

the exchange of one set of idols and superstitions for another. In a sublime sense Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and courts neither governmental patronage nor carnal weapons. We deprecate compulsory entrance for the Gospel, as when a gunship goes side by side with the peaceful Gospel ship. But it is not asking too much that a so-called Christian nation, such as England or the United States, shall everywhere be known as the protector of its own citizens, the friend of Christian institutions, and the upholder of *sobriety, morality, and piety*. The flag of a nation whose belt of empire girdles the globe need not bear the cross on its folds, but it should be the signal and symbol of a true Christian civilization, an enlightened Christian morality. Around the humblest of its subjects it should wrap its folds in the hour of danger, protecting person and property, liberty and life. In the formation of treaties regard may be had to the security of the Christian missionary as well as of the merchant. In sending representatives to foreign courts, why should not men be chosen who will carry with them a high moral and Christian influence as well as the tact of the statesman and the skill of the diplomat? Our government need not go into Turkey to build churches, or colleges, or hospitals; but, when built by consent of the ruling powers, she may insist that they be inviolate. England need not demand of foreign powers an edict of toleration; but when a Hatti Humayun or a Tientsin treaty is issued, rights are acknowledged of which the British Government may properly demand that converts and their Christian teachers may avail themselves. To be a citizen of Rome ought not to have cast about Paul a protection with which citizenship in the American republic would not invest Dr. Jessup in Syria, or Dr. Lindley in South Africa, or Dr. Jonas King in Athens. Was there any good reason why England should permit Bishop Hannington, when on a peaceful errand, to be murdered in Mwangwa's dominions, without calling the despot of Uganda to account?

I. A Christian government should encourage everywhere a Christian *morality*. We have seen how, from the days of Assyrian supremacy, there had been an increasing tendency toward unity and fraternity, more compact organization, commercial intercourse, social development, and political alliance—in a word, civilization. But the salt of morality was lacking, and that is a fatal lack. The seven "golden ages" have been, curiously enough, profligate ages. Egypt under the Ptolemies, Athens under Pericles, Rome under Augustus, Italy under Leo X., Russia under Ivan III., England under Elizabeth, France under Louis XIV., were all conspicuous for a high civilization, but also for moral putrefaction and petrification.

All history shows that moral corruption and progressive liberty are incompatible. Political development and moral deterioration have never long stood side by side. Since our Lord's advent, if there has been a coincidence of political and moral progress it has been owing to the fact that the salt has displaced the leaven. There is such a thing as a *political con-*