

THE CASTING DOWN OF THRONES.

A DISCOURSE

ON THE

PRESENT STATE OF EUROPE.

DELIVERED IN THE

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA,

May 14, 1848.

BY ALBERT BARNES.

I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit.—DANIEL vii. 9.

PHILADELPHIA:
WILLIAM SLOANAKER, 98 CHESTNUT STREET.
NEW YORK:
W. H. GRAHAM, TRIBUNE BUILDINGS.

PHILADELPHIA:
T. K. AND P. G. COLLINS, PRINTERS.

A DISCOURSE.

I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit.—DANIEL vii. 9.

EVENTS are occurring in the world that are suprising and unexampled. They amaze us by the rapidity with which they succeed each other, and the facility with which they are accomplished. At no period of the world's history have changes so important taken place in so brief a period of time—changes that indicate so much progress already made towards the state to which the nations of the earth will ultimately come, or that promise so much progress in the future. These events, so interesting to all, will be viewed by men, each one from his own post of observation. Kings will look at them from their thrones, and princes in their palaces. Statesmen will contemplate them as affecting the peace of empires, and the welfare of nations; philosophers as denoting progress in the human mind; philanthropists as bearing on the ills under which oppressed humanity has groaned; the student of prophecy as connected with the predicted development of the great purposes of God; he who hopes for the universal prevalence of Christianity on the earth in their bearings on the progress and triumph of the Gospel. It is one of the promptings of all minds in such circumstances to look to the past, to see whether we can find parallel events there that in their issues shall be any guide as to the results of what is now occurring; and equally an instinctive prompting, among those who believe in the Scripture prophetic records, to look to those records to see whether these very

events may not be there shadowed forth in some symbol till now not understood, and whether the ultimate bearing and results may not be found foretold. Never was human sagacity more at a stand; and never were men more impatient to see the next act in unrolling the volume where is written the fate of nations—or, in Scripture language, to hear the next blast of the trumpet, or to witness the next opening of a seal.

It were greatly to be wished, indeed, that in reference to these passing events, some mighty Christian minds—some minds with the power of Burke or Canning, and with an acquaintance with the principles of religion and the government of God corresponding to their power; could be brought to express the probable relation which they have to the progress of things of highest interest on the earth:—that some such view should be taken of them as might be taken by men that might easily be referred to in the Senate of the United States, if they were thoroughly imbued with the evangelical spirit, and if they had been as careful students of the Bible as they have of the constitution of their country;—of the government of God, as they have of the principles of human administration. There is no one who would not be interested in knowing how such minds would view these events as bearing on the progress of the Redeemer's kingdom, and the advancement of society towards the time when he shall reign all over the earth. It is not improper, however, for any one who occupies a place to which any portion of his fellow-men are accustomed to look for instruction on the purposes of Divine Providence, to endeavor to contribute what he can that shall tend to assign those events to their appropriate place in the divine arrangement, and to ascertain their bearing on the best interests and hopes of man.

I will not venture to say that the prophecy in my text had reference to these things. I use it only because the prophet, in vision, saw, in the progress of human affairs, the casting down of thrones as an important event that would precede the time when "the Ancient of Days"

should "sit:"—"I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire." It was an era that was distinctly marked, and that was introductory to a higher era. It was an important change in human affairs, destroying an ancient form of domination, to be succeeded by the direct reign of the Most High himself, coming as a ruler over the nations. If there is any single phrase that will best characterize the events now occurring abroad, it is "THE CASTING DOWN OF THRONES." They are the result of a sudden up-heaving of power against "thrones;" a simultaneous, and almost miraculous rising of millions of minds, as of one mind, against those who have occupied these hereditary seats of authority; a dissolution of the spell which bound nations in the belief of the divine right of kings; a conviction that will no longer be suppressed in immense masses of mind, in different kingdoms, and under different dynasties, that the source of power is in the people, and that they have an inalienable right to exercise that power. It is appropriate to consider this as a stage in the world's progress in the introduction of the reign of God, and of that form in which He shall rule over men in the high condition to which the race is to be elevated. The subject of this discourse, therefore, is the bearing of the casting down of thrones on the world's progress. Our warfare in this land has been against thrones; our example goes, and has gone, to encourage all who endeavor to "cast them down;" our sympathies and congratulations are always with them. The natural *order* of considering the subject, is, the relation of thrones and kings heretofore to the progress of the race; and the casting down of thrones as an exponent of the progress already made in the world, and an index of the future.

I. The relation of thrones and kings to the progress of the race. We have had but one mind on this subject in this country, and, without intermeddling with the affairs of others, we have never hesitated to proclaim our views

to the nations of the earth. We have sent forth our Declaration of Independence as a strong testimonial on the subject. We have proclaimed the working of our institutions as incomparably better than any that are controlled by regal power. We have held up our sudden increase, and growth, and prosperity, as an illustration of their value. We have invited the subjects of despotism to come and live among us, and to write home to their friends their views as acquired by experience here;—we have asked the intelligent foreigner to come and look in upon our courts, and legislative halls, and churches, and school-houses; to examine our rent rolls, and our tax bills, and to go home and publish his own version of these things to the world. We have sent forth our young men by thousands and tens of thousands—for various purposes of education, of commerce, of pleasure, of benevolence, every one of whom has gone as an apostle of liberty, and every one of whom has been prepared to tell the old world something of the working of institutions where there are no thrones and no kings.

The views which we as a Christian nation entertain on this subject, have grown, we think, out of the Bible, and are the result of the experience and observation of many ages. Those views we have embodied in our constitution, and have proclaimed them to mankind. The elementary consideration in our views is, that, under God, who is regarded as the Supreme Ruler, all civil authority emanates from the people, and the rulers have no more power than the people, every man in the fair exercise of his right, have voluntarily, and without any constraint, committed to those whom they have placed in office. We abjure the doctrine of the divine right of kings, and believe that there is no class or order of men, except in the parental relation, who are entrusted by nature with any authority over any other. A few remarks, illustrative of this fundamental doctrine, and of the steps by which it has been reached in the world, though having no claim to novelty or originality, may

serve to remind us of our obligations of gratitude, and to keep before us a just sense of the value of our institutions.

(1). The true doctrine respecting kings, and their influence on civil and religious liberty, we think, was stated in the inspired records at a very early period of the world, and the experience of ages has only tended to confirm it. It occurred on a proposed change of the constitution of the Hebrew commonwealth. Before that period, the Hebrew community had a "constitution" defining every man's rights, and guarding every man's interest,—under a mode of government wholly unlike that of any other nation. As emblematic of what *will be* when the principles of religion shall everywhere prevail, securing to every human being the blessings of liberty, and guarding their rights, *God* was regarded as the sovereign, and under him every man had his right to liberty, to property, to home, to the peaceful pursuits of his own choice. The name of "*commonwealth*" was that which would best express the nature of the constitution; and under that commonwealth, where the law was laid down; where the rights of all were defined; where there was a certain tenure of property; where every man ultimately became a freeman; and where it was contemplated that the influence of religion would preserve, mould, and sanctify all, the great principles were asserted which must enter into every form of constitutional liberty. That form of government it was, at length, proposed to change. The nations around them had an earthly sovereign. The pomp and splendor of courts attracted those who had lived under the comparative plainness and simplicity of a commonwealth. A formal delegation, embracing all the "elders of Israel," gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel, the last of the judges, and said to him, "Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways; now make us a king to judge us like all the nations." The thing, it is said, displeased Samuel, and was not less displeasing to God. Yet *liberty* was always an essential element under the Jewish, theocracy; and, in illustration of that great principle which God has always designed should reign in regard to civil

government, though under a solemn protest, the people were allowed to exercise their own choice in the administration of civil affairs. God would not control them in this, so essential did he regard freedom, even when he knew they were about to throw off the better administration, and to embrace a form of government which could be attended only with evil. He, therefore, said to Samuel, "Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." Yet, this concession was made under solemn protest, and with a direction to Samuel to state what would be the essential nature of the kingly government which they desired, and what would be its influence on their happiness and liberty. "Howbeit, yet protest solemnly unto them, and show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them." This Samuel faithfully did in words whose truth and value have been confirmed, we think, in the history of the world ever since. "This will be the manner of the king," said he, "that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties, and will set them to ear [plough] his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your olive-yards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your men-servants, and your maid-servants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep, and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the Lord will not hear you in that day." 1 Sam. viii.

It may serve to illustrate the truthfulness and value of

this representation, to remind you, that Thomas Paine, a man avowedly without any faith in the inspiration of the Bible, in his work on "Common Sense,"—a work which Chief Justice Marshall describes as one of the important means of bringing about the American Revolution, urges this passage with great power as describing the essential nature of a kingly government, and as a reason why the colonies should throw off that of the mother country. Whatever effect that argument may have had in laying the foundations of American liberty, even though in the hands of Paine, is to be traced to the Bible; and far back in the history of the world, and among a people then but just emerged from slavery, and whom it is the pleasure of many to regard as semi-savage and barbarous, there was somehow laid down a doctrine quite in advance of the age; a doctrine which furnished one of the most effective arguments to an enemy of revealed religion in rousing a nation to assert their rights, and a doctrine whose truth the nations are now beginning to see.

(2). The next observation that I shall make is, that there has been among men, or among a certain class of men, a strong effort made to assert "the divine right of kings," and to throw around their persons a sacredness which should be inviolable. This effort has been made, of course, by those occupying thrones, and by their ministers and minions. It has been made by all those who "hang on princes' favors." It has been made by the ministers of religion when there is a connection between church and state, and when the king is the acknowledged head of the church. It has even been made by men, who, in other circumstances, would have been the stoutest champions of freedom; and who had in their souls, after all, the essential elements of liberty. In the year 1675, Dr. South, chaplain to Charles II., perhaps in most respects the best preacher of his age, and in many respects a model for all preachers, and a man whose sermons—though they *are* sermons—every orator would do himself a benefit to study; a man who never feared to rebuke iniquity on a throne occupied by perhaps the meanest and the

wickedest prince that ever sat on a throne, or in a court the most corrupt then in Europe; a man with wit as scorching when applied to the corruptions of a licentious age, as it was when applied to the peculiarities of the Puritans; a man in whose soul there were intermingled, as there is apt to be, the highest love for the doctrines of grace even in the sternest form of Calvinism, and the most ardent love for liberty of speech—even such a man delivered a sermon on “The care of Providence in defence of Kings,” in which he maintained the following extraordinary positions:—That that care is shown (1) by endowing them with a more than ordinary sagacity and quickness of understanding above other men; (2) by giving them a singular courage and presence of mind in cases of difficulty and danger; (3) by disposing of events and accidents in a strange concurrence for their advantage and preservation; (4) by wonderfully inclining the hearts and wills of men to a benign affection towards them; (5) by rescuing them from unseen and unknown mischiefs prepared against them; (6) by imprinting a certain awe and dread of their persons and authority upon the minds of their subjects; and (7) by disposing their hearts to such virtuous and pious courses as he has pronounced a blessing to, and restraining them from those ways to which he has pronounced a curse.

Even in that same British constitution where are found so many of the principles of freedom, there lives and lingers still the maxim that “the king can do no wrong:”—and I need not say that in the ‘father land’ the reasonings of Pym, and Hampden, and Milton, in favor of liberty have never yet been half-appreciated, or produced half the effect which they are destined to accomplish.

(3). The next observation which it is necessary to make is, that the progress of the race has been marked by successive struggles against this power. History is made up, in its most valuable, and most remarkable portions, of the record of the various acts of successful opposition to this asserted divine authority, and every point gained has constituted an epoch in the history of the world—a step in

the progress toward that period when "thrones" are to be everywhere cast down, and when universal liberty shall prevail. Under kingly governments, an authority, deriving the right from God, has been asserted over life, liberty, and property; over religion, morals, and opinions; over lands, houses, and public charities; over education, the press, and freedom of oral utterance. The kingly power is complete only where the most absolute authority is conceded over all these, and where all that the subject enjoys is regarded in the light of a "*grant*" or "*boon*," graciously bestowed on those who had no claim. History has taught us how, one after another, these things have been denied, until now with us *all* are denied, and the proprietorship and the source of all authority are with the people. The Hebrew commonwealth in its best days did much to disabuse the world of these opinions; the Greeks and the Romans in their palmy days, when republics, rendered invaluable aid in this cause; the concessions in the time of Alfred, and in the time of John—the right of trial by jury, and the Magna Charta, and the writ of habeas corpus, did more still; the Puritans did more yet; the returning exiles from Geneva, and the arguments of Hampden and Pym, and the writings of Milton, did more; the trials of Horne Tooke, and Hardy, and the pleadings of Erskine, carried forward the great work; our own revolution consummated the idea on this side the waters, and the successive demands which have been made, and which are now made abroad, in tones that it is no longer safe to disregard, are carrying forward the idea there. The history of liberty has not yet been written; but it could be, and its essential feature would be the successful resistance of the claimed prerogatives of crowns, constituting great epochs in the history of the world, and advancing to that period when *all* these prerogatives shall be torn away, and the worthless crown and throne shall fall. In our own country, the work is complete; in Europe, it is again begun, and invasions are to be made on the prerogatives of kings which are never to be usurped and swayed again. The essential remark made thus far is, that the

throne has stood in the way of the liberty of the world, and that the progress of the race has been marked in successive steps, by events that have stripped the throne of power, and transferred it where it belonged of right, to the people. It is because we entertain these views in this land, that we rejoice in the overthrow of thrones in the old world.

II. In the second place, it was proposed to consider the casting down of thrones as an indication of a better state of things in the world. If it were *not* so, our exultation at the intelligence which has reached us from abroad, would be as foolish as it would be wicked. We instinctively associate in our minds the "casting down of thrones" with certain other things that they drag down with them, and with certain things which spring up by an elasticity and vigor of their own when the super-incumbent pressure of the throne is removed. It is not that, in itself considered, we rejoice in the misfortunes of any class of men. It is not that we exult in the calamities that come suddenly upon a man venerable by years, and burdened with cares, driven from his throne and his family penniless, though the richest man of his age; dependent on the kindness of a peasant or a sailor for a garment, though used to the robes of royalty; ending his life as he began it, in misfortune and exile; it is not that we would not welcome him to our shores, or allow him peacefully to select the happiest spot of our land which he might purchase, where to live, and where to die:—it is that we see in this the evidence that the things which have tyrannized over man must fall, and that principles must rise that are to endure when society shall have reached its highest point, and the race of man shall be free.

Perhaps the eye of Christian faith and hope may be warranted in seeing, in such an event, evidence of the purpose of God, that in one most central and important kingdom of the earth, no more obstructions shall be placed by royal authority to the progress of evangelical religion; that *from* that throne that has now fallen, no power shall henceforward go forth to embarrass the missionaries of the

cross in their labors in Africa, in the islands of the sea, or anywhere throughout the world. Who can tell but that the act of that fallen monarch, in sending forth an expedition of armed vessels to take the crown from the head of a queen of her own people's love, in a green isle of the ocean—a people made free and intelligent by that Gospel which he has sought to supplant by another system—that this act of his, in the “meanest” expedition that was ever sent out from a civilized land—may have had a closer connection in the development of the great purposes of God with the loss of his own crown, and the crumbling of his own throne, than the world is yet prepared to hear and understand? Who can tell but that it may be the divine intention that crowned heads shall be no more allowed to interfere with the progress of Protestant liberty? A king falls not alone. Then come down with him those things which have been the supports of his throne; there spring up of necessity, when a throne falls, many things indispensable to the progress of the race. I propose to remind you of a few of them.

First. The downfall of an hereditary aristocracy, and of all that contributes to its support. Such an aristocracy, with all its untold ills, is everywhere essential to the support of a throne; such an aristocracy, with all its appendages, is inconsistent with the best form of liberty. It involves titles, revenues, places, prerogatives, hereditary name and power. In England it fell when Charles fell, but the world was not far enough advanced for the great idea. In the former French Revolution it fell, nor was the world far enough advanced as yet. Again, it has fallen with the throne, whether to rise again, time must determine. It cannot live with liberty. Once, it was proposed to have titles of nobility in our own country, but the almost unanimous voice of the people spurned the idea. A few remains of the system lingered awhile in this land, in the form of great entailed estates, but the last relic of the system is fast passing away. And it is well. There is no delusion greater than that which plays around the mind, and which floats before the fancy, when we think

of the days of chivalry—the working of the feudal system—the days of castles, and barons, and kings. The picture, as contrasted with what exists in our own land, has been well drawn by a writer of our own country.

“There is the gloomy castle with its massive towers, deep moat, heavy drawbridge, and ponderous gates; at the entrance, the Herculean warder, on the battlements the steel-clad sentinels, within the court-yard rough and rioting men-at-arms. There is the oaken-hall, when, after the chase or fight, the mad revel runs high, and the wildest passions rage. From the tallest turret may be seen dark forests stretching away in the distance; poorly cultivated hills and valleys; lying hard by, groups, under the very shadow of the fortress, of dark, cold, damp, mud-walled, and thatch-roofed hovels. Let this domain be examined in clear daylight, disrobed of all rainbow-broidered clouds of romance, in all its rugged, coarse, and naked reality—just as the stern fidelity of history must describe it, and not as the gorgeous imagination of the novelist paints it. Within and around the feudal domain was superstition and not religion; ignorance and not knowledge; slavery and not freedom; rudeness and not refinement; suffering and not comfort; wealth obtained by violence; poverty caused by direct oppression; man the foe or slave of his brother man; despotic and lawless force, encumbered with its own iron panoply, ruling herds of human beings colared and driven like brutes. The landholding nobility and the squalid serfs of Russia are, in many respects, living examples of the relations which almost universally obtained, a few centuries since, between lords and peasants, warlike barons and stolid followers.

“Having imagined this picture of the past, let it be contrasted with another, familiar as our own homes, and easily painted—a New England village, with its lines of trees, leafy sentinels guarding each side of the broad street; rows of neat houses, with stores and mechanics’ shops, and churches interspersed. The inhabitants of this small democracy are nearly on a level, well-fed, well-clad, intelligent, and independent. Every adult male is

a voter; and almost every adult male may, in turn, aspire to be a selectman or a representative to the General Court. A newspaper is printed in the village of course, and the affairs of the nation are duly discussed by the fireside in winter, by the road-side in summer, and at the store, or post-office, at all seasons in the year. Front doors are secured by slender bolts, scores of which might be wrought out of the huge bars that fastened the iron-cased gates of ancient castles," or, in more instances, not fastened at all. "That feudal estate once *was*; this New England village now *is*. Who can bring them together in his imagination, and not see what an advance the present is on the past?"—*Christian Examiner*, March, 1848, pp. 162–4.

Compare our condition—our views—with what prevailed then. Barons were once, indeed, in a certain sense, the friends of liberty, and the world owes much to the demands which they made at Runymede. But the form of their demand was not the highest which liberty makes. They demanded their *own* liberty, and their *own* rights, as against the asserted power of the king, not the liberty of their vassals; and perhaps they never dreamed that the same principles, which in *their* hands was so mighty against the usurpations of the monarch, would be employed in some future age by those held in vassalage against the power of nobles. That time has come. In our own land, the idea is perfect. We assert that there shall be no entail; no rights of primogeniture; no title of rank, and no office conveyed from father to son. We maintain that every man shall start with his neighbor fairly on the race of life; that every one shall enjoy the avails of his own labor; that every one shall have access to any office to which his talent and attainments may conduct him; that every one shall have an equal claim to protection. With the fall of monarchy—the casting down of thrones—these ideas will spread over the world, for the idea of hereditary prerogatives is centered in that of monarchy, and when the throne falls, that idea also falls.

Second. Freedom of opinion and of speech accompanies the "casting down" of thrones. It was compara-

tively easy to control this whole matter before the invention of the art of printing:—but a printing-press is the most unmanageable of all things for a despot. That was a sad hour for tyranny when the art of making movable metallic types was thought of; and no arrangement has been made to reconcile this invention with the essential notions of a monarchy. To control the opinions of men is essential to a despotism, but it cannot exist in a Republic. The essential idea in a republic is *freedom*—and the freedom of thought, and the freedom of opinion, and the freedom of expression, in any way that men choose, is to them the most important kind of freedom. But, in all ages, despots have found it necessary to attempt to restrain this; and in all countries, too, there has been an effort made to protect certain dogmas, or measures, or institutions, from freedom of discussion in regard to their nature and tendency. Under despotism this is indispensable; in a republic it is impossible. Algernon Sidney was executed, and his blood attainted, for some unpublished papers found in his closet, containing merely speculative opinions in favor of a republican form of government. It was in allusion to this judicial murder by the infamous Jeffries, and to the fact that the record of the conviction had been destroyed, that Erskine, on the trial of Hardy, uttered the splendid anathema against “those who took from the files the sentence against Sidney, which should have been left on record to all ages, that it might arise and blacken in the sight, like the handwriting on the wall before the eastern tyrant, to deter from outrages on justice.” Sheridan, also, in an attack on ministers who were attempting to carry a bill against the freedom of the press, uttered a similar sentiment full of the spirit of liberty. “Give them a corrupt house of lords; give them a venal house of commons; give them a tyrannical prince; give them a truckling court,—and let me have but an unfettered press, and I will defy them to encroach a hair’s breadth upon the liberties of England.”

But the expression of sentiment by the press cannot be restrained in a republic—cannot be ultimately restrained

anywhere. And where there is a free press to speak out—and the press is one of those things that will make itself free; if there is wrong in a community, there will be agitation, and the truth will ultimately prevail. “Though all the winds of doctrine”—says that great champion of liberty, to whom the world owes more than it has yet acknowledged—Milton; “Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth lie in the field, we do injuriously by licensing, and prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter? Her confuting is the best and surest suppressing. For who knows not that truth is strong, next to the Almighty? She needs no policies, nor stratagems, nor licensings, to make her victorious; these are the shifts and the defences that error uses against her power; but give her room, and do not bind her when she sleeps.”

It is true, that free discussion will produce agitation, and may disturb the repose of a people. It has always been the policy of Satan to produce, if possible, *a dead calm* in the world; a state of unquestioning acquiescence in his reign. It has been his aim to set up certain thrones so firm that they could not be shaken; to secure such a prevalence of certain opinions that they would not be controverted; to bind the mind in fetters, so strong that there could be no hope of being free; and to make it so acquiesce in the existing order of things that there should be no desire to be free:—to lull a nation, or the world, into so profound repose that there should be no disposition, and no power to rouse from it. The *beau ideal* of such a nation, in the vision of the prince of darkness, is probably China—where the highest talent has been displayed, by language, and by custom, to extinguish all the tendencies of the human mind to progress. The next in order is probably the regions where the religion of the Brahmins prevails, and then the countries where the Papal religion abounds—all of these being forms of religion easily linked with despotism. Then come all those countries and institutions where there are customs that are not to be

questioned; forms of evil that are not to be examined; laws that have the sanction of ages and that may not be disturbed. Now, these things can never be changed without agitation. The apostles, when they preached, are represented as "turning the world upside down;" Luther, and Zwingli, and Knox, shook Europe to its centre. There *are* attempts always to shield some things from investigation. A free press in one place is broken up, and threatened in another; but the general progress is onward, and the time is coming in all parts of this land, and in all lands, when it shall be conceded that all things may be freely examined—for when "thrones are cast down," there fall also, all the right and the power to control public opinion, and truth is left to make her way upon the earth as she can.

Third. The "casting down of thrones" draws in its train the restraints on the right of suffrage. On the downfall of a throne man becomes *a voter*. The source of authority is transferred from the hereditary claimant to the people as such—and every man has a right to express his preference for rulers, unawed by arms, and unrestrained by dictation. Suffrage at all, is not a doctrine of kingcraft; for all the authority is in the sovereign. Burke, in his "Reflections on the Revolution in France," demonstrated in opposition to Dr. Price, that the British sovereign is in no sense elective, or the choice of the people. But when the crown falls from the head, every man in theory, and ultimately every man in fact, becomes a voter. The right of appearing at the ballot-box is a right which has been *extorted* from kings, and the progress of liberty has been marked by the number of persons to whom it has been extended, and the number of points which they have been permitted to determine in this quiet way. If the authority is not in the "anointed king," it is in the anointed people—in all the people—in one as much as another. It is in the human being—the *man*—who is to be governed, and sooner or later he will know it, and will assert the right. Sooner or later every man learns that he has a right to vote, and every man learns that he should be eligible to

office. Yet the remains of other systems; of the feudal system; of monarchical principles; of aristocratic institutions, linger long often even in a republic. To this day, "no man is eligible to a seat in the House of Representatives in South Carolina, who does not own a settled freehold estate of five hundred acres of land and ten negroes," or "a real estate of the value of one hundred and fifty pounds sterling clear of debt;" and to this day also, thousands of native born inhabitants of this land—and of the commonwealth of Penn, too—mocked with the name and the shadow of freedom, have no voice in making the laws by which the property which they themselves have earned, is taxed. We may wage war against the right; we may set up barriers against it; we may make use of ancient prejudice, or ancient customs, but the theory of liberty is in favor of universal suffrage, and ultimately the theory will prevail. When the throne falls, the power passes into the hands of the people—no longer recognizing rank, and grade, and color; and it is vain to attempt to check its progress as it moves among the masses of men. France, almost as if by miracle, struck at once into the true notion of liberty, when the throne fell, like Minerva leaping from the head of Jupiter in full perfection; and whether she has now firmness, and virtue, and intelligence enough to maintain it or not, *that* is the idea to which the world is coming, and to which it must come, if it could not rear the throne of despotism again.

Fourth. With the fall of thrones there comes a separation of religion and the state. In despotism they are always united—for religion is the most powerful principle that governs man, and he who has the control of the conscience has the control of the state. In governments where authority is claimed by hereditary right, and by divine right, this power is claimed of course by the sovereign; for it belongs in reality to the sovereign, and when *the people* become the sovereign, it passes into their hands. We have slowly learned this ourselves; but having learned it, we proclaim it to the world as one of the inestimable discoveries of modern times. We hold up our example to

the world, and invite the nations to its contemplation, and ask them to imitate us. "No intermeddling, and no favor," is all that we ask of civil rulers; and with this as our motto and maxim, we have no doubt that religion will live, nor that it will be a better support to the state than it ever has been, when under the patronage and protection of government. I said, that 'we have slowly learned this ourselves.' With all their hatred of tyranny, and all their inextinguishable love of freedom, our fathers came to this land poorly instructed on this point. So vastly was this sentiment in advance of their age; and so thoroughly had they, alike under the crown and in the commonwealth, felt that religion *needed* the patronage of the state, and that it was indispensable to the welfare of the state that it should be under its protection, that it was long before our fathers were disabused of the idea. In Virginia, in New York, and in New England, they clung to the notion still, and made the support of religion, in certain specified forms, a part of the requirement of the laws. It has been but recently, within the memory of most of us, that the last lingering remnants of these laws have disappeared from our statute books;—but they *are* all gone, and the church stands aloof from all connection with the state, and moves on in her own way with neither fear nor favor. Of all our institutions now, this is that which foreigners can least understand, and where perhaps they see most peril; of all our institutions this is that which perhaps we prize most, and where we would be most prompt to oppose any interference or any change. And to this, the nations of the world will come, and the downfall of each successive throne, and the promulgation of every new constitution, is a step in the progress towards it. A throne could not long stand without the help to be derived from a patronized religion; nor can a throne fall without sooner or later making it certain that religion will be independent of the state.

Fifth. The "casting down of thrones" is, and is to be, connected with freedom in the true sense—the freedom of all, and with the introduction of a period when "the An-

cient of Days," the great God alone, shall rule over men. So far as the demolition of royal hereditary power goes to emancipate one man, it goes to emancipate all; so far as it raises one to the dignity of a freeman, it, in principle, raises all; so far as it breaks the fetters of one, it breaks the fetters of all; so far as it opens to the view of any man, the right to civil and religious liberty, it opens that view to all. The principle is one whose progress cannot long be arrested towards universal emancipation. *Our* principles of liberty strangely stopped before we reached this result, and millions are still held in bondage; France, seventy years after the proclamation of our independence, and taking our principles as her guide, leaped at once to a conclusion which *we* should have reached, that if one man is free, all are; that if one class of men are entitled to liberty, all are; that if it is wrong for kings to tyrannize over men, it is wrong for any man to do it; that if men are not to be slaves beneath a throne, they are not to be slaves in a republic; and that, as they who stand around the throne when it falls, are free, so all men, so far as *they* are concerned, are free also. The conclusion is inevitable; and to this, sooner or later, all men must come. If liberty is *our* right, it is the right of others; if it was not right that we should be fettered and manacled, having done no wrong, it is not right that others should be. If kings are guilty of wrong in depriving men of freedom, then all other men are guilty of wrong in doing the same thing; and if they are right who seek their own freedom, they cannot be right in withholding it from others. Curran saw this in the immortal declaration, that the "moment any one touched the soil of England, that moment he was free, and his shackles fell." Mansfield saw it, when from the highest seat of judicial power, he declared this to be British law; and it is strange that the world—that the great advocates of liberty—that the great defenders of the Gospel—that the great upholders of the democratic principle—have not always and everywhere proclaimed it. But it will be proclaimed. Slavery cannot always exist in a republic. There is such a singular

incongruity between the declaration in the instrument which proclaims our freedom, "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness," and the doctrine and the fact that millions are held in servitude; there is such an incongruity in reading and proclaiming this throughout the land, and dwelling upon it as a "self-evident" truth, and in the same breath, proclaiming the doctrine that there are now as many millions in our own country as first gave utterance to this truth who are not, and ought not, to be free; there is such an absolute impossibility in maintaining the democratic principle, and still defending the institution of perpetual bondage; and there is such a fell and chilling difficulty in expressing congratulation to a foreign people because they *all* are free, while we enslave millions in our own bosom, that the eyes will yet be open upon inconsistencies and absurdities so glaring, and the world will begin to ask, whether we mean to teach that liberty is the right of man as such, or only our own right; whether we mean to rejoice that it is extended to others, or only that it is ours. But the world does not go backward on this point. They that rejoice with France; they that exult with the hope that Europe will be emancipated; they that express sympathy with the elevation of man when thrones are prostrated, are holding up a sentiment which will yet emancipate every human being from oppression and bondage. And to that the world is coming:—and God speed the day.

You will indulge me, on a great subject wholly unexhausted, with a remark or two, in conclusion. They will relate to our hopes and our duties in reference to the state of things in Europe, particularly France.

We hope much, but we fear much, for it has been long since said, by high authority, even *in* France, "France wants a religion:" and were the Bible spread all through that land now; could every Frenchman read in his own tongue the word of God; were the principles of Protestant Christianity everywhere diffused and understood; were

there as much intelligence to appreciate the nature and the blessings of freedom there, as there was in this land when our fathers detached themselves from the throne, what might we not hope in regard to that country ! But men are prone to forget that a far-spreading infidelity is as offensive in the sight of the great God as any form of tyranny ; and that the one as well as the other may be equally subversive of liberty. Our fathers were successful because the fear of God reigned in the land. France certainly would be, if the same fear of the Lord were there.

And yet it may be that God means to rule in the hearts of that people, until, under his Providence, the principles of religion and intelligent freedom can be diffused abroad. No man can fail to recognize his hand in these wonderful events—for no man could have believed that that throne *could* have fallen, guarded as it was, by two hundred thousand chosen men trained for such an emergency ; that it could have been borne off and broken to atoms by a handful of unarmed men ; that a crown could have been plucked from the brow of royalty, and a dozen plain citizens entrusted with the administration of a mighty empire, with no conflict of arms, unless God had been there.

France is now all open to the spread of a pure Gospel. No man will hinder the colporteur there ; no one the vender of Bibles ; no one the evangelical preacher ; no one the society, or the men that seek to turn the nation to God. For the first time in their history, the Waldenses on her borders are free ; and for the first time may the principles of her own Calvin, who found a home in Geneva—the principles that *from* Geneva found their way to England, and thence to Plymouth—for the first time may those principles, flowing down from Alpine hills, spread all over the plains of France. What then is the obvious duty of those who love these great principles, and who know their source, and understand their value ? It is to bear France, with her new rulers—raised more suddenly than men were ever before to power, and entrusted, not by their own seeking, with the destinies of

empires—on the heart before God ; to pray God of his great mercy to preside in their great changes, and save Europe from the conflicts of arms ; and to seek through any channel now open to us, to diffuse through France and through Europe, the knowledge of the Gospel, and the principles of our liberty. There is such a channel. The Foreign Evangelical Society has had this pre-eminently as the field of its operations—a society that has been engaged as its great work, in spreading through nominally Christian lands, that pure Gospel to which *we* owe our calm and peaceful freedom, and which, if it were now diffused abroad through France—through Europe—would secure all that the most sanguine hope for, in regard to the rights of man.

We owe much to France. When, in former years, her plains were drenched with the blood of the Huguenots, thousands of those who then escaped from death came to our shores, and their piety and wisdom mingled with that of the sons of the Pilgrims, in laying the foundations of our liberty, and their blood flowed on the same battle-field in defending our rights. In the days of our revolution she helped us ; and, perhaps more than all, as laying a claim to our sympathy, she has caught the love of liberty from our example, for she has lighted her torch at our altar, and seeks to enjoy a republic modeled after the fashion of our own. We owe it to the world, to hail the progress of liberty everywhere ; to rejoice with every one who becomes a freeman ; and to bear on our hearts before the God who has given *us* liberty, the case of all who are struggling for it, until every “throne shall be cast down, and the Ancient of Days shall sit :”—until “the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever.”