

Civil Rulers Serving the Lord

or **The Scriptural Doctrine of National Religion.**

Published by the Library Committee of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Geelong Australia. 1997

A Sermon, preached at the opening of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Scotland, May 15th, 1882, by the Rev. James Dick, M.A.

Psalm 2: 11. "Serve the Lord with fear."

In matters pertaining to purely secular progress the civilised nations of today have profited much by the experiences of nations in the past. In material strength and resources for the purposes either of peace or of war, and in the social order, education, refinement, and prevalent human sympathy which go to make up civilisation, in the ordinary sense of that word, the leading nations of the world are vastly superior to their predecessors of a thousand or two thousand years ago. To the great and rapid progress which they have made, history has contributed in no small degree. Those methods of national policy that are seen to have been generally beneficial in the past, the national successes of the past, even the national failures of the past, have all in their own way conveyed useful instruction on the subject of national prosperity.

In addition, however, to the lessons taught by history in its ordinary course, as one of God's methods of teaching the nations, there have been specially brilliant and outstanding facts in His providence which within a few generations have practically revolutionised the world, and served to enrich our civilisation with the streams of material, intellectual, and moral wealth through a thousand channels all unknown before. Such events were the invention of the art of printing, which, from rude beginnings, has grown to the mightiest human agency on the face of the earth; the discovery of America by Columbus, which not only added to the then known world a

new hemisphere, but gave a powerful impulse to the study of geography and the art of navigation, and opened up those facilities for colonisation which have since created, under God, the great nationality of the United States; and the comparatively recent invention of the application of steam for the propelling machinery, to which we owe "the steamship and railway," easy inter-communication between the most distant nations, and a thousand new industries in the home. Nor have the inventions to which we have referred leaped to perfection all at once. We may even question whether they have attained to perfection yet. The mechanical and engineering triumphs of forty or fifty years ago that in their day wore a look of completeness and finality, as if they had touched the outermost limit of human skill, have been far surpassed by the more brilliant and astonishing triumphs of the present time. And who can tell whether many of the mechanical appliances that seem so perfect now may not be wholly superseded as antiquated and rude, fifty years hence, to make way for some inventions more splendid and daring still? Whatever may be in the future, we know that the great nations of the world now have made skilful use of history, in respect of what may be called secular duty, of national enterprise, and of all outward progress. We know that, in these respects, they have gathered up what was fitted to be useful from the experience or the experiments of the past, seeking to have it incorporated

with the national attainments, while they still go forward on the march of knowledge and of power.

When we speak of the secular prosperity of great nations, we do not mean that it has flowed solely or chiefly from secular sources. The three greatest nations at the present time are unquestionably Britain and Germany in the Old World, and the United States of America in the New. To what do they owe their greatness? The lessons of secular wisdom learned from history, together with abundant natural advantages, might conceivably account for the purely physical or material elements of their greatness. But there are elements in their prosperity and civilisation that cannot be accounted for on any secular principles. They have a moral as well as material elevation above other great nations that can be satisfactorily explained only by a prevalent sense of obligation, less or more, on the part of their people to the God of the Bible. And if we can and must trace the moral superiority of these nominally Protestant nations to the direct or indirect influence of supernatural revelation and the knowledge of the true God, surely it is but fair to suppose that a part, at least, of their secular superiority may be traced to the same source. The light of Divine revelation and the favour of the Almighty have probably contributed not a little even to the temporal prosperity of these great States, who have so many of God's saints among their inhabitants, while the same gracious Providence has certainly contributed the whole of that comparative moral excellence by which they are distinguished from Popish and other idolatrous nations.

There is one point, however, and that of supreme importance, on which the teaching of history, of Divine revelation, and of present national needs, though all clear enough and solemn enough, has been almost universally disregarded. With all their great progress and growing civilisation, the great nations to which we have referred have learned nothing about the duty of formal national subjection to God and Christ. They are in rebellion against the

Sovereign hand that has made them great. They still refuse to acknowledge those Christian principles of national action which, by their direct or indirect operation in the past, have made all the true moral greatness of nations. All that is pure in their civilisation, all that is morally excellent in their laws, all that is righteous in their action may be justly set down as net results of the operation of Scriptural principles in the past. The law and gospel of Jesus Christ by their influence on individual lives have lifted these nations immeasurably above many others. Yet they frown upon the religion that has enlightened them. Christian nations, they are indeed called, because Christianity is the religion professed by the majority of the inhabitants, but they are not Christian nations in the strict sense of being nationally subject to God's Anointed.

The Second Psalm furnishes an inspired representation of

**FACTS IN THE RELATION OF THE KINGS
OF THE EARTH TO THE SOVEREIGNTY OF
JEHOVAH.**

The heathen raging and the people imagining a vain thing, the kings of the earth setting themselves and the rulers taking counsel together against the Lord and against His Christ - that is what the powers of this world, for the most part have been doing since the beginning. There is, of course, the outstanding exception of the formal submission of the Jewish nation for many generations to the authority of Jehovah, although the practical force of that relationship to God was almost wholly destroyed occasionally, when they mingled with the heathen and learned their way of rebellion and self-will. And there was, at the time of the First and Second Reformations in Scotland, a formal surrender of our own land to Him whose "blessed evangel" brought peace and true civilisation. But with these exceptions, and one or two minor exceptions of a similar kind, the nations have been hitherto in uniform and incessant rebellion against God.

Civil Rulers Serving the Lord

It was so in David's time, when from his throne on the literal "holy hill of Zion" he contemplated the state of the nations. Identifying himself and his kingdom with the cause of God, he saw the swelling tumult of hostile kingdoms, and knew that it was a tumult against God. Yet reflecting on the wall of fire round about and the glory in the midst of God's covenant nation, he knew also that the people were imagining a vain thing, in plotting to shake the throne of the Lord's Anointed, and to lay waste "the Lord's Portion." And then, looking out prophetically into the future he foresaw the same eager and malignant plotting against the greater Anointed or Christ of God, of whom he was a type, and the same surging rebellion with the same results - crushing defeat for the Lord's enemies and fresh accessions of power for His saints. Never was there a vain imagination so utterly vain as the attempt of men and devils to destroy the Son of God. "Of a truth against Thy Hold Child Jesus," said the disciples after Peter and John had been commanded by the Jewish Council to preach no more in the name of Jesus, referring to David's words, "both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were gathered together." But it was only "to do what Thy hand and counsel determined before to be done."

So it is still. The most enlightened nations of the world are still set against the Lord. The tendency of public policy in our own land for generations has been toward the management of national affairs with the least possible recognition of God. Indeed the problem that the greatest statesmen in our country are trying to solve now is how to secure the admission of avowed atheists to the House of Commons, and so practically render the whole government of the nation atheistic; for the rule that shall give full legal standing and legislative functions to an atheist will absolutely exclude God from and authority whatsoever over the nation or its administration. If God must be in a nation as its Lord, then an atheist must not and cannot be admitted to

its legislature. And if an atheist according to the genius of the constitution must be admitted, that is a proof that God is gone from the constitution already, although custom may still require an oath in His name. This course is pleaded for in the name of civil liberty and liberty of conscience; which plainly means that there can be no liberty under the authority of God! The cords and bands of the Lord's Christ constitute intolerable bondage in the estimation of our esteemed statesmen. To have any necessary connection "between civil duty and religious belief" is according to the first minister of the Crown at present, alien to the genius of the constitution. But the oath of allegiance involves, on the part of those who take it, some belief in the True God, and such a yoke can be no longer borne! So the Prime Minister and his colleagues are ready, if the temper of the country will allow them, to break the last shred of theism that in a sense binds the constitution as yet to the throne of the Supreme, and send the nation adrift on the dark stream of atheism that flows on to the moral chaos and perdition, under the frown and curse of heaven. The brilliant statesman is thus but a conspirator against Christ like those who are described in this Second Psalm. His language practically and really is, "Let us asunder break their bands, and cast their cords from us." The nation's covenants or oaths of allegiance to Christ the King were formally repudiated two hundred years ago, and now the rebellion is to be crowned by driving the very name of God out of the atheist's way! "Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing?"

GOD CALLS THE NATIONS TO WISDOM.

To the rebellious powers in David's time, the Divine long-suffering said, "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings; be instructed ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the son lest He be angry and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little." The same merciful exhortations are

Civil Rulers Serving the Lord

still uttered in the audience of the nations,- merciful because the fact and the guilt of national rebellion seem to call for the thunders of the curse rather than for any fresh prescription of duty,- merciful because reiterated calls to national duty suggest the possibility and the hope of national restoration and honour, when the nations might have been justly left in everlasting dishonour or hopelessly broken to pieces like a potter's vessel.

THE DIVINE CALL IS UNHEEDED.

The kings and judges and governments whom God mercifully invites to "be wise" are not learning wisdom; they are not serving the Lord with fear; they are not kissing the Son; they are continuing to brave the kindling of His wrath and courting speedy destruction. They seem to think that the precedents for national indifference to Christ's authority are now so firmly established, that He must give up all His claims and leave the nations to their own way. His authority over nations, they seem to say, may have been useful once, but it would be superstition to recognise it now. National disregard for Christ's authority has grown into an almost venerable custom in the popular estimation; and the idol of political expediency, which immoral custom has put in the place of the Divine law, is worshipped by both rulers and ruled, with few exceptions, as the nation's God. Even the great body of professing Christians either consent to the idolatry and join in it, or, which comes practically to the same thing, they think it is hopeless to attempt its abolition. And so the nations become more and more hardened in that sin which is an invariable and essential element in their public policy.

NEVERTHELESS THE FORCE OF THE DIVINE CLAIMS IS NOT ABATED.

Persistent sin may sear the national conscience and destroy the sense of obligation, but cannot diminish the obligation itself. God's command here to

kings to "serve the Lord with fear" is no less binding now than it was from the beginning. It has been forgotten by the nations but never for a moment by the Governor among the nations. It expresses the will of the King of kings with as much freshness of solemnity and interest, to those who are wise enough to understand it, as if it were uttered in an audible voice from heaven this very hour in every palace, and parliament, and senate upon earth. "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings."

IN WHAT CAPACITY ARE KINGS TO SERVE THE LORD?

Having seen that this 2nd Psalm is applied in the New Testament to the hostility of the rulers of Jesus Christ we do not need to prove that the command, "Serve the Lord with fear" is addressed to kings and rulers respecting official homage to Christ as Mediatorial King, to whom the Father has given all nations for His inheritance. There would be no force in the mention of official titles if the command were meant only for their private life. Moreover the true import and application of the command can be at once determined by a reference to the evils against which it is directed. The kings are setting themselves, and the rulers taking counsel - that is, in their official character and making use of their official power and influence they are consulting how *not* to serve the Lord. This is their sin; their duty is exactly the opposite of this. This command requires them in the same official capacity to serve the Lord. And this is, we think, so obviously the meaning that we wonder it has ever been questioned. Nothing but the credulity of error could believe, and nothing but the ingenuity of error could ask us to believe, that God addresses kings as kings, when condemning their rebellion, and that He addresses them only as private persons when He requires them to cease their rebellion. It is quite clear that in the same official capacity in which they have been opposing Christ they are commanded to

change their rebellion for faithful allegiance and spontaneous service.

We now come to the questions, What is the nature, and what is the extent, of the service which the rulers or states are required to render to Christ? We might answer by referring to a number of Scripture statements and facts that go to illustrate different aspects of national homage to the King of kings. But we may also, quite apart from such illustration, determine every question as to the nature or extent of national service to Christ by considering intelligently

THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF CHRIST'S AUTHORITY OVER THE NATIONS.

His dominion is not mere physical control such as he exercises over earth and sea and air, or over the sun, moon, and stars in the their courses. If it were only this there could be no national sin. No national action could be morally wrong, because the nation in that case would not be required to observe any fixed moral standard. And He could not punish any nation for taking its own way if He does not require it to take His way, or even requires it not to take His way, according to the position taken by many professing Christians who hold that "religious equality" is only political justice.

Nor is His dominion merely the authority of a holy Creator and Law Giver. True, it is all this, but it is more. There is not a single precept of His Word to us, in any relations that men sustain to one another or to Him, that has not been given by Him as the Mediator. That is, He has been commissioned by the Father to execute certain glorious purposes of mediation among the fallen, magnifying the grace of the Eternal Godhead in saving sinners, and all power in heaven and earth has been given unto Him for the accomplishment of these purposes. And He has been specially set as God's King upon the Holy Hill of Zion, to be thus the Sole Head and Lord of His Church, and to issue His commands or the revelation of His will, from His central kingdom to all the kingdoms of the earth,

for "Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Indeed the grant of authority to Him as Mediator goes beyond all nations, for it includes all creatures. It is expressly said that God "gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church." That is, every creature in heaven and earth, and under the earth, is placed under his dominion to be subservient to the accomplishment of His purposes as God's Anointed Mediatorial King.

From the Scriptural doctrine of Christ's universal Lordship we can understand the nature and the extent of the service which nations are required to render to Him. He is their King, possessed of absolute authority over them, the rightful Lord of every person, every where, at all times, in every relation, and so the rightful Lord of all the persons in a nation when they are joined together in the capacity of rulers and ruled.

Hence proper national service to Christ is

I. THE PUBLIC CONFESSON THAT, IN RESPECT OF ALL THE ORDINARY AFFAIRS OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT, CHRIST IS THE NATION'S LORD. The Scripture most clearly teaches, as we have seen, that He has authority over all nations, and that His authority has no limits. It is not an authority that affects only some great questions of morality and religion, and leaves a thousand other questions of public policy to the nations to settle as best they can, but an authority that claims to be supreme in the decision of every question, so that the whole administration of the realm may be harmony with His Holy Word, and therefore in the highest sense His administration; reflecting no discredit upon His crown as He is the Governor among the nations; and proclaiming by its heavenly morality and uprightness that the Son of God is in deed and in truth the nation's King, and that the influence of His Spirit is paramount in the nation's counsels. It may be said that this is placing the ideal of national service very high. So it is, but it is no higher than the Scriptural ideal, and no higher than the

prophetic ideal. That every act of national policy should be an act of obedience to that law of Christ which is broad enough to cover every human relation and every human action, is the ideal of national duty frequently prescribed in Scripture, and the ideal of national glory frequently predicted.

The formal revelation of Christ's claims to supremacy is made in the most public manner, and associated with that work of salvation which is of the most public interest. Therefore, obviously, national homage to Him ought to be, first of all,

1, ~ *A public, formal, express confession of His Lordship.*

This is the fitting response to the public claim. This is the necessary response if the nation wishes to have respect to His glory. He demands the crown as a part of the glory to which He is from eternity entitled as the Creator and Moral Governor of the universe, and from eternity entitled as the Creator and Moral Governor of the universe, and from eternity entitled also by the grant of the Father to Him as Mediator. It is specially and formally in this latter capacity that He presents His claim. And nothing less will satisfy Him than to have the crown of Kingly authority over the nations placed publicly and nationally upon His head.

One very instructive analogy for the public national confession of Christ as Lord may be found in the public personal confession which, by the law of His kingdom, He requires from every believer. Those who enter His kingdom spiritually are required to enter it also visibly, accepting by open profession His authority and the responsibilities of His service, and counting it an honour as well as a duty to be publicly identified with His cause. The Saviour uttered very solemn words of incitement to this duty - "Whosoever shall confess Me before men, Him will I confess also before My Father which is in heaven." And the other side of the same truth is presented in the following words, - "But whosoever shall

deny Me before men, him will I also deny before My Father which is in heaven." If our Lord thus attaches great importance to the glory He derives from the confession of individual believers, He must regard a national confession of His Name and authority as more important still, because it covers a wider ground, and is fitted to exert a wider influence in promoting His glory.

Another analogy is suggested by the circumstances of an earthly king's coronation day. On the death of a king or queen, the heir-apparent becomes virtual sovereign. But his sovereignty is not left, as a matter of national custom or general understanding, to be inferred from his relationship to the deceased monarch. He is publicly crowned and exalted to the throne by the formal deed of the nation as its lawful king. Jesus Christ is rightful heir to the throne of all nations in a sense that requires even kings and queens to be His humble vassals. He has waited long for His coronation in His earthly dominions. Why should he not *He* be publicly crowned? No heir-apparent ever had such a glorious title. No earthly coronation that the world has ever seen was so imperatively demanded by the interests of public righteousness. The grace that wore the purple robe and the crown of thorns, put on Him in cruel mockery of His magnificent Kingly claims, and wore them without a complaint or a frown, to accomplish a saving purpose that He might be able to send out authoritatively a gospel of salvation "to all nations," - the grace that has kept the gospel before the nations in spite of national ingratitude, indifference, and rebellion, is surely entitled to a hearing when it asks the nations now to remove the degradation of the thorn-crown, and confess that He is worthy to wear the imperial crown of universal dominion as the King of grace and of glory. Such a coronation amid the intelligent acclaim of ransomed nations would at once honour Him and reflect unspeakable honour upon the nations themselves.

The oath of allegiance sworn by subjects to a monarch suggests an important form of national confession to Christ. As

we think of such a pledge of fealty, our thoughts go back naturally to those national covenants which held such a prominent place in the history of Israel of old, and to those national covenants which constituted such a power in Church and State in the days of the Reformation. What were they all but oaths of allegiance on the part of Churches or nations to the Heavenly King? And what could be more natural or becoming or scriptural than for the subjects of the Sovereign Mediator thus to swear allegiance to Him still? "God hath highly exalted Him and given Him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, ...and every tongue CONFESS that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." And this prediction accords exactly with the oath of Christ Himself, recorded in Isaiah xlv. 23, "I have sworn by Myself ... that unto Me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." This oath to subdue all things to Himself is not the only oath sworn by the Great King of kings. He has also sworn - His oath being added to His promise that we might have strong consolation - that He will make His reign a reign of blessing to the spiritual seed of Abraham, and make that seed a blessing to all the nations of the earth. To this gracious coronation oath, as we may regard it, ought not all nations and kindreds of the earth to respond with an oath of thankful and joyful allegiance?

It would, however, be a mockery of Christ's royal claims if the national confession of His Lordship consisted in mere words, and still worse if the insincere words were accompanied by the solemnity of an oath. In national service to Him there must be, further,

2, - A practical Confession of His Lordship.

An important part of the Scriptural ideal of national homage to Christ is a thoroughly Scriptural national constitution. Whether the constitution be written or unwritten, it must contain, along with the verbal or practical acknowledgement of Christ's Sovereignty, the fearless assertion

and application of the holy principles of His Word. The Character of the national compact that does so much to mould the national life, must be itself moulded by the will of Christ, if its influence and issues are to be for good. As it is with the individual life so it is with the national life. True individual life has its origin in the creation of a holy disposition to receive and be guided by the Holy Word of God to holy ends. On the part of the individual, anything less than or different from the acceptance of the holy principles of Christ's kingdom as guiding principles of the life, is rebellion against Christ, and, in spite of any profession of religion, tends to more and greater rebellion as the life runs on its course. Similarly a national constitution if it be not according to the will of Christ, is, notwithstanding verbal professions to the contrary, at variance with His will, and so, being shaped in rebellion against Him and in the rejection of the wise principles of His kingdom, it leads to rebellion and to the casting off, one by one, of the cords of His authority, which national traditions or national sentiment may have for a time retained. A Scriptural constitution, on the other hand, seeks to break no bands and cast off no cords of Mediatorial authority, by rather to bind the nations the more closely in dutiful and honourable allegiance to Christ's throne.

Beginning with holy principles it provides for the appointment of holy men to carry them out. Indeed it could not be a thoroughly Scriptural constitution if it did not require Scriptural qualifications in its various officers. And a constitution, otherwise Scriptural, could not be carried out by any other method. If ungodly men be set up they have no practical or real sympathy with what is Scriptural in the constitution, and therefore cannot honestly carry it out. And if a constitution that is Scriptural in every other particular admits of the elevation of men, who give no satisfactory evidence of Scriptural qualifications, to fill public offices of State, all its Scriptural provisions will soon, by the deadly logic of one wrong principle

admitted, be wholly abolished, or at least be neutralised and become a dead letter.

We know how the *nominal Protestantism* of the British constitution, which survived the shock of the Restoration and of the Revolution, was at last surrendered to the demands of Popery, when Roman Catholics by the Emancipation Act became eligible for membership in Parliament and for various public offices. We know how the *nominal Christianity* of the constitution, which lingered for about a generation longer, at last was trampled under the feet of a false liberality, that clamoured for the political emancipation of the Jews. And we know how the Government of the present hour was willing at any time during the last three or four years to abolish the theism of the constitution, or the reference to the Being of God, in order to provide for the admission of an atheist as one of the nation's legislators.

Let the first wrong step be taken; let men without Scriptural qualifications be elected to the House of Commons under the sanction of the constitution; and every other step logically follows, down to the abyss of national atheism. Even men professing evangelical Christianity have argued for the admission of atheists on the ground that the genius of the constitution logically tends to their admission. If Roman Catholics, and Jews, and Socinians make good legislators, it is argued, why should not an atheist make a good legislator too? And if the former classes are freely admitted, and if it is commonly regarded as a proof of the wonderful liberty and liberality and elasticity of the British constitution that they are admitted, why limit the glorious freedom enjoyed under the constitution, by straining it to exclude any man on account of his belief or unbelief? It is our profoundest conviction that this reasoning is unanswerable, on the principles on which the nation has been acting for the last two hundred years. But on Scriptural principles, the concessions and facts upon which the reasoning is founded would have had no being, and so the reasoning could have had

no being. As it is, and adopting a Scriptural standard by which to try such arguments - which the nation as a nation cannot do seeing that it has repudiated the Scriptural standard - we cannot easily answer it. If there has been one wrong concession to God's enemies, one criminal departure from the commands of Christ in the public policy, that is no reason why there should be another. If the nation has been moving steadily for a few generations towards a dangerous precipice and a yawning gulf that is not reason why it should take the fatal leap. The danger is now, or ought to be, full in view. All that is needed to discern it is a little intelligent acquaintance with history, or better still, a little of that wisdom that comes from above to open blind eyes. And the sight of the danger ought to lead the nation to stop, to turn back, to retrace its steps, though it is proverbially harder to go up the hill than to go down.

It may be argued for the admission of the atheist to Parliament that if the nation is now to take religious ground, and exclude atheists, it cannot logically stop there. It must go on to purge the Parliament of Arians and other infidels, of Jews and of Papists. And why not? Because, we shall be told, that would amount to persecution. It is not our present business to deal at length with the reasonableness of the cry of persecution which is raised so commonly in these days against any effort to secure *Scriptural qualifications*. But we may suppose a case which we think ought to settle the question with any evangelical Christian. Let us suppose that the heir-apparent to the British throne should declare himself an atheist. By the present law of the land this would bar his way to the crown. According to the sentiment that cries "Persecution" when an atheist member of Parliament is shut out, it must also be persecution to require Protestantism, or even nominal Christianity of any sort, in the heir-apparent. Is the law of the Protestant succession then a persecuting law? So-called Christians, and even Christian ministers, who argue for the admission of the atheist to Parliament to avoid persecution, are logically bound to

answer this question in the affirmative, for the disqualification for office is the same in principle, whether applied to a king or to a subject. But is it not simply preposterous, not to say monstrous, to argue that a nation of professing Christians should not only be permitted to crown an atheist, but required to do so, if he should happen to be the heir-apparent, and that it would be persecution to refuse him the crown? Is the mere withholding of an important public trust from a man who denies the being of God, a thing that in the very slightest degree resembles persecution? Persecution means the infliction of injuries or the withholding of rights for conscience sake. But it is assuming what requires to be proved to assume that an atheist has a right to the throne, or a right to rule over men in any office in the State, under any conceivable circumstances, in a Bible land. The Word of God emphatically denies his right. And it is rather dangerous as well as foolish for Christians to assert it. By doing so they cast over their Christianity and their patriotism the shadow of natural and most reasonable suspicion.

It may be said that exclusion of atheists will logically lead to the adoption of such tests in other cases as will amount to a trial of orthodoxy. And why not? Does not God say that "he that ruleth over men must be just, *ruling in the fear of God?*" And does he not also say, "Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee whom the Lord thy God shall choose?" The rule thus laid down by the Spirit of Inspiration about kings applies also to subordinate officers - they too must be men who fear God, who live truth and hate covetousness. Without religious tests - tests of orthodoxy, if you will - it is impossible for a nation to do anything to secure such rulers, or to secure the rejection of those who have not these qualifications. Moreover, we think it altogether impossible for a nation to have true peace or true and lasting social order in national atheism, or even at any intermediate point between national atheism and the Second Reformation principle which relentlessly and, we believe, with the approval of the

Most High God, excluded from all places of power and trust in the State those who were known to be disaffected toward the covenants and the work of reformation. If the nation were now to retrace its steps all the way to that high and safe ground, it would at once free itself from many a fallacious argument. And it would find that the perfection of civil liberty, and liberty of conscience is not national atheism - which is an altogether devilish conception of liberty - but national subjection to God, exemplified in a Scriptural constitution, as administered by God-fearing men,

To realise the practical recognition of Christ's authority now, in a nation like our own, would require a sweeping moral revolution. A nation newly sprung up would have much to do in the effort to comprehend all its detailed duties to the Anointed of God. A nation that has for many generations been proceeding on wrong principles and withholding its strength from its Divine Head, has all to do and much to undo. A complicated system of idolatry has grown up, and grown old, around the central idol of political expediency. The worship of that idol has been sanctioned and almost sanctified by the prevailing custom of the nation for two hundred years. It will be difficult to abolish it now. It is hard to pull up a tree that has struck its roots deep and sent them out far into the earth. As people have come to consider it a tight thing, and even a holy thing - for they plead liberty of conscience for it - to effect an entire separation "between civil duty and religious belief," it will be difficult to uproot their convictions, and prove to them that there can be no proper discharge of "civil duty" at all, unless there be proper "religious belief" to shape the motives, determine the ends, and choose the means. It will be difficult also to have State abuses reformed, because people have come to regard them as necessary State institutions.

Nevertheless the very first measures of national service to Christ in Britain must be measures of reform. National rebellion has entrenched itself behind a constitution

that does not contain the formal subjection of the nation to Christ, and behind many a law and custom and principle at variance with Christ's will. The constitution, by its fatal defect in leaving out the moral supremacy of Jesus Christ, admits of almost anything in the shape of legislation, however shocking to the religious sense, for which a misguided popular sentiment may clamour; almost anything, however immoral and unjust in the sight of God and godly men, that will bring gains into the national treasury. Witness the recent abominable legislation by which the nation became responsible for and gave its sanction to uncleanness, the destructive opium traffic that has been forced upon China at the sword's point, and the reckless licensing of an equally destructive and demoralising traffic in intoxicating liquors at home. Add to all this the national countenance and support given to Prelacy and Popery, and to some forms of heathen idolatry in British possessions abroad, in violation of the law of Christ the King of nations, and, of course, also in violation of the most solemn national obligations to the contrary in the public covenants; add also the principles upon which support is extended to Presbyterianism in Scotland, placing it on a level with Popery, Prelacy, and Paganism, and so making it one of a number of mutually antagonistic forms of religion that it is considered expedient to support for political ends; add more over the prevalent spirit of the legislation and administration, which ignores the law of Christ, and exalts to supremacy mere political expediency or the will of the people; and the result is a mountain of national sin that must be levelled and become a plain by decisive reformation or revolution, to make way for national return to God and national homage to God's Son.

In the days of the reforming kings of Judah, their zeal first attacked the idols that had been set up to receive the people's worship. The image of Baal was not allowed any longer to usurp the place of Jehovah. Images, altars, groves, and all other monuments of degrading idolatry were

swept away and the temple cleansed, that the worship of the true God might be restored. So it must be with our own land if it would return to God's covenant and service. The Baal of mere political expediency must be ground to powder; the will of the people must bend or break in the presence of the will of the Lord of hosts; iniquitous legislation must be repealed; unscriptural concessions to false systems must be recalled; endowments given to error, to idolatry, to Antichrist, must be withdrawn, and, for the maintenance of truth and true religion, they must be laid at the feet of Christ. God's message, through Samuel, to a sinning nation of old, was "If ye do return unto the Lord with all your hearts, then put away the strange gods and Ashtaroth from among you, and prepare your hearts unto the Lord and serve Him only." The true practical service of Christ cannot co-exist with habitual idolatry on the part either of an individual or of a nation. Christ claims not a part but the whole of our homage in every relation, not limited but absolute authority over men and nations. Therefore the idols must be utterly abolished in an idolatrous nation, as an essential preliminary to the practical service of Christ; and as a proof that the nation is sincere in its submission to the Universal Lord.

The open and practical subjection of a nation to Christ, where that subjection is sincere, extends, however beyond purely civil matters, which are the immediate ends of a national constitution. The nation, as we have seen, is required to place all its civil affairs beneath His authority, and to endeavour to have them first and last regulated by His holy law, for His glory as the King of nations. But truly holy and obedient nation will do much more than this. It will intelligently recognise the great end of Christ's authority over nations, and voluntarily seek to promote the accomplishment of that end as its own great and ultimate end. The service rendered for this purpose to Christ constitutes the second department of national service, which we

must now briefly consider. It may be defined in this way:-

II. THE CONSECRATION OF THE NATION'S INFLUENCE AND RESOURCES TO THE PROMOTION OF HIS GLORY IN THE CHURCH.

At the very outset, in dealing with the vexed question of the relations that ought to subsist between the Church and State, we must endeavour to apprehend intelligently the doctrine of Christ's Headship. We are accustomed to the propositions, Christ is Head of the Church, and Christ is Head over the nations. And we are accustomed to hear two parties, who hold the most conflicting views of the relation between Church and State, both with equal readiness assenting to both of these propositions. The conflict arises from the attempt to separate the two headships, or rather to divide one headship into two. The Head over the nations, as we have already seen, is the Mediator. This Second Psalm decisively settles for us the question of the capacity in which He rules over the nations. It is as God's Anointed, sitting on the holy hill of Zion - that is, enthroned in the Church - that He issues His commands to the nations. In this capacity, and from this position of exaltation in the midst of the Church, He exercises supreme authority over the whole intelligent creation, physical control over such parts of that creation as reject His authority, and all power over the irrational and inanimate creation, so as to make all things work together for good to His Church. It is clear from this that what He literally makes all things do, He requires intelligent creatures, who are capacitated to serve Him, to concur with all other things in doing, and so requires nations, as placed under Him, to make His glory in the Church their greatest concern.

But the matter may be presented in another light. We are expressly told that God "gave Him to be Head over all things." And we are expressly told the purpose for which He is thus given to be Head over all things - it is "*to the Church,*" or for the Church. Nations, as a matter of course, as nations, are included in "all things." Let us,

then, read the passage in its connection with the point we are now considering - "gave Him to be Head over" nations "to the Church," and we derive from it the following doctrine; - *That the great end for which Christ is set over nations, or, conversely, that the great end for which nations are placed under Christ, is that they may be subservient to His purpose in the Church.* Subordinate ends, of course, there are; immediate civil or political ends, of course, there are, for the relation of organised States to Christ their Head, and for the authority of Christ over them; but the great ultimate end is expressed in the words, "to the Church."

It is inconceivable, on any Scriptural view of the Mediator's crown, that it should be otherwise. No intelligent Christian doubts that the Church of Christ is a kingdom which infinitely transcends all earthly kingdoms in importance, as the kingdom which has been established in grace, and which sustains so close a relation to Christ that it is called "His body." His body is for ever inseparable from Himself in its history. The progress of the Church is the progress of His glory in a far higher sense than the progress of any earthly kingdom could be. And it would be strange indeed if the nations, though placed under "this King of Glory," were at liberty to stand aloof from His most glorious operations in maintaining, perpetuation, and extending His kingdom, and refuse Him their influence and their tribute; stranger still if we supposed Him to forbid the nations to co-operate with Him as He makes for Himself "a glorious name" in the Church. That would imply that the nations were not placed under Him *for the Church* at all, that the nations ought to have one end in view while He has another; that He has two quite distinct and mutually exclusive purposes to serve in His Mediatorial sovereignty instead of one eternal purpose, quite apart from the Church, instead of being, as Scripture teaches, for the Church, or "to the Church;" and, in short, that nations alone are to be but neutral spectators while He is marching in the midst of His Church and at the head

Civil Rulers Serving the Lord

of creation to the consummation of His Mediatorial glory.

If Christ's purpose and power are concentrated in the Church, then the purpose and power of all His true servants, whether they be individuals or nations, must tend toward the same centre. If Christ is Head of the nations then they owe Him formal, intelligent obedience. And real obedience looks to His eye for direction, seeks to know that upon which His heart is set, kisses the Son in token of loving acquiescence in His holy will, and follows Him "whithersoever he goeth." To affirm that nations may not render this formal, intelligent, and loving obedience to Christ, by giving their strength and resources, specially and chiefly, to the advancement of His kingdom, the church, and that nations are to concern themselves only about purely civil matters, is to affirm that under the Mediatorial dominion of Jesus Christ there are most influential human associations that exist only for earthly purposes. We know it is a fact that practically they do so exist now, and that but seldom in all the history of the past have the purposes of the nations risen above the earthliness of purpose on the part of civil rulers in their official capacity is wholly incredible. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that actual national indifference to Christ, or active rebellion against Him, is the very ideal of national duty. And if we suppose civil rulers asking, In what way are we to serve Christ under whom we are placed? we cannot for a moment suppose that He would answer, You are not to think of serving Me at all in your official capacity; you are to take cognisance only of civil matters; and as for My Church, although that is the sphere of My special operation and special honour, you are simple to let it alone. This would be equivalent to sanction on Christ's part of the rebellious counsel, "Let us break their bands and cast their cords away from us." And it would be quite inconsistent with His terrible words to the Church with regard to neutral nations, "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea those nations shall be utterly wasted."

We believe we are justified in regarding it as a matter of Scriptural demonstration that nations, as nations, in their public and official action, are to have supreme regard to the advancement of Christ's revealed purpose in the Church. It is clear that the claims of this doctrine are not satisfied with anything less than formal national legislation in favour of the Church, following immediately upon the national recognition of Him who "excellency is over Israel." In such legislation is to be found real national religion, which does not consist, as is sometimes loosely argued, in the personal religion of the inhabitants of a nation, but in the religion that appears in the public and formal action of the nation as such. A part of national religion, we have already seen, consists in the placing of all civil action under the direction of the Mediator as Supreme Lawgiver. But the chief part consists in the formal identification of a nation with His cause, and the formal humble alliance of the nation with His Church, as His servant or minister "to the Church," in order that His cause may, by intelligent instrumentality, be helped on to that triumph which shall bless alike both the Church and the nations, while it places the crown upon His head.

We do not mean, of course, that the nation should be ruled over by the Church; still less do we mean that the Church should be ruled over or dictated to by the nation. Rome is a monstrous example of the former error; Erastian Establishments past or present are examples of the latter. We do mean that Christ should rule over both for a common end, and that they should be heartily willing to be joined together in friendly alliance for the better attainment of that end. Such an alliance we may, for convenience, call by the name of a civil establishment of the Church, so far as the action of the State is concerned; and we might also almost call it an ecclesiastical establishment of the State, so far as the action of the Church is concerned. That is, the Scriptural State formally recognises the Scriptural Church as the independent spiritual kingdom of Jesus, and, while

attending to its own immediate and subordinate ends, it gives its main strength and influence to the furtherance of the Church's work, which is the noblest end that any civil society can propose to itself. The Scriptural Church, on the other hand, recognises the Scriptural State as a State from which it can freely and gladly receive aid, and seeks to promote reciprocally the cause of social order, peace, and happiness in the State. From this friendly alliance for a common end, towards which State and Church advance in harmony, the State recognising the Church's more immediate and direct relation to that end, and therefore her intrinsic superiority to any nation, and the Church recognising the friendly offices of the state as part of her Lord's provision for her good; the State being voluntarily tributary to the Church that her prosperity may be promoted and her Lord glorified, and the Church exerting all her influence to promote in the State the cultivation of every virtue that can refine, ennoble, and adorn human life - from such alliance not evil but good, not a curse but a blessing, may be expected to flow. In such alliance the Church will be no more a political engine to be skilfully worked by unscrupulous statesmen for secular ends; and the State will be no more, as under the domination of Rome, the degraded instrument of ecclesiastical tyranny and terrorism. When the time comes for the world to behold such alliance, the kingdoms of this world having become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and the nations having learned to bring their honour and glory into the Church of God to present their offerings to Christ in the midst of the Church, the world will have a blessed discovery of the nature of the gospel of God - "On earth peace and good-will toward men," and to Him who sits upon the throne of this vast regenerated kingdom there will be "glory in the highest."

We have spoken of the nation being tributary to Christ, by which we mean its yielding to Him not only the tribute of official influence, but the tribute of public money. The question may be asked, In what circumstances is it the duty of the State to

give endowment or official contributions to the Church? Recognising the doctrine that the State is to be subject to Christ for the Church, we might with precisely the same force ask, In what circumstances is it the duty of the State to be subject Christ? Circumstances may arise when it would not be dutiful for the Church to accept a State subsidy whither fixed or variable, as, for example, when the State gives money on corrupt conditions; as there may be circumstances when it may not be dutiful for a State to subsidise a particular section of the Church, when that Church is corrupt. But there never can be circumstances in which the money of the State shall not belong to Christ the Head of the Church in such proportion as He requires it for the advancement of His cause, and in such proportion as national obligation to His gospel may suggest. He is "Head over all things" - therefore, over the nation's money - "to the Church." From this it seems perfectly clear that the giving of money out of the State funds to Christ is always dutiful for the State. In fact, we know of no Scriptural principle that can ever free the State from the duty of liberality to Christ's cause, especially as that cause is represented by the Church, that will not equally free the individual from that duty. Between individual liberality and State liberality, the Scripture makes absolutely no distinction in point of permanent dutifulness. More than this, the Scripture makes no distinction in point of permanent dutifulness between *legislative countenance and encouragement* to the Church, and the *contribution of money* to the Church from the State funds. There are no circumstances which require the State to legislate in favour of the Church, which do not equally require the State to give out of its treasury to the Church. And there is no principle to prevent the State from giving regular contributions out of the common taxation to the Church to aid her in carrying on Christ's work, that will not equally prevent any legislative or national recognition whatsoever of the Church's standing, or, for that matter, that will not equally prevent and national submission to

Jesus Christ in any respect. It may be argued, indeed, as against national endowment - by which we mean any regular contributions out of the common taxation to the Church, not an endowment that covers the Church's whole need and excludes individual liberality - that this will prove a temptation to unfaithfulness and covetousness. It may, if consciously accepted from a corrupt State that gives to Popery with the one hand and to Protestantism with the other. But a difficulty of this kind would not arise in the case we are contemplating, namely, that of a State giving tribute intelligently to Jesus Christ. And in all ordinary circumstances, State money is no more temptation than any other money. An unendowed Church may be at once as unsound doctrinally, and as covetous practically, as an endowed Church.

The principle, however, that is most commonly argued against State tribute to Christ for His Church, is this: It is alleged that it would be unwarrantable interference with the rights of conscience to take money out of the public treasury to which people of all shades of religious or irreligious opinion contribute, and give it to the Church to promote the religion of Christ. Then, surely, it must also be unwarrantable infringement of the rights of conscience to make use of the legislature which presides over all these shades of religious opinion, for any distinctly Christian legislation. A man's conscience in respect of the impartiality which he thinks the course of the law should manifest is surely as sacred as his conscience in respect of the taxes he pays. But is it not a matter of taxation in either case? The machinery of legislation is kept in motion chiefly by the common taxation. If you may not take public money and give it to the Church for fear of wounding the consciences of infidels or atheists or Jews who pay taxes, neither may you wound their consciences by using the legislature, which is supported by their money, for the purpose of making laws in favour of the Church. Thus, if the plea of "conscience" is valid against the giving of State money to the Church it is equally valid

against giving countenance to the Church in any shape of to any extent, and equally valid against the slightest national recognition of Jesus as Lord.

Accordingly thought there are some who would not like to go so far as their argument would carry them, yet we find that those who are opposed to national endowment of religion, are for the most part consistent with themselves so far as to oppose also any distinctively Christian legislation or action on the part of the nation. This line of thought is a complete answer to the Christian man who would like national legislation in favour of true religion, but is afraid of national tribute to true religion, lest the consciences of some Papists or Jews, or infidels should be wounded by the giving of their money to the Church to promote Christ's cause! To such a Christian man we would say, You cannot possibly let go the endowment out of deference to conscience, without being required by the very same conscience to let go the legislation.

But how may we answer the consistent Voluntary who grants this? There are many answers. One may be found in the very nature and office of conscience. It is a power given by God for the purpose of distinguishing between right and wrong - not a power that is entitled to clamour for the obliteration of the distinction. It is a power under God, not a power superior to God, and over Him in the State. Therefore it is the duty of the State to go to the Will of God, revealed in His Holy Law, to find an answer to clamour of conscience against Christ's rights - which after all is not conscience, but moral obliquity. Another answer may be that to suppose that conscience is the rule of State action, is to make all civil government, in relation to moral questions, the creature of a million, or twenty millions, of conflicting whims. The Legislature has frequently to do with moral and religious questions, which cannot possibly be settled without wounding some consciences. And if conscience, according to the theory we are considering, must be held sacred, then legislation on all

moral questions must come to an abrupt end. It is evident that the nation *must* have a moral standard, and if God declares that His Law is the standard, why should “conscience” silence the testimony of God, and set aside the standard He has fixed? It may be asked flippantly, and with an air of triumph, Who are to know the meaning of the standard God has given? To which we answer, Those who honestly try. A Christian surely has more faith in his Bible, and in the standard of Christian obligation which it erects for men in all relations, than to suppose that both are unintelligible.

This argument about conscience may have another answer, drawn from the authority of Jesus Christ. All evangelical Christians admit that Christ has authority over all, and that He is Head over the nations. His authority must be either merely nominal or real. If it be merely nominal, then He has been mocked by the sound of an empty honour. He is then a mere titular Governor among the nations, called a Governor by courtesy, but not entitled to assert any real authority, or require any national homage. The He must be content to see all moral and religious questions, and all civil questions also, taken out of His hands, and settled by the rebel conscience of His enemies, and He must be content to hear His professed disciples pleading that it ought to be so! And, on the other hand, if His authority is real, if He is entitled to command the nations as their rightful Lord - and who that names His name will deny this? - then He is also fully entitled to have His authority acknowledged, and to demand that the demands of every opposing conscience be utterly disregarded. From Christ’s authority, considered as real, the whole doctrine of national submission, down to the fostering of His Church, and the placing of national money at His feet for His purposes in the Church, may and must be at once inferred. And no human custom, or principle of government, when once His authority is understood by churches and nations, will be allowed to shut Him out longer, as disaffection, and false theories, and secular, carnal reasonings shut Him out

now, from possession of His royal rights. To such as may be willing to have national money regularly expended on religious national education, though not on the Church, the question might be put, What is the difference in principle? None whatever. That State money may be devoted regularly to religious national instruction, and that it is only the individual contributions of Church members that must be regularly devoted to the support of the ministry, is a distinction for which not a shadow of warrant can be pleaded from the Word of God. Where can it be found? Only in the exigencies of a theory to the effect that regular State aid to the Church is a very questionable or suspicious thing. The Word of God nowhere gives so much as a hint that there is any purpose for which the contribution of an individual Christian may be used that is not equally a purpose for which State money may be used. The money in both cases belongs to Christ. It is thrown into His treasury when it is rightly given. There is not a shadow of difference between the money of His subject, the individual Christian, and the money of His subject, the Christian State. It is freely given in both cases to Him who is Head over all things to His church. And it is a bold thing for any one to prescribe to Christ how He is to employ State money, as distinguished from individual money, when He Himself has made no distinction.

We must very carefully guard against the settlement of such a question as that of Christ’s authority over the nations, over their legislation, over their resources, by the consideration of past or present abuses. We know there have been wrong and injurious methods employed by churches and nations in dealing with this question in the past. And what has been unquestionably wrong in the past, and is unquestionably wrong still, in the methods of national endowment, weighs so heavily on some minds as to make them forget that there are right methods, and that Christ is Lord of the nations’ money “to the Church.” But we must settle the question in another and very different way. What saith the Scripture? There is no

Scripture principle or doctrine that we should not be justified in letting go and denouncing, if abuse were a good reason for letting go the Scripture doctrine of regular national offerings to Christ for His Church. Every doctrine and principle has been abused. Not by abuses, therefore, but by the plain teaching of Scripture - preceptive, historic, and prophetic - must we settle the question of national service to God's Christ. Let us remember Christ's official character as the Mediator, the grounds of His Mediatorial reign, His relation to the Church and His special and peculiar interest in her welfare and progress, the grant of all things, including all nations, for His inheritance, to be subservient to His purposes in the Church; let us remember the command we are now considering, in its connection with Christ set upon the Holy Hill of Zion; let us remember the manifold predictions such as, "All kings shall fall down before Him, all nations shall serve Him" - "before Him" as the Mediatorial King of the Church, to whom, in that capacity, they offer their willing services for His central and most glorious kingdom - "serve Him" in that capacity for the furtherance of that great purpose of His in the Church which infinitely transcends all worldly purposes in importance to the moral universe; let us remember all this, and we can have no difficulty in accepting the Reformation doctrine of national subjection to Jesus Christ as the enthroned Mediator. When the nations bring their offerings of intelligent homage to Him they will find Him in the very midst of His Church, and they will never find Him anywhere else. He "sits between the cherubims," "Great and High in Zion," or the Church, "above all people." In that position of central honour he must be acknowledged and worshipped at length by all the nations of the world. There is no principle more clearly and more solemnly laid down in the Word of God, and more clearly established by history, than this; and there was no principle more joyfully and intelligently accepted by our fathers of the Second Reformation than this; - that true national duty and the most

elevated national policy consist in bearing faithful allegiance to Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, as "King of kings and Lord of lords," in the spirit and tone and contents of the national constitution, in the whole national legislation and administration, and in the specific acknowledgement of His right to the nation's constant and regular tribute to Him as its Lord. When the nations come to know this, and to act in the spirit of this subjection; when they acknowledge Him as the Lord of Hosts and obey His commands along the whole line of national action; then, and not till then, shall the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.

With regard to the principle whose ultimate triumph we thus anticipate, the inspired history amply confirms inspired precepts. Humble subjection on the part of God's people of old to the will of the Anointed, was invariably associated with national prosperity and greatness as necessary fruits of the Divine approbation, while national disobedience was invariably accompanied or followed by national disaster and degradation. Strengthened and exalted in the way of obedience, weakened and dishonoured in the way of disobedience - every page of Israel's history presents one or other of these two pictures. When we turn to secular history, making due allowance for the absence of special obligations which a special relationship to God laid upon Israel, we find many a notable illustration of the same general principle. The great empires and kingdoms of the world have almost uniformly been either wholly ignorant of the Divine claims or utterly regardless of them. Interpreting the history of such powers by Scripture teaching and Scripture history, we can understand the rise and fall of empires. We know in that case that the surging to and fro of the wave of imperial power was not fortuitous but providential. Not chance or fate of force of arms, but the Sovereign will of God that refuses permanence of power to rebellious nations, threw down successively the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman empires.

Civil Rulers Serving the Lord

During the nineteen centuries since Rome reached the zenith of its power the same providential will may be traced in the dismemberment of the empire and in the manifold changes which have taken place among the nations, especially in Europe. Great kingdoms have fallen and little kingdoms have become great; nations that are in the main Protestant, like Britain and Prussia, have been raised to special eminence; and great Popish nations such as Spain and France have been marked out in God's providence for special humiliation; France having been scourged by disastrous revolutions at different times, decisively defeated by British armies early in the present century, and more recently reduced to the humbling necessity of making terms of peace with the German conqueror within the walls of her capital; while Spain, though possessed of the most brilliant natural advantages, has been sinking into national insignificance and imbecility ever since her "Invincible Armada" was vanquished.

Such facts of history are so many hints, perhaps we might say, emphatic demonstrations, that there is a Supreme Mind and an Almighty Hand and a Righteous Will, presiding in national affairs, and that it would be the lasting joy of the nations to crown and serve their Lord. The time for the realisation of this may be far

off, but it is coming - slowly perhaps but most surely coming, for God has purposed, and who can stay the march of a sovereign Divine purpose? Would that the nations of the world, instead of opposing His will, and trying to thwart His purpose, were hastening to greet with songs of joyful anticipation the "King who cometh in the name of the Lord!"

The reign of Jesus Christ is indeed the gospel. "The Lord reigneth let the earth be glad." And we believe it is the special function of all earnest witnesses for Christ to keep this gospel before the nations, to point not only to the Lamb slain, but to the Lamb "in the midst of the throne;" to plead His righteous cause; to ask rebellious men and nations to lay down their arms and worship Him; to demand and reiterate the demand for subjection to Him, that there may be individual subjection, growing into more consistent and complete ecclesiastical subjection, and into widespread national subjection; to labour and pray without ceasing that there may soon be universal recognition of the universal Lord, and that men and nations being gathered into one under the sea, to tyrannise over human life no more, to supplant His holy law no more, to obscure His glorious crown no more. Amen and Amen.