

of society. No man can be truly said to be the friend of 'the people' while inimical, or even indifferent, to the cause of national godliness. Nations, once most illustrious, have declined, and perished from their exalted station, when public virtue disappeared, which never long survives the destruction of private principle. What signify alterations in the form of political institutions, which many seem to consider the only tests of patriotism, if that influence be neglected, which can alone prevent the machinery thus erected from being applied to the purposes of general and extensive injury?

But, clearly as we might shew the connection between religion and politics, from the nearly universal consent of mankind, the dictates of sound reason and the principles of social expediency, it is not on these we wish to rest the chief support of our argument. The necessity of having our politics in subjection to our religion, is distinctly asserted in the doctrines of revelation. There, the Deity asserts his right to govern the nations of the world, declares his determination to punish disobedience to his will by the infliction of national judgments, and solemnly assures kingdoms, that such evils can be averted only by turning in true repentance from what has caused these tokens of his anger. A brief summary of the political duty, enacted by the highest authority, may be found in these words, spoken by Jeremiah, xviii. 7—10. 'At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it, if that nation against whom I have pronounced, 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 to build and to plant it, if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them.' Can any man receive these words as the declaration of the unchanging God regarding the principles of his government over kingdoms of the world, and then maintain that religion has nothing to do with politics? For what are politics, but the principles on which the actions of nations proceed? And if those be in opposition to the divine will, what believer in the doctrines of revelation can anticipate any result from actions thus directed, but national ruin? Every consistently religious man, whether consulting the welfare of 'the people,' or the honor of religion, is loudly called on to do his utmost, that the politics on which the legislation of his country proceeds, be agreeable to the mind and will of Him, whose hand unseen directs the destinies of nations.

Many, who admit entirely the general principle we have been laying down, feel deterred from asserting it in the face of world, by their dread of encountering the arguments brought against it from the undeniable hypocrisy of many, who have used the sacred name of religion only to advance their own interested pur-

poses. But is there any reason for this fear? Has not the insincerity of many professing Christians led unbelievers to stigmatize, as hypocrisy, every profession of earnest zeal regarding religion? And ought true Christians to be deterred on that account, from publicly avowing their attachment to him, whose they are and whom they serve? It is not to be denied, that many have endeavored to enlist religion on one side of politics, who had no real concern for that which they only call to their aid in the season of extremity. But should that prevent others from opposing every system of politics, which they believe to be opposed to the Bible? And ought they to be ashamed of avowing, that the reason of their opposition is drawn, not from their adherence to any of the shifting parties of this world, but from their zeal for the authority of God, which no country can long forget with impunity? Men are not ashamed to avow their connection with those who are recognized as the leaders of the several parties of their day; and is it not most disgraceful for men to profess to believe the Scriptures of truth, and yet to fear to be ranked as supporters of the principles of legislation, which are there held forth?

But, when we contend for the connection of religion with politics, we do not mean, by religion, that abstraction which may be any thing or nothing, but that precise system of truth which is set forth in the holy Scriptures. And, to be still more particular, we hold religion to be not one or other of the various corruptions of this system, which the waywardness of the human mind has produced; but that doctrine, which the fathers of the Reformation asserted, when they raised the standard of Protestantism against the monstrous apostasy of Rome. 'This is the religion which was interwoven with the whole fabric of the British Constitution, at the memorable Revolution, and which has secured to Britain more internal peace and outward prosperity, than ever was enjoyed by any country. The same arguments which lead us to believe, that there is but one book which contains the revealed will of God, lead us to conclude, however much we may be opposed to the mock liberality of the day, that this revelation cannot have two meanings essentially opposed to each other. Could we but persuade men to make this true religion, for the preservation of which our fathers were more anxious than for the maintaining of all their other privileges, the rule to direct their political exertions, the result would be quite the reverse of what ill informed persons anticipate as the inevitable effect of religious controversy.

Religion points out to politicians the great rule by which legislation ought to be directed, and at the same time prescribes the temper and weapons, by which the cause of truth ought to be maintained in the world. Men, no doubt, have maintained what they termed religious controversy, in utter neglect of the temper and spirit prescribed by true religion; but this ought