moral law, ability to do right and wrong, and the certainty of rewards and punishments. All this may be affirmed of the family, the nation and the human race. The multiplying of quotations from learned authors who maintain the moral personality of the State would doubtless...
become wearisome to the average reader without adding to the weight or clearer of the argument. Sometimes a single declaration, clearly and forcefully made by a well-known and recognized authority will prove more convincing than a large volume of quotations from authors living or dead. A decision by the Supreme Court of the United States rendered in the case of Keith vs. Clark, contains the gist of the whole matter, making clear the significance of the term and placing the sanction of the highest court in the land upon its use. The facts necessary to understand the case are these: The State of Tennessee was admitted into the Union in 1796. In 1838 this State organized the State Bank of Tennessee, and agreed by a clause in the charter to receive all its issues of circulating notes in payment of taxes. By a constitutional amendment adopted in 1836 the State declared the issues of the bank during the period of the Civil War to be void, and forbade their receipt for taxes. Mr. Keith offered Clark, the tax receiver, forty dollars of the notes issued during that period in payment of taxes, which Clark refused. Keith entered suit and lost. He carried the case from one court to another, losing each time, till it came before the Supreme Court of the United States, which court reversed the decisions of the lower courts. In the course of the argument this court quoted Vattel (Law of Nations, Sec. 1) with approbation as follows:

"Nations or States are bodies politic, societies of men united together for the promotion of their mutual safety and advantage by the joint efforts of their combined strength. Such a society has her affairs and her interests. She deliberates and takes resolutions in common, thus becoming a moral person who possesses an understanding and a will peculiar to herself, and is susceptible of obligations and rights."

The court then proceeded to argue the continuity and the moral obligations of the State through all the changes that may take place, and declared that nothing short of complete extinction or absorption by another State can annul those obligations. The following sentences contain the substance of the argument on this point:

"The political society which in 1796 became a State of the Union, by the name of the State of Tennessee, is the same which is now represented as one of those States in the Congress of the United States. Not only is it the same body politic now, but it has always been the same. There has been perpetual succession and perpetual identity. There has from that time always been a State of Tennessee, and the same State of Tennessee. Its executive, its legislative, its judicial departments have continued without interruption and in regular order. It
has changed, modified, and reconstructed its organic law, or State Constitution, more than once. It has done this before the rebellion, during the rebellion and since the rebellion. And it was always done by the collective authority and in the name of the same body of people constituting the political society known as the State of Tennessee. The significance and value of this opinion are at once apparent. It is an authoritative declaration by the highest court in the land that the State is a moral person. Reformers who urge the moral obligation of the State to submit to the authority of the Ruler of Nations and to conform its laws and life to the divine will did not originate this form of expression. They found it in current use and employed it as expressive both of the fact and of the conviction among men of the fact, that States or nations as such are creatures of God's moral government and should recognize His supremacy. The meaning of the form of expression under review is made clear by the above extract. There is no mysticism about this conception of the State. It holds that the State is the same State through all the generations of its existence. It may change its constitution any number of times, but that does not destroy its identity. Generations may come and go, institutions within the State may rise and fall; advancing civilization may produce manifold improvements in the laws and in their administration; but amid all these changes it is the same State. This opinion declares authoritatively that there is a moral obligation resting upon this moral being called the State to fulfill its contracts. No matter how many years have elapsed since the contract was made, it is still binding. The generation existing when the contract was made may have all passed away and an entirely new generation may have taken its place. Still the contract made by the State is binding. Binding upon whom? Not upon the individuals viewed as individuals, but upon the State viewed as a personality having rights and obligations. While it may not be wise at all times to use this form of expression the idea it embodies must be emphasized in every effort to secure political reform. That idea is that the social body known as the State is possessed of moral character, is capable of moral actions, is therefore a fit subject of the moral government of God, and is in fact a subject of that government. Since the government of the United States exercises its authority over individual States as moral persons compelling them to fulfill certain of their obligations, how much more may we expect the Supreme Ruler of this world so to deal with all nations. R. C. W.
Studies in Christian Citizenship

Our National Thanksgiving Festival

By E. C. Wyllie, D.D., LL.D.

The annual observance of a day of Thanksgiving by the people of the United States has become an established custom. There is no law requiring this observance, or empowering any public official or body of officials to call the people to engage in it. The President of the United States and the Governors of the several States of the Union issue proclamations year by year, enumerating the blessings and beneficent providences which have been vouchsafed to the people, and calling upon the people to render thanks to the Giver of all good, and designating a day, (usually the last Thursday of November), on which the festival is to be observed.

By the issuing of these annual proclamations, Thanksgiving day is made to differ from most other days set apart for general observance. The first annual Thanksgiving Proclama-
tions.

1
nated as Independence day and the thirtieth of May as Memorial day in the same manner. The appointment of Thanksgiving day is a voluntary act of civil magistrates. It is a most fitting custom and receives the approbation of almost all Christians whatever their denominational connection. The issuing of annual proclamations appointing such a festival instead of fixing it by statute gives opportunity each year to specify the causes which then exist for which thanks should be rendered. While the issuing of such proclamations is generally and heartily approved by the Christian people of our country, there are many who do not approve them without reservation their form and contents. Usually, however, they are less open to criticism for what they contain than for what they omit. They often fail to recognize God as the God of nations; they usually fail to recognize Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations and as the only way of approach to God the Father. The history of this national festival is deserving of careful study. Among the Hebrews there were three annual festivals of divine appointment. These are known as the Feast of the Passover or unleavened bread, the Feast of harvest or first fruits, and the Feast of Ingathering at the end of the year, sometimes called the Feast of Tabernacles. It is a very plausible supposition that our Thanksgiving festival is an imitation of this last named feast. It is not claimed that there is any divine warrant for our custom, or that there is no express command authorizing it. Yet it is not only lawful, it is exceedingly becoming, for individuals, families, Churches and nations to take time to consider the goodness of God manifested in the boundaries of His providence and in the gifts of His grace. There is a popular belief that Thanksgiving days were first observed by the people of New England. This, however, is not correct. Such a festival was frequently observed on the continent of Europe by appointment of civil authorities long before any such observance by either Pilgrims or Puritans. There is the record of a Thanksgiving day in Leyden, Holland, October 3, 1577, the first anniversary of the deliverance of that city from siege. In 1608 the Pilgrims, exiled from England, went to Holland, where they remained till 1620. In that year the Mayflower colony came to New England and seem to have brought with them the idea of observing this festival.
1680, after which it became an annual custom. The Puritans also observed Thanksgiving day and sometimes united with the Pilgrims in observing the same day.

As early as 1644 the Dutch governor of the New Netherlands issued a Thanksgiving proclamation. This was repeated a number of times in the following years. The English governor of New York appointed days of Thanksgiving in 1735 and 1760.

During the period of the Revolutionary war Thanksgiving days were observed annually, calls for the same being issued by Congress.

After 1784 the custom was discontinued till after the adoption of the constitution and the election of Washington as the first President. He appointed two Thanksgiving days, the first in 1789 and the second in 1795.

Temporary discontinuance as a national usage ever since.

Fast days have been appointed by Presidents John Adams, Madison, Buchanan, Lincoln and some others.

During the interval when no National Thanksgiving proclamations were issued the custom was gaining ground in the several States. In New England it was a constant usage. It became so in the Southern States, so that in 1858 eight governors in the South issued Thanksgiving proclamations.

The purpose for which this festival is observed invites our attention. That purpose is indicated in a general way by its name. It is a Thanksgiving day. Its purpose must be to cultivate and to give expression to feelings of thankfulness for blessings received. Moreover, it is a national, not an ecclesiastical festival. In a nation where there is no union of Church and State civil magistrates would not dare appoint an ecclesiastical observance.

It is, therefore, a national or civil festival for rendering thanks for blessings upon the nation at large and upon the individual citizens of which it is composed.

Two things are aimed at, therefore, in Thanksgiving services. The first is the cultivation of the feeling of thankfulness. There is a disposition shown by the people of most nations to indulge in unwarranted pride. Patriotism, when not properly developed and trained, is in great danger of becoming chiefly a spirit of baser selfishness. This spirit some-
times shows itself in an exaggerated form in the United States. We boast of our vast expanse of territory, our rapid growth in population and wealth, our form of government with its free institutions, our victories on the field of battle, our army and navy, our banks and industry, our moral and educational institutions, our achievements in all kinds whereby civilization has been advanced, our churches maintained without financial aid from the State, our morality, our superiority in almost all respects to all other nations. Sometimes there is at least a little of the spirit of Nebuchadnezzar manifested when, walking in the royal palace of Babylon, he spake and said: "Is not this great Babylon which I have built, for the royal dwelling place, by the might of my power and for the glory of my majesty?" There is constant need of guarding against this proud and foolish boasting. We need as a people to offer constantly the prayer of Kipling's Recessional:

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Thanksgiving services are designed to keep us in mind of the fact that we have nothing which we have not received, and that only those nations continue to be blessed that fear God and keep His commandments. The second thing aimed at in Thanksgiving services is the proper expression of feelings of thankfulness. This may be done in a measure by the appropriate use of our blessings, by making a liberal distribution of our surplus to those who are in need, by talking together of the wonderful gifts of God bestowed upon an unworthy people. But all this is not enough. Thankfulness implies a person toward whom the thanks are due. We do not thank ourselves or one another for our blessings. There is a Divine Being who provides over us as individuals and as a nation to whom we are indebted for all we have. A Thanksgiving service is essentially a religious service and involves acts of worship offered to God. It is a matter of great importance, therefore, that this worship be duly rendered. If we would render thanks to God, to Almighty God, to our Heavenly Father, it must be done through the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is vain for us to attempt to approach the Supreme Being in any other way than through the Mediator. This is true both of individuals and of nations. But Jesus Christ is also the Mediatorial Ruler of men and of nations. He is the Lord of providence. He exercises supreme authority over all things. He is the dispenser of all blessings to nations. No Thanksgiving service is properly engaged in if the worship of Jesus Christ is eliminated. No Thanksgiving proclamation is properly framed if He is not fittingly recognized. He must be honored either as the Mediator of approach to the Father or...
as the King and Benefactor with whom we have to do.

An examination of some of the first national Thanksgiving proclamations will prove to be very instructive. Frequently in times of distress during the Revolutionary struggle, Fast days were appointed by the Continental Congress, and when in answer to prayer victory was granted, days were appointed for Thanksgiving. In 1777 a resolution to appoint a committee to prepare a recommendation to the several States to set apart a day of Thanksgiving for signal victories over the enemies of the United States was adopted. The committee recommended the appointment of December 18 of that year "for solemn thanksgiving and praise, that with one heart and one voice the good people may express the grateful feelings of their hearts and consecrate themselves to the service of their Divine Benefactor; and that together with their sincere acknowledgments and offerings, they may join the pious confession of their manifold sins, whereby they had forfeited every favor, and their humble and earnest supplication that it may please God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, mercifully to forgive and blot them out of remembrance; that it may please Him graciously to afford His blessings on the governments of these States respectively, and prosper the public council of the whole; . . . to take schools and seminaries of education . . . under His nurturing hand, and to prosper the means of religion for the promotion and enlargement of that kingdom which consisteth in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

In 1793 both houses of Congress requested President Washington to call the people to thanksgiving "for the many and signal favors of Almighty God, especially by affording them two Thanksgiving opportunities, an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness." Among the causes for thankfulness President Washington enumerates the following: "His kind care and protection of the people of the country, previous to their becoming a nation, the signal and manifold mercies and the favorable interpositions of His providence in the course and conclusion of the late war, the great degree of tranquillity, union and plenty which we have since enjoyed." The proclamation continues, "And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations, and beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions," etc.

In 1795, after the suppression of an insurrection, President Washington issued a second Thanksgiving proclamation, in which this and
other favors are mentioned and for which it is declared that "it is in a special manner our duty as a people, with devout reverence and affectionate gratitude, to acknowledge our many and great obligations to Almighty God and to implore Him to continue and confirm the blessings we experience." The 19th day of February was appointed "as a day of thanksgiving and prayer . . . to render sincere and hearty thanks to the Great Ruler of Nations for the manifold and signal mercies which distinguish our lot as a nation."

As Fast day proclamations belonging in the same class with those setting apart days of Thanksgiving, they may be expected to contain similar forms of religious expression. It is Appropriate here to refer to such a proclamation issued by President Adams, March 23, 1798. Its opening clause begins thus: "As the safety and prosperity of nations ultimately and essentially depend on the protection and blessing of Almighty God, and the national acknowledgment of this truth is not only an indispensable duty which the people owe to Him, but a duty whose natural influence is favorable to the promotion of that morality and piety without which social happiness cannot exist nor the blessings of a free government be enjoyed; and as this duty, at all times incumbent, is so especially in seasons of difficulty and danger, when exist-
It is recommended that the people pray God to "make us deeply sensible that righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

It is not here contended that these proclamations are free from imperfections in their acknowledgments of God and of Jesus Christ. It is not certain that Washington had Jesus Christ in mind when he spoke of the "Great Lord and Ruler of nations," although were we now to use such a term we would mean no other. It is probable that these acknowledgments express as fully and accurately the nation's relation to God and to Christ as that relation was then conceived of by the most advanced bodies of Christians. What is especially commendable is the frankness with which Jesus Christ is acknowledged, the recognition of the Lord and Ruler of nations, the call to give thanks for national blessings, the confession of national sins. These features make it clear that the festival is a national one, that the worship to be engaged in is national worship of the God of nations, and that it is designed to give public expression to the principles of national religion.

A comparison of these earlier proclamations with those of later date will afford material for thoughtful meditation. In 1863 the Senate of the United States adopted a resolution "devoutly recognizing the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and of nations," expressing the conviction that "no people, however great in numbers and resources, or however strong in the justice of their cause, can prosper without His favor, and at the same time deploiring the national offenses which have provoked His righteous judgments," and expressing encouragement "in this day of trouble by the assurances of His Word, to seek Him for succor according to His appointed way, through Jesus Christ." The resolution then requests the President of the United States "to set apart a day for national prayer and humiliation." In compliance with this request the President designated April 30, 1863, "as a day of national humiliation, fasting and prayer." The proclamation declares it to be the duty of nations, as well as of men, to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God, to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow. It declares it to be the teaching of "Holy Scripture and proven by all history that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord," and that "nations, like individuals, are subject to punishments and chastisements in this world."

In his Thanksgiving proclamation issued November 6, 1886, President Cleveland said, "And let us, through the mediation of Him who has taught us to pray, implore the for-
givenness of our sins and a continuation of heavenly favors."

No other acknowledgments of Jesus Christ have been made by our Presidents in their proclamations appointing days of fasting or thanksgiving. There are acknowledgments of God, of Almighty God, the Lord, God of nations, Ruler of the universe; but the Mediator is ignored. The redeeming feature of these proclamations is that they bear witness to the nation's dependence on God and to the fact of national religion. National blessings, national gratitude, national sins and national obligations are made prominent in most of them.

It is a cause of profound regret that there has been a departure from the distinctively Christian form of proclamation by nearly all our later Presidents. A CHRISTLESS PROCLAMATION: Christian people should not be satisfied with proclamations calling them either to confess sin or render thanks which do not recognize Jesus Christ either as the way of approach to God or as the Mediatorial Ruler and Judge. Just as the national constitution in its failure to acknowledge the God and Ruler of nations was a departure from former usage by the American people in framing such documents, so the omission of all reference to Jesus Christ in Thanksgiving proclamations is a departure from the original form of such documents. It is safe to assume that the failure of our national constitution to acknowledge Jesus Christ has exerted a deleterious influence on these and other documents.

That the failure to acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ in Thanksgiving proclamations is not a mere oversight is evident from the following facts: The examples of such acknowledgments already quoted are well known to our Presidents; most of them have been Christian men and are not strangers to the claims made for Christ in the Bible, requests have frequently been laid before our Presidents that their proclamations be made distinctively Christian; some of our Presidents decline to do so for fear of offending Jews and other non-Christians. (Any one desiring the facts in detail can obtain them by writing to the National Reform office, 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.)

The proper method of observing the Thanksgiving festival should receive serious attention by all American citizens. Many abuses have crept in METHODS OF OBSERVING THE FESTIVAL, which ought to be condemned and eliminated. With some it is a time for feasting and nothing more. While this has doubtless always characterized the day, it never was designed to be its only or its principal feature. With some it has become a day for athletic games. Evidently there is no fitness of such games for a
day of thanksgiving. They must decidedly prevent such exercises as the day calls for. There are some who spend this and all holidays and holy days in reveling, rioting and drunkenness. Such abuses ought to cease because they profane what is sacred and lower the tone of public morals.

Thanksgiving proclamations usually include with clearness and accuracy the proper exercises for the occasion. Public religious services are recommended. Expressions of gratitude are advised for the temporal blessings with which the year has been crowned; for peace and health; for civil and religious liberty; for the continuance of our National and State governments; for the beneficial influence of schools and churches. It is advised that prayer be offered for the continuance of all these blessings; for the people of the land that they may be peaceful, industrious and law-abiding; for rulers that they may be a terror to evil-doers and a praise to them that do well; for all nations that they may be prosperous, righteous and peaceable.

It is still further recommended in some of these proclamations that confession be made of both individual and national sins, and forgiveness sought through Jesus Christ.

There are some parts of an appropriate Thanksgiving service not mentioned in any of these proclamations. It is a most fitting occasion for presenting the Christian principles of civil government; pointing out the defects of our governmental framework; showing the dangers which hang over our country because of its secularism; urging the necessity of reformation to make this nation right with God so as to secure the continuance of His blessings.

There is a manifest tendency to observe Thanksgiving day in some quarters in strict accordance with Christian Thanksgiving proclamations. Union services by Jews and Christians are arranged, presumably on the level of the faith of the Jews. It is vain to attempt to approach God on the merely deistic basis. The ceremonies of Christians who engage in such a service are blazoned and corrupted. Their part of the service is even a greater offense than that of the Jews. The latter worship according to their belief and profession, the former compromise on the very principle which makes them Christians.

That Thanksgiving proclamations may be framed after the pattern of the most perfect type of such documents; that they may express the truth as to the obligation of the nation to give thanks for national blessings; that they may embody the true principles of political science in so far as these should find expression in such papers; that the true and only way of approach to God through Jesus Christ may be plainly mentioned; that the people may observe the
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