

The American Sentinel 11 (1896)

January 2, 1896

"Retrospective and Prospective" *American Sentinel* 11, 1 , pp. 1, 2.

WITH this number the AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the eleventh year of its publication.

When the first number of the SENTINEL was issued, few, comparatively, even of its friends, realized the real necessity there was for such a paper, and very many thought that there was in this country no field for a journal devoted to the advocacy of religious liberty. But subsequent events have fully justified the existence of the SENTINEL, every year making the necessity for it more apparent than the previous one.

The past year has been unusually eventful in the conflict between truth and error, between righteousness and unrighteousness, between soul-liberty and the bondage of sin.

The year opened with persecution for conscience' sake, actually in progress in Switzerland, in England, and in various parts of our own country, notably in Tennessee; and there has been no general abatement.

Under color of the Swiss Factory Act, the Seventh-day Adventist publishing house in Basel was closed some months since, the manager imprisoned, and the publishing work carried on there greatly crippled.

The employÈs of this publishing house, instead of being protected by the operations of this "law," have been greatly embarrassed and made to suffer hardship because of the loss of employment; and this seems the more inconsistent because Sunday is not as strictly observed in Switzerland as in some other countries. The plaza in front of the Imprimerie Polyglotte, the Seventh-day Adventist publishing house, is frequently the scene of Sunday military parades and athletic games; and on at least one recent occasion the reviewing stands were erected on Sunday. Nevertheless both the government and people of Switzerland have turned a deaf ear to the prayer of the Seventh-day Adventists for simple justice.

In England religious persecution, waged against the same people, has run about the same course. Here, as in Basel, it was carried on under color of the Factory Act; and, as appears from the statement

which we take from the *Daily Graphic*, published upon page 4,¹¹ the greatest sufferers have been those whom the act styles "protected persons." The facts, as set forth in the appeal of the Board of Directors to the Home Secretary, to which we have just referred, unmistakably stamp the action of the authorities in this instance as religious persecution.

Intolerance in Our Own Land.

In our own country bigotry and intolerance have been no less pronounced. The first quarter of the year saw ten Seventh-day Adventists convicted and imprisoned in Rhea County, Tenn., upon the technical charge of "nuisance," their offense being the performance of ordinary secular labor on the first day of the week. And this conviction was had notwithstanding the absence of all evidence that there was any disturbance other than the mental annoyance experienced by those whose bigotry and intolerance render them incapable of cheerfully awarding to others the exercise of rights which they demand for themselves. This persecution was a gross injustice not only to the imprisoned men and their families, but also resulted in cutting short a term of the Graysville Academy, to the great detriment of a number of students who were about ready to graduate.

An appeal to the legislature of Tennessee for relief by repeal of the oppressive act was treated with contempt; and four months later eight Seventh-day Adventists, including several of the same individuals formerly imprisoned, were again convicted and imprisoned and worked in the chain-gang with common criminals. During the same time there were other similar cases of persecution in Massachusetts, Maryland, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Illinois, Ontario, and Manitoba.

Statutes Overridden.

In both Illinois and Arkansas there is a clause exempting from the penalties of the "law" observers of the seventh day. But this provision has been overridden, notably in Illinois, and quiet, inoffensive, and in every respect law-abiding citizens have been haled before courts, and have been tried and unjustly convicted. And but for an appeal to the Supreme Court, now pending, these men would be suffering imprisonment at the present moment for the exercise of their God-given, constitutional, and statutory rights.

And what has been the attitude of the people toward these persecutions? Largely one of indifference. This has been especially true in foreign lands. In London it is said by a high government official that the numbers concerned were too insignificant to justify any action looking to relief, by the government. ²² In this country, a considerable part of the secular press has spoken out nobly in defense of the rights of conscience, and in condemnation of tyranny. But a majority of the *religious* papers have been either silent or have given their voice in favor of restriction and oppression.

With the single exception of the American Baptist Publication Association, the various religious bodies of this country, so far as they have spoken, have by resolutions not only indorsed the restriction of religious liberty, but have demanded the enactment and enforcement of still more stringent statutes calculated to bind as with a chain not only the bodies but the souls of men to the Sunday Juggernaut. With the details our readers are familiar.

What Is Involved.

The law of God declares that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and commands in unequivocal language that it be kept holy. Not only so, but God appeals repeatedly to the facts set forth in that commandment as the ground of his rightful authority over all men, and also declares: "I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." ³³ Thus the Sabbath is the sign of God not only as Creator but as re-Creator, or Saviour.

But in contradistinction to this the Catholic Church commands the observance of Sunday, to which she appeals as the badge of her authority to command men under sin. ⁴⁴ And

²

such has been her influence with the nations of earth that almost every civilized State on the globe has incorporated into its statutes the papal dogma of Sunday sacredness. So far is our country from being an exception to this statement, that it has stood forth so prominently in this respect that this institution is by many styled "the American Sabbath."

Notwithstanding the fact that in 1829 and 1830 the Congress of the United States adopted the Sunday Mail Reports, written by Hon. Richard M. Johnson, in which it was declared that if the Sunday act then demanded "should be adopted, it would be difficult for human

sagacity to foresee how rapid would be the succession or how numerous the train of measures which [would] follow, involving the dearest rights of all—the rights of conscience." The Fifty-second Congress in its World's fair legislation in 1893 took this dangerous step by interpreting the law of God, declaring in effect that the fourth commandment was not only binding upon all men and nations, but that it required the observance of the first day of the week.

It is true that the Government has not been consistent in this matter, but it is plainly seen that the trend of public sentiment and of governmental policy is in the direction of showing greater honor to the Sunday institution; and in this the several States are not one white behind the General Government. In fact, most of the States have for many years been committed to the defense of the Sunday dogma.

What of the Future?

What the present Congress will do it is of course impossible to tell; but indications are not lacking that it is ambitious to make a "reform" record. Already there has been introduced into both the Senate, and House, the joint resolution which we print on page 6; but even if adopted, this proposed amendment would add but little to what we already have in general orders, religious proclamations, the practice of employing chaplains, State and national statutes, and judicial decisions.

Judge Brewer's dictum of Feb. 29, 1892, that this is a "Christian nation," while theoretically without force as law, has practically nullified that portion of the First Amendment which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Being a "Christian nation," it follows that the "Christian" religion is the religion of the nation, and that its institutions are to be protected because they are "Christian." Such was probably the most potent argument (aside from threatened political boycott) ⁵⁵ urged in behalf of the World's Fair Sunday-closing clause. But be this as it may, the trend of events in this country and in the world cannot be mistaken. Everywhere the Papacy is being exalted either in its own proper character, or by the adoption of its institutions, dogmas and methods.

But this occasions no surprise to the student of sacred Scripture, for it is plainly declared in Rev. 13:8: "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him [the Papacy], whose names are not written in the

book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Obedience is the highest form of worship, and regardless of their profession, those who knowingly obey the command of the Papacy rather than the command of God, thereby worship the beast. It is the boast of Rome that "the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage [worship] they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Roman Catholic] church." ⁶⁶

The Papacy and Its Image.

The beast, the Papacy, is a church clothed with civil power and therefore holding adulterous connection with the nations of the earth. One of the symbols by which it is represented is that of a lewd woman. (See Rev. 17:1-5.) It follows that any church forsaking the power of God and seeking the power of the State becomes papal in character, whether recognized as a part of the Papacy or not.

Fourteen of the "evangelical" denominations of the United States, banding themselves together in the American Sabbath Union, ⁷⁷ have sought and obtained civil power for the furtherance of their ends, and the enforcement of at least one of their dogmas, ⁸⁸ namely, that of Sunday sacredness,—the dogma to which, in preference to all others, as we have shown, the Papal Church appeals as the symbol of her power to "command men under sin."

In thus imitating the Papacy and receiving power from the State instead of from her Lord, the professed Protestant church of America has inaugurated an American papacy, an image as it were of the Papacy of the pope. And against the worship of this image as well as against obeying the Papacy itself, the Scriptures given the solemn warning of Rev. 14:9, 10. It is for the purpose of sounding this warning that the SENTINEL exists. We have never for a moment expected to prevent those things which are foretold in the Scriptures. Opposition may retard, but cannot finally avert that which the Word of God long since declared would come to pass.

This country was settled and this nation established, we firmly believe, in the providence of God, that it might be an asylum for the oppressed of all nations, and that here a purer church might be maintained and greater liberty to preach the gospel be enjoyed than was possible in any other quarter of the globe. But these privileges have not been appreciated, and misguided men, ambitious for their own aggrandizement and mistaking ambition for religious fervor, have

untiringly plotted for the overthrow of liberty of conscience in the suppose interests of the religion of Him who said to the impulsive Peter: "Put up thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

One after another of the constitutional guarantees of religious liberties have been and are being swept away, not indeed by direct repeal, but by legislation subtly inconsistent with our charters of liberty, State and national, and by practices equally at variance with the spirit of our free institutions, and scarcely less sophistical than the legislation referred to; and by judicial decisions based upon colonial history and royal charters rather than upon those guarantees of freedom of conscience by which the people of nearly every State have sought to make sure their liberties.

The Sunday institution figures more largely in this assault on soul-liberty than any other papal dogma, because it is the test of loyalty to the Papacy, as the Sabbath is the test of loyalty to God. It is for this reason that we view with alarm every attempt to coerce men in this matter, and raise our voices in warning against every forward step which is taken in the exaltation of this man-made institution, this papal counterfeit of the Sabbath of the Lord. And so the SENTINEL will continue in the future to uncompromisingly oppose, as it has in the past, every step in the direction of a more perfect development of union of Church and State, which is bound up with and necessarily included in every statute and every judicial decision, and every governmental action designed in any way to either enforce upon the people the observance of any religious dogmas, or which prohibits in any manner the free exercise of religious faith. The nation may not hear, the great mass of the people may not pause, apostate Protestantism may not desist from her pursuit of civil power; but individuals will heed the warning and be saved in the kingdom of God. And to this end we labor.

"Will the 'Christian' Nations Fight?" *American Sentinel* 11, 1 , pp. 2, 3.

THIS is the question that is now agitating many minds in all parts of the civilized world, and no one is able to give it a conclusive answer. Two great "Christian" nations have had a serious falling out, and one of them has threatened the other with a possible settlement of their differences by force of arms. Both are standing upon their dignity, and announce that they are firmly resolved to maintain the

same, by a careful avoidance of anything like a confession of being in the wrong.

The situation was very generally discussed by leading clergymen in their Sunday sermons, Dec. 22, and a number expressed themselves strongly concerning the unchristian spectacle which would be presented in the event of war. The Rev. Dr. John Hall, of the Fifth Ave. Presbyterian Church, New York, said that "nothing would cause more malignant satisfaction to the devil than the possibility of strife between two such great Christian nations as ours, and that with which we are most closely associated by ties of blood and kindred interests." Rev. Francis E. Mason, of Brooklyn notice that "the world is in a state of commotion and war. Even our own Congress, the Congress of an avowed Christian nation, is this moment considering the purchase of 2,000,000 rifles." And the Rev. L. A. Banks, of the same city, alluding to the idea of a forcible annexation of Canada, which would be an inevitable outcome of hostilities, inquired: "Has a nation any more moral right to steal a State than a private citizen to steal an overcoat or a watch?" He might also with equal pertinency have inquired whether a nation has any more moral right than a private citizen has to kill people who stand in the way of its covetous or ambitious designs.

It is pleasing to note that the leading cler-

3

gymen of the country, with some exceptions, stand firmly for the maintenance of peace, and that the "sober second thought" of the people has turned largely in this direction. Still, as has been pointed out, a nation may be led into war against the wishes of the majority of its people. In the present case, it is evident that both in England and America the people almost universally deprecate the idea of war; *but*—there are certain things a "Christian" nation cannot sacrifice even to avert war. A "Christian" nation must at all costs maintain its dignity. A backdown,—a confession of being in the wrong, is not to be thought of on either side; at least not from any other motive than that of fear of the consequences. And here lies the danger. Have these two great "Christian" nations, through the action of their chief representatives, taken a definite antagonistic stand on the question of controversy? If they have, then war seems inevitable, notwithstanding the natural aversion of the people thereto; for must not a "Christian" nation fight rather than acknowledge itself in the wrong? Certainly—to voice the general sentiment—it must.

Hence both nations will await with anxiety the result of the commission to be appointed by President Cleveland to make an investigation which will settle the question of the duty of the United States. Meanwhile suggestions are being made by peace-loving people, of means which they think still open to this nation or to England to avoid a conflict without any loss of dignity. It is possible, and certainly devoutly to be hoped, that events may furnish such a solution of the difficulty. But in case they do not, and it remains either to confess or to fight, then these two "Christian" nations will lay hold of all the carnal weapons they can command, and kill, maim, burn, batter down, and in general do their best to disable each other, in order that their "Christian" dignity may be maintained!

Can we not see that all talk about this or any other nation being Christian, in a governmental sense, is nonsense?

"Practical Christian Sociology" *American Sentinel* 11, 1 , p. 3.

IN Dr. Crafts' work, "Practical Christian Sociology," referred to in our issue of Dec. 19, 1895, he makes this argument(?) for the first day of the week, to which he applies the names "Sabbath" and "Lord's Day":—

That first gospel, the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and it should bruise his heel, pictures the promised Christ as a bruised Conqueror, a Saviour-King. The later prophecies painted the Coming One sometimes as a sufferer, sometimes as a sovereign, which led some of the Jews that were unable to conceive of a king as a voluntary sufferer to expect two Messiahs. At the birth of Christ two cries rang out together: "Unto you is born a Saviour." "Where is he that is born King?" On the Mount of Coronation Jesus "spake of his decease." When we recall the cross at the *Lord's* Supper that very name should prompt us to look above his wounded feet and hands and side and brow, to the words above his head, "This is the King;" to which also points the word *sacrament*, whose original meaning is a soldier's oath of loyalty to his king. These double pictures of the Saviour-King culminate in Revelation in the throne on which was a Lamb "as it had been slain." "The gospel of our salvation" is also "the gospel of the kingdom," the *good news* including not only pardon through Jesus the Saviour, but also protection and direction through Christ the King.

At the portals of that same book of Revelation, which is preëminently the book of Christ's Kingship, stands the most impressive sign of his present earthly authority, "the Lord's Day,"

the profound significance of which in this connection I have never seen developed. One day in every week an invisible Lord commands us to halt in the most absorbing pursuits of our earthly life; in the pursuit of money and business; in the pursuit of pleasure; in the pursuit of politics and fame; in the pursuit of education; and we halt as a sign that we believe in that invisible Lord and are loyal to his law. There is no other sign of our faith and loyalty so impressive to a selfish world as this twenty-four-hour halt in our work every week at Christ's command. The Lord's day is therefore the "sign," the ensign of our Lord Jesus Christ; its field of blue spangled with stars and sun; its stripes the black and white of night and day, and the many colors of sunrise and sunset; and this flag of Christ is carried round the world every week and is saluted by some in every land by the laying aside of tools and toil, in token of their loyalty to a living Lord. Breaking the sabbath, therefore, is tearing the flag of the government of the universe, and so an offense kindred to treason. We have forgotten all the murderers of the Revolution, but not Benedict Arnold, because an offense against a good government the calm verdict of history adjudges to be a greater wrong than any that can be done to individuals. Desecrating the Lord's day, in addition to any wrong to workers or to society that it involves, is high treason to the Lord himself. ⁹¹

With the first of these paragraphs we have no fault to find. The cross and the throne do indeed both appear in the Lord's Supper. The words, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death *till he come*," ¹⁰² point us not only back to the valley of humiliation, but forward to Mount Zion; and the eye of faith sees Christ not only as the Man of Calvary, the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," but beholds him coming again as "King of kings and Lord of lords."

But the second paragraph is as full of error as the first one is of truth. "The Lord's day" truly stands "at the portals" of the book of Revelation "as the most impressive sign" of Christ's authority, but that day is not Sunday, nor does it stand for civil authority exercised by self-appointed vicars of the Son of God.

The only Lord's day known to the Scriptures of truth is the seventh day, "the Sabbath of the Lord," kept by patriarchs, prophets, apostles, the holy women at the tomb, and by our Lord himself. That this day, honored alike by God and his people, is indeed the Lord's day, is evident from Ex. 20:8-11; Isa. 58:13; and Matt. 12:8. The first of these texts says plainly: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" in the second, the Lord calls the Sabbath "my holy day;" while in the third, that same Lord, as the Son of man, styles himself "Lord

even of the Sabbath day." The conclusion is irresistible that the seer of Patmos was in the Spirit upon the day divinely sanctified and blest for man,—“the Sabbath of the Lord.”

But the Lord's day of Rev. 1:10 is none the less the badge of Christ's authority. Dr. Crafts himself says:—

When the laws and law principles of the Old Testament have been added to those of the New, we have not yet before us the complete law of Christ, which includes also the so-called “laws of nature,” “the Oldest Testament,” of which Christ is divinely declared to be the author. “In the beginning was the Word. The world was made by him, and the world knew him not.” Nor does it yet know Christ as its Creator. Although John three times declares that “the world was made by him,” and although the book of Hebrews twice declares the same; and although Paul in Colossians, which presents Christ as King of the Cosmos as well as King of the Church, proclaims that in him were all things created, and that with him all creation is filled, and that by him all things “hold together,” yet how seldom to a child's curious questions about the great world does anyone answer “Jesus made it”! He is known as the author of “the *new* creation,” only—as Redeemer, but not as Creator. If the so-called “Apostles' Creed,” which is partly responsible for the exclusion of Christ from the work of creation, is to be made truly apostolic, in view of the foregoing words of apostles we must change a word and say, “I believe in God the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth *through* Jesus Christ his only begotten Son, our Lord.” Natural science, by its evidences of design, order, and progress, proves mind in nature; Scripture proclaims that mind to be “the mind of Christ,” whom we disobey whenever we disregard a law written in our bodies as surely as if it were written in our Bible. ¹¹³

Beyond all question Christ is the Creator. The Sabbath is therefore the Lord's day because it is both the memorial of his work and of rest, the day he himself blest and sanctified, the day which he himself made for man before sin had doomed him to wearing toil,—and hence the day primarily designed not for physical rest but for spiritual rejoicing.

Nor is the Sabbath, the Lord's day of the sacred Scriptures, simply the memorial of a finished creation and of divine rest. The Sabbath is a sign to every son of Adam,—separated from sin by redeeming grace,—of the divine power by which he is saved: “Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them.” ^{12 4} As “the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters” ^{13 5} to bring order

out of confusion, to transform chaos into beauty, so the same divine Spirit changes the stony heart to a heart of flesh, and from the chaos of sin brings forth the beauty of holiness, the spiritual "man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." ¹⁴⁶ "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." ¹⁵⁷ The power that redeems, that re-creates, is the same that in the beginning created the world from nothing, and that from darkness made light. And in every age and in both Testaments the Sabbath of the Lord, the Lord's day, stands as the symbol of that power.

But the author of "Practical Christian Sociology" scorns the Lord's day of the Scriptures and insists that another day shall represent the Lord's power! He tramples in the dust "the ensign of our Lord Jesus Christ," the standard which our Lord himself as Creator ordained, whose "field of blue" he himself "spangled with stars and sun," and whose "stripes the black and white of night and day, and the many colors of sunrise and sunset," his own fingers painted; and in its stead he unfurls the flag of antichrist and demands that it shall be acknowledged as the standard of "the King of kings, and Lord of lords!" Ignoring the only divine command ever given to "halt as a sign that we believe in that invisible Lord and are loyal to his law," our author demands for the counterfeit Lord's day the honor due alone to the Sabbath of the Lord, the true Lord's day, and declares that breaking this false sabbath, this man-made Lord's day, is tearing the flag of the Government of the universe, and so an offense kindred to treason"! How dare any man so write? and what shall such an one answer when the Lord of the true Sabbath shall demand, "Who hath required this at your hands?" Are not such well described in these words of Holy Writ: "Have ye not seen a vain vision, and have ye not spoken a lying divination, whereas ye say, The Lord saith it; albeit I have not spoken?" ¹⁶⁸ "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am profaned among them." ¹⁷⁹

January 9, 1896

"Congress and Sunday Legislation" *American Sentinel* 11, 2 , pp. 9, 10.

LAMST week we printed on our last page the text of the Sunday bill recently introduced into Congress by Representative Morse, of Massachusetts.

This bill is entitled, "A bill for the protection of the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia."

Such being the title of the bill, it is clear that it is one which should meet with no favor from an American Congress, for it is opposed to the very fundamental principles of free government.

The Declaration of Independence is not law in the common acceptations of that term, but the principles enunciated in it, existing as they do in the very nature of things, are superior even to the Constitution, and by those principles that instrument must be interpreted.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," our forefathers declared, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. . . . that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

That we have not read amiss or misinterpreted the Declaration of Independence when we say that it teaches that government exists for the protection of human rights, is evident from the following words by the author of that immortal instrument, written nearly forty years later, namely, June 7, 1815:

OUR legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their power; that *their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, and to take none of them from us*. No man has a natural right to commit aggression on the equal rights of another; and this is all from which the laws ought to restrain him; every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of the society; and this is all the laws should enforce on him. ¹⁸¹

This leaves no room to question Jefferson's meaning. But with these words the language of the Declaration is plain: the American doctrine as enunciated by our forefathers is that just governments exist for the purpose of protecting men in the exercise of their rights; not "for the protection of the first day of the week," or any other day of the week. But the title of this Sunday bill shows that it is designed, not

to secure human rights, but to confer honor upon a day because of its religious character, something never contemplated by the founders of the Government as is witnessed not only by the Declaration of Independence, but by the First Amendment to the Constitution as well.

But it may be said that the words: "For the protection of the first day of the week," etc., really mean for the protection of people in the use of the day for the purposes specified. Not so; for the language of the act itself forbids this interpretation. The words, "The first day of the week, *known as the Lord's day*, set apart by general consent *in accordance with divine appointment* as a day of rest and worship," stamp the proposed legislation as religious, and show the purpose of the act to be, not to secure human rights, but to honor as a divine institution the particular day in question.

That the purpose of the bill is, as we have stated, to honor Sunday and to secure its religious observance is further shown by the clause exempting from its provisions "those who religiously observe Saturday." It is not enough that one simply rests on Saturday; he must "religiously observe" it, showing that the bill aims at religious observance on one day or the other.

Further, the bill assumes to settle a religious controversy by declaring that "the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day," is "set apart" "*in accordance with divine appointment*." The First Amendment to the Federal Constitution declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." What possible right then has the national legislature to decide that a given day is "set apart in accordance with divine appointment"? or to decree that it must be observed by refraining upon it from "any labor, except works of necessity and mercy"?

If Congress may, for the reason given, require Sunday observance, might it not also require anything else that it deems "in accordance with divine appointment"? If, as some assert, the First Amendment means no more than that Congress shall not establish any denomination as the State church, and that it shall not forbid the profession of any faith,—if the First Amendment means no more than this, we ask, might not Congress require any other religious observance as well as the observance of "the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day"? Might not the national legislature require, for instance, that all persons should profess some

religion, leaving each one free to choose the particular church he would join? Or might not Congress require all within its jurisdiction to have their children christened, leaving them free to choose the particular church whose minister should administer the rite? Certainly.

But the First Amendment means more than that: it means as expressed May 26, 1797, by George Washington, the father of his country, that "the Government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion;"¹⁹ 2 it means as Jefferson expressed it in 1808, that "the Government of the United States" is "interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline, or exercises."²⁰ 3 It means, as Mr. Madison, the father of the Constitution, expressed it in 1823, "that religion is essentially distinct from civil government, and exempt from its cognizance."²¹ 4 It means, as a committee of the United States Senate expressed in 1829, that "among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the Constitution has wisely withheld from our Government the power of defining the divine law. It is a right reserved to each citizen; and while he respects the rights of others, he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions."²² 5

10

Such being the meaning of the First Amendment to the Constitution, will Congress reject this Sunday bill? Time alone can tell.

"Numbers and Rights" *American Sentinel* 11, 2 , p. 10.

NUMBERS and rights sustain no relation to each other. This is contrary to the general idea; but it is nevertheless true.

Rights are God-given. As the Declaration of Independence says: "We hold these truths to be self-evidence: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." They do not pertain to men because men are associated together in large numbers; nor are they determined by that fact. The rights of man have their basis in the purpose of the Creator; and that purpose is independent of the number of those to whom it pertains.

Every individual is bound by his relation to his Creator and to his fellowmen. But his relation to his fellows is not independent of his relation to God. In other words, it is a duty which man owes to God, to

love his neighbor as himself. It is a part of the law of God that a man should not steal, kill, commit adultery, bear false witness, or do anything that would invade the rights of his fellowmen. "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law."

In fulfilling the purpose of God in our creation, we must of necessity fulfill every obligation which we owe to mankind. And to fulfill that divine purpose, it is necessary that we should possess and exercise certain rights. An all-wise Creator has accordingly endowed all men with those rights; and these rights, being thus inherent in the individual, are unalienable.

The purpose of the Creator is that every being whom he has made should be upright and perfect in all his ways, a free agent, and should live a life of unmarred happiness. Because of the fall, this purpose can never be fully realized in this world, but it will be perfectly accomplished in the world to come.

In this world progress is made toward the attainment of this purpose by development of character. God does not want automatons, nor slaves. God would stultify his own name if he should create beings of such a nature. He could not do less than create beings of the highest and most perfect type; nor could he be satisfied with anything else. He will have no one love and serve him from fear, or because he could not do otherwise. Such a tribute would be of an inferior nature, and therefore entirely unsuitable as an offering to the infinite God.

In order that man may develop a perfect character, he must have liberty. In order that his tribute to God may be voluntary, he must have freedom of choice. Accordingly men are left free by the Creator either to love and serve him, or to ignore him and serve themselves. The devil aims to interfere with this freedom of choice and compel men to refrain from the service of God. He would make every man a slave, controlled not by his own free choice, but by the will of another who leads him about in chains. And any effort of men to deprive any of their fellowmen of this freedom of choice further than to make secure from invasion their own God-given liberty, is against the divine purpose, and in harmony with the purpose and work of the devil.

The necessity of this individual liberty to the development of noble, God-like character, is amply and sadly illustrated by the spectacle of individual character presented among those races and classes of people which have been long the victims of oppression. We find them very largely deprived of their manhood, without that sense of honor

and self-respect which shrink from acts of meanness, and with no adequate conception of moral principle as a thing of value. Lying and deception are counted as accomplishments, hypocrisy as a virtue, and vice as a legitimate pleasure. Every noble faculty is debased. It is not with such beings that God would people his world.

And in order that this shall not be, men must cherish and exercise their individual right of free choice. They must choose for themselves whom they will serve, and choose that Master who will never take from them this freedom. Development of good and noble character can take place only along the line of free individual choice.

This individual freedom of choice comprises within its limits the unalienable rights of mankind. When this freedom is denied, the highest interests of the individual are attacked; and if the attack be successful, the gravest injury to mankind results.

It matters not, also, whether this freedom be denied by some individual despot, or by the doctrine that rights are determined by the judgment of majorities. The so-called "public conscience" cannot take the place of the individual conscience. The individual who surrenders his conscience surrenders his very soul. He surrenders faith; for Christian faith is not mere assent to the truth, but it is belief which is manifested by works. (See James 2:14-20.) And with the surrender of faith, goes also the right to eternal life itself.

The doctrine of the "greatest good to the greatest number" when so applied as to demand the yielding of the individual conscience to the will of the majority, becomes but the means of erecting a despotism. The theory that the majority must rule, is a very plausible one in this day, and a correct one so far as concerns those matters in which all have a common interest, and which are subject to human control. But it does not apply within the sphere of rights. And it is a fact also that the majorities in this world are made up not of leaders, or persons of independent judgment, but of followers: so that what appears to be the judgment of the majority, is very often only the will or opinion of the few by whom the majority are led. This is especially true in matters where the people do not feel their immediate interests to be directly affected, as in questions of religion. A religious despotism can be all the more readily established by a few influential bigots because the public are generally willing to let others (their spiritual advisers) think for them in religious matters, and thus be spared the trouble of investigating and deciding for themselves. This is human nature; and the religion of human nature is popery.

The facts we have stated can be more readily perceived through an illustration. It is contended at the present time that the best interests of the largest number demand the observance of the first day of the week. In London, England, as notice in our last issue, seventh-day observers have recently been denied the relief which might be afforded them by legislation, and which would simply have protected their rights, on the ground that they were but few in number. And in this country the plea of the same people for their right to set apart the seventh day according to the command of God, is denied on the ground that the majority think the first day is the proper one to be set apart, and the majority must rule. Shall the individual allow the "public conscience" to guide him in such a matter? Will the "public conscience" be responsible to God for individual conduct respecting his commands? Will the doctrine of majority rule shield a person in the day of Judgment in any matter where the majority happened not to be on the side of God's law? And will the penalty of disobedience be shifted from the individual transgressor and placed upon the spectre of "the majority," or of "government"?

No; every one of us shall give an account of himself before God. The "public conscience" will afford no individual any security in that day. The doctrine that rights pertain only to numbers,—that individual freedom of choice is swallowed up in the higher interests of the community, will excuse no one for failing to make that choice and to stand by that choice which his own conscience, as educated and guided by the word of God, told him to be right, and which, firmly adhered to, would have developed in him that character which is fitted for eternity.

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers;" but let every soul also remember that "there is no power but of God," and that his relation to God is an individual relations, and that as such it demands of him the exercise of his God-given rights. And let him, as he values his eternal interests, refuse to allow that relation and those rights to be controlled by the opinion and the "conscience" of the majority. God is the great "higher power" and he alone constitutes the true "majority."

"To Increase Church Collections" *American Sentinel* 11, 2 , pp. 10, 11.

THE book, "Practical Christian Sociology,"²³ 1 a late literary production, to which we have taken occasion to refer several times recently, is full of unique and striking things.

Like a true "reformer," the author of the book in question, cuts and slashes in every direction, sparing neither friend nor foe. Dividing the 19th century into three periods, of the second he says:—

The daybreak that came with that middle third of our century has already been overcast with heavy thunder clouds, especially in our own country. No doubt there has been moral progress since 1867 in the world at large, *but it would be hard to prove moral progress in the United States since that date.*²⁴2

Our author then enumerates the rise and development of various evils, prominent among which is "the Sunday paper, which," he says, "in most instances, is not only a sin but a crime."

Following his bill of particulars, he says:—

One reason why these evils have grown apace is because the church has not adequately recognized personal and social ethics as an integral and important part of its work. As Columbus discovered an unknown hemisphere, so we are just discovering a neglected hemisphere of social ethics. Those critics of the church are in error who assume that in British and American pulpits dogma has crowded out duty and creed has displaced conduct. All that can truly be said is that individual and social ethics have not had due emphasis in the utterances of the churches even in sermons, much less in creeds. They are a nineteenth-century development not sufficiently recognized in the eighteenth-century creeds and disciplines of our churches.²⁵3

We thank our author for the frank statement that his so-called "reforms," prominent among which is his "sabbath" crusade, are "a nineteenth-century development."

11

This is practically what we have been telling our author, and everybody else for years about the Sunday movement; that Christ and his apostles knew nothing of it; that the early church never kept Sunday; that it always rested upon no better authority than the edict of Constantine and the decrees of a fallen church; and that the idea of compelling its observance *as the sabbath*, is of very modern origin indeed. Now, Mr. Crafts acknowledges this himself. The demand that everybody shall observe Sunday as the "Christian sabbath," is only a nineteenth-century development, saving, of course, the Puritan theocracy in New England in the seventeenth century. The Puritans were something more than two centuries in advance of our author in

the matter of enforced Sunday-keeping. But no matter; Mr. Crafts is quite right: it is a modern discovery—certainly much more modern than the sacred Scriptures; which accounts fully and satisfactorily for the fact that it is nowhere mentioned in the writings of apostles, prophets, or evangelists.

But notwithstanding the modern origin of these "reforms," our author sharply arraigns the whole of the modern church for failure to give them financial support. He says:—

Not one of the large denominations, so far as we know, recognizes any of the social reforms as a part of Christianity in its official schedules of benevolence. How the efficacy of other church collections is decreased by lack of adequate church support of social reforms, for example, sabbath observance! Offerings for church erection and ministerial education and home missions are of value in proportion as the people are on the sabbath free to attend the churches thus erected and hear the preachers thus educated and supported. Mr. Puddefoot, the well-known home missionary secretary, informs me that there are in the frontier towns home missionary churches where the only man in attendance on sabbath morning is the preacher; churches where the communion has to be postponed from sabbath morning until evening, "because the deacons are all down in the mines." Surely, if only to increase the efficiency of other church benevolences, there ought to be in every church table of collections a column for sabbath reform. ²⁶⁴

Our author would, with his so-called sabbath reform, very soon change all this, for he would by civil law compel those deacons to remain out of the mines on Sunday; would prohibit Sunday papers, close places of Sunday amusement, and make the day everywhere so uninteresting that the deacons and everybody else would gladly resort to the churches. Then would the people not only receive the instruction supplied by collections taken elsewhere for the support of frontier churches, but such churches would themselves have larger collections, for there would be more persons present to give. This is certainly "practical sociology," even though it be not Christian.

Then, too, with the Sunday laws of all the States put in proper working order and energetically enforced, as would be the case if our author was well supplied with collections, it would be so much easier to enforce church discipline. The worldly-minded deacons who not having the fear of the minister before their eyes go into the mines on Sunday instead of to the communion, could be persuaded by the terrors of the civil law—by fines or by imprisonment, if need be—to go to the communion on Sunday morning instead of to the mines. And

though at first they might realize that it was not their choice, that they would prefer the mines and the wages there earned, they would by and by come to imagine it a matter of their own choice, and then if not before, would they be devout observers of the so-called Christian sabbath; and all owing to the collections for so-called sabbath reform! Yes, the scheme is practical; very practical—but is it Christian?

But how about the spiritual life of the churches whose pews and collection boxes must be filled by means of Sunday laws? The words of our author himself, though not so designed, are well adapted to answer this question. He says:—

Christians have mostly ceased from hating each other for microscopic differences of doctrine, but Christian love seldom goes beyond its own church walls, and does not always go beyond its own hired pew. General society is, of course, more Christianized, and the *quantity* of Christian sociology is much greater, but the quality of it inside the church, we fear, has not improved. The heathen are not audibly exclaiming to-day, "See how these Christians love each other!" They, and the Christians also, are rather pointing to "the flagitious anarchy," the "Hadesian theology" of our sectarian conflicts, and to the well-defined Christian castes that radiate from the central high-priced pew of Deacon Dives to the inferior pews of Demas and Lazarus; the one next the pulpit and the other next to the door. Not thus were the Christian slaves and "the saints of Cesar's household" separated in the early church. There were no class churches. Christian brotherhood was not as often to-day so nominal that in the words of Prof. Ely, one would rather be a second cousin by blood than a "brother," in the general sense, even to a Christian. ²⁷⁵

These facts answer the question as to the spiritual condition of the churches. "He that loveth not knoweth not God." ²⁸ 6 "For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" ²⁹ 7

According to our author's own representation, the church is lacking in Christian love, and is therefore without the true knowledge of God. And this is the reason why there is so much seeking after the power of organization and the power of the State. The very federations and confederacies for which Mr. Crafts is laboring are only so many efforts to supply by numbers the lack of power in the church; but the Word of the Lord is, "Say ye not, A confederacy to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread." ³⁰ 8

January 16, 1896

"The Higher 'Monroe Doctrine'" *American Sentinel* 11, 3 , p. 17.

WHEN in the course of human events the lands of this hemisphere had become peopled with those who, fleeing from the hard and oppressive conditions which beset their existence in the Old World, sought to establish themselves under the happier conditions afforded by a new country and a new order of things, it at length became necessary, in view of the threatening attitude of certain European powers, and especially of a combination calling itself the "holy alliance," to declare as the sentiment and determination of the United States of America, that the monarchies of the Old World must not be permitted to extend their systems further upon these shores; but that the peoples of this New World must be left free to work out their own destinies under the inspiration of their own genius, and the guiding star of the republican principle of government. This was the Monroe doctrine,—a highly proper one, and a credit to the nation which gave it birth.

But prior to this pronouncement, upon another and even greater occasion, a doctrine had been proclaimed from this country, which, broader in principle and wider in application, interposed a shield between all despotism and the rights of mankind. An assembly of men great alike in statesmanship, patriotism, and political wisdom, speaking with a voice that was heard throughout the world, had said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: 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; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

And in the spirit of this declaration, the Constitution of the new Republic—its fundamental law—declared, in the language of its First Amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishing of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Thus did this new-born nation lay the foundation of "a new order of things," by proclaiming its adherence to the great principle of equal civil and religious rights for the men.

This is the greater and higher Monroe doctrine,—the foundation upon which rests all the force and propriety of the doctrine which

warns off from these shores the monarchies and despotisms of the Old World. And this higher doctrine is being violated; not by a foreign foe, but by a domestic one,—a conspiracy within our own borders. The AMERICAN SENTINEL declares to the people to-day that the great American principle of equal civil and religious liberty to all is denied both by words and deeds in this land, and is likely to be overthrown completely in our very midst.

Do you ask the proof? Witness the rapid growth of the sentiment in favor of religious legislation; witness the organizations springing up all over the land, powerful in numbers and influence, which demand legislation enforcing the observance of a religious institution,—the Sunday sabbath; witness the Sunday Court of the United States declaring, in February, 1892, that "this is a Christian nation," and the Congress of the United States declaring, in the summer of the same year, that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the Christian Sabbath; witness the revival of the dragon spirit of religious persecution against good and honest citizens who observe the seventh day, as enjoined by the fourth commandment; witness these men, everywhere acknowledged as good citizens, dragged before the courts, fined and imprisoned, and worked in chain-gangs, because they will not exalt the Sunday to an equality with the Bible Sabbath; witness the bill now before Congress to secure an amendment to the Constitution which will make it "acknowledge" God, and declare his revealed will to be the supreme law of the land. Witness all these efforts being made to plunge our nation into the deadly vortex of religious controversy, and witness also the blind indifference of the people to their danger.

Shall the higher Monroe doctrine be maintained? Shall a halt be called upon this conspiracy against American liberty? Citizens, Americans, What is your answer?

"Federation of Churches" *American Sentinel* 11, 3 , pp. 17, 18.

THE ambition of popular Christianity as it exists in the various denominations of the day is not organic union but federation, or more properly speaking, confederacy.

In his book, "Practical Christian Sociology," with which our readers are already familiar, Dr. Crafts says:—

There are Christian remedies for social ills that can best be applied by State and national federation of churches. . . . Some day it is to be hoped the churches will be shamed or aroused to

undertake a united campaign against social evils in some more effective way than by the paper bombardment of mere resolutions. . . . An official national federation of Christian churches in a strong and well-supported National Bureau of Reforms might be a most effective method of ethical home missionary work. The bureau so named, that I have established unofficially, will be glad to yield the field to an official one. Let us hope the proposed Federal Council of Presbyterian and Reformed Churches will ere long become a national federation of *all* churches to save society as well as souls. Such federations of churches for the solution of social reforms were recommended by a conference of Christians, chiefly from Great Britain, representing many denominations, which assembled at Grindelwald, Switzerland, in the summer of 1894. ³¹¹

Among the "reforms" to be undertaken by the proposed federation, Dr. Crafts gives a prominent place to the "crusade" against "sabbath-breaking," and in this "reform" he suggests that the forces of Rome be enlisted; he says:—

On such reforms as temperance, sabbath reform, divorce, and purity, Roman Catholic co-operation may in a measure be secured. In many cases it will be wise, at the initiation of a federation of churches, to undertake only the one reform in which the churches are most fully united, which will usually be sabbath reform, leaving the other reforms to be added to the plan when federation has achieved some advance in its first undertaking. ³²²

In the *Christian Statesman* of Dec. 9, 1893, of which paper he was then editor, Dr. Crafts said: "The most powerful enemy civil liberty has ever had to contend against is the Papacy." And yet knowing this he proposes federation with that enemy for the purpose of effecting so-called "reforms" by political action!

Our author should read again the history of the ages and there learn that even the Church cannot be trusted with civil power; and most dangerous to liberty either civil or religious would be such a federation as Dr. Crafts pro-

18

poses, and this whether it embraced Rome or not.

Sixty-seven years ago the Sunday-keeping churches of this country united in a demand upon Congress for the discontinuance of Sunday mails. The petitions were referred to the Senate and House Committees on Post Offices and Post Roads. January 19, 1829, the Senate Committee reported adversely to the proposition. Among other things the committee said:—

Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. This first effort

of the kind calls for the establishment of a principle which, in the opinion of the committee, would lay the foundation for dangerous innovations upon the spirit of the Constitution, and upon the religious rights of the citizens. If admitted, it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it, and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequence.

The report was adopted. A similar report was made to the House in March, 1830. Of the proposed measure the House Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, said:—

If the measure recommended should be adopted, it would be difficult for human sagacity to foresee how rapid would be the succession, or how numerous the train of measures which follow, involving the dearest rights of all—the rights of conscience.

Because of the wisdom of our statesmen of the early years of the century, the "federation" then formed to effect "social reforms" by congressional action failed of its purpose. . . . come. In his "Notes on Virginia," query 17, Mr. Jefferson said:—

The spirit of the times may alter, will alter. Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless. A single zealot may commence persecution, and better men be his victims. . . . The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion.

We live at a time when two dangers,—the one foretold by Jefferson, the other by the Congress of the United States in the reports from which we have quoted,—both threaten our liberties at the same time. Some at least of our rulers have become corrupt, caring more for power than for principle, our people have become careless, and while gigantic religious combinations to effect political purposes already exist, and are doing their work, still others are proposed and urged, and that on a much larger scale. Certainly there is just cause for alarm.

The closing of the World's Fair by act of Congress is an illustration of the power of a gigantic religious combination and of the subserviency of politicians.

In 1892 the churches made their demand for a Sunday law. They presented their memorials and petitions backed up with such persuasive words as those which follow from Presbyterian churches

in Brighton, N. Y.; Parma Center, N. Y.; and Rochester, N. Y., and recorded in the *Congressional Record* of May 25, 1892, thus:—

Resolved, That we do hereby pledge ourselves and each other, that we will from this time henceforth, refuse to vote for, or support for any office or position of trust, any member of Congress, either senator or representative, who shall vote for any further aid of any kind for the World's Fair except on conditions named in these resolutions.

To secure the popularity and patronage which were thus put up at public auction by the churches, our nation's legislators assembled in Congress *did* yield to the demand for a Sunday law, and did enact such a law in three distinct ways and places; and for the reasons as stated by themselves, thus:—

If I had charge of this amendment in the interest of the Columbian Exposition, I would write the provision for the closure in any form that the religious sentiment of the country demands, and . . . I say to the junior senator from Illinois [Mr. Palmer] *he had better yield* to this sentiment, and not let it go out to the country that there is the slightest doubt that if this money shall be appropriated, the Exposition will be closed on Sunday. . . . I should make the closure provision satisfactory to those petitioners who have memorialized us against the desecration of the Lord's day. ³³³

And again upon this demand for Sunday law, in the same debate, it was said:—

Now, if gentlemen repudiate this, if they desire to reject it. . . . I should like to see the disclaimer put in white and black and proposed by the Congress of the United States. Write it. How would you write? . . . Word it, if you dare; advocate it, if you dare. How many who voted for it would ever come back here again? None, I hope. . . . You endanger yourselves by opposing it. ³⁴⁴

It was the same way in the House. A dispatch from Washington to the Chicago *Daily Post*, April 9, 1892, gave the following from an interview with a member of the House Committee on the World's Fair:—

The reason we shall vote for it is, I will confess to you, a fear that, unless we do so, the church folks will get together and knife us at the polls; and — well you know we all want to come back, and we can't afford to take any risks.

Do you think it will pass the House?

Yes; and the Senate, too. We are all in the same boat. I am sorry for those in charge of the Fair; but self-preservation in the first law of nature, and that is all there is about it.

The republic from a religious standpoint, of the "reforms" demanded do not necessarily enter into this question at all. The

government is interdicted both by the Constitution and by the higher law of natural right from legislating upon such subjects. In the very nature of the case, being accountable to God for the deeds done in the body, we must be free from the cognizance of government in all things pertaining to our relation to God. "The framers of the Constitution," said the House report already referred to, "recognized the eternal principle that man's relation with his God is above human legislation, and his rights of conscience inalienable. Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our own bosoms. It is this consciousness which, in defiance of human laws, has sustained so many martyrs in tortures and in flames. They *felt* that their duty to God was superior to human enactments, and that man could exercise no authority over their consciences. *It is an inborn principle which nothing can eradicate.*"

But forgetting this truth,—forgetting that God has committed to men only civil authority,—that he commissions "the powers that be," to exact only that which is due to Cesar, our author, and tens of thousands who hold similar views, cease not to plot for the overthrow of religious liberty by making the State not only the guardian of civil rights but of private morals, thus clothing the government with power not only to define and guarantee natural rights, but to interpret and enforce the divine law! Such should remember the language of the Senate report, previously referred to, that "among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God."

We declare, in the language of the Presbyterians, Baptists and Quakers, of Virginia, in 1776, that it is "impossible for the magistrate [civil government] to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects which profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility, which would lead us back to the Church of Rome."

These so-called reformers may be honest in their purpose; they doubtless imagine that they are doing God service, but they are none the less aiming deadly blows at the vitals of American manhood and womanhood, and assaulting the very citadel of civil and religious liberty.

"Is 'National Reform' Practicable?" *American Sentinel* 11, 3 , pp. 18, 19.

"A VERY familiar objection to the National Reform movement," says the *Christian Statesman*, of Dec. 14, 1895, is, "Put God and Christ and the Bible into the hearts of the people, and there will be no necessity for the proposed Christian amendment of the Constitution." "This," says the *Statesman*, "raises the question as to the practical character of the National Reform movement."

The *Statesman* attempts to answer the question by the following:—

The first thing to be noticed is that it is an effort to secure the acceptance, by every man, of God as the source of all authority, of Jesus Christ as the king in every relation of life including the political, and of the Bible as the supreme rule of conduct everywhere. In other words, it is an effort to secure at least all that the objector says ought to be secured in order to the purifying of the political pool. But the practical reformer is . . . met by the astounding fact that many of . . . and the Bible in their hearts are ring leaders in political corruption. And a little investigation reveals the fact that they do not consider themselves bound by moral restraints in the political sphere. They have accepted God, Christ and the Bible for deliverance from condemnation in the next world, and probably for the regulation of political conduct. From the political sphere divine authority and law are ruled out. The National Reform movement aims to supplement the work that has been done in putting Christ and his law in the hearts for salvation in the next world, by putting into the heart respect for divine authority and law in the sphere of politics.

It is an effort to drive out of men's hearts the secular theory of politics and to teach men that they must accept of God as supreme in the political sphere, of Christ as their ruler in politics, and of the divine will as of supreme authority in all political matters. This is practical reform work of the most fundamental and necessary kind. There never will be thorough and permanent reform so long as men act on the secular theory of politics, which practically and theoretically denies accountability to God for acts performed in the political sphere.

To secure the recognition, by every citizen, of God as the supreme ruler, and of his right as Creator of all things, would be a most worthy motive in any work. But God cares only for such a recognition and acknowledgment of his claims as is prompted by love. "God is love;" and whatsoever is not of love is not from him. He speaks of sacrifices and offerings to him not prompted by love, as "an abomination," and "a smoke in my nose." Prov. 28:9; Isa. 65:3-5.

There is one way of securing from men a recognition of God's claims, which is acceptable to him; and that is by the conversion of the heart, through the power of the gospel of his Son.

But does the *Statesman* advocate this means for securing the recognition of God which it demands? No; it is continually calling for legislation, to compel men to do that which in their hearts they do not want to do.

"The practical reformer," it tells us, "is

19

often met by the astounding fact that many of those who profess to have God and Christ, and the Bible in their hearts, are ring-leaders in political corruption." The writer of this talks like some innocent youth just getting his eyes opened to the depravity of human nature. There is no more common class of people in the world than hypocrites; and one great fault of the "National Reform" scheme is that by making a profession of religion a necessary qualification for office, and a thing demanded of all by "the law," it would place a premium upon hypocrisy which would make it an infinitely greater evil than it is.

The *Statesman* speaks as though it were possible for an individual to be a Christian in those relations of life pertaining to church affairs, and a worldling in other relations, at the same time. "The National Reform movement," it says, "aims to supplement the work that has been done by putting Christ and his law in the heart for salvation in the next world, by putting into the heart respect for divine authority and law in the sphere of politics."

But the person who professes to have Christ and his law in his heart for salvation in the next world, and yet does not conduct himself harmoniously with that profession in matters relating to civil government, is a hypocrite, and his profession of Christ is a sham. And this sham the "reform" scheme would "supplement" by a corresponding sham "in the sphere of politics." Only, in that sphere it would be infinitely worse than when confined to the sphere of private life, since it would work injury not only to the interests of one person, but to the rights of many others.

The "National Reform" scheme assumes that were all our rulers and legislators Christians they would at once have laws enacted compelling all persons to recognize the sovereignty of God, and the binding obligation of his law. But this is exactly what, in such a case, we should not have; for a Christian is one who is like Christ, and Christ, though having legions of angels at his call, never once sought

to convert anybody by force, or to secure recognition of himself or his Father by such means.

The "reform" scheme is in fact nothing less than an effort to overturn the Republic of the United States, and set up in its place a man-made theocracy, with these "reformers" as its self appointed rulers; since it is wholly at variance with the idea of a government by representatives. Power can be delegated by one person to another, but morality cannot be. Morally, one person cannot represent another; he can represent only himself. It is certain that man is a free moral agent; and this being true, it is equally certain that moral action cannot be performed by one person as the representative of another. To be the moral representative of another would involve nothing less than the "mystery of godliness" made manifest in the gospel of Christ,—that mystery by which the sinner can be crucified with Christ, and created new in him. Man has and can have but one Saviour. The righteousness of Jesus Christ, and him only, can be made the righteousness of individuals on this earth.

The members of Congress, or of the State legislatures, hold in their hands the power delegated to them by the people, and acting within the limits of that delegated power, represent the people themselves; but they hold no moral power or accountability belonging to the people. Such power the people cannot delegate, any more than they can give up their free moral agency. No such transaction would be recognized [*sic.*] by the Creator, for he will reward or punish every individual at the final day for his own deeds. In the scheme of "Christian" government, therefore which these "reformers" hope to realize, there will be in the place of the proper representatives of the people, certain persons who assume to recognize the authority of God and to execute his will for the individuals whom they govern. This usurpation of power and authority is involved in any attempt at a governmental recognition of God and conformity to his standard of morality.

In fact, the "National Reform" scheme of government does not admit that civil governments are established by the people, but declares them to be creatures of God; so that only those whom God chooses can rightfully fill the positions of governmental authority. These positions would of course, necessarily be filled by some persons; and it would rest with the "reformers" and their religious associates, as being the ones presumably most closely in touch with the divine will, to determine through what individuals the will of Christ,

that is, their idea of his will, should be governmentally carried out. And what would be more natural and fitting in such a scheme than that they should appoint themselves to the offices pertaining to their theocracy?

A civil government is not "godless" which does not recognize God and attempt to carry out the requirements of the moral law; for the reason that any such attempt by civil government would be but an effort to do that which it is not constituted to do, and which it could not claim to do without asserting what is false. A government which would, in the name of the people, profess an allegiance to God which only a part of the people believed in or acknowledged, and would, as the act of the people, do that which only a part of the people would think of doing, by way of carrying out its conception of the will of Christ, would be a godless government indeed. A government which would compel its citizens by legislation to profess to recognize God and to observe the requirements of his moral law, would be utterly godless. But that government which leaves all its citizens free, as the Creator has left them, either to recognize God or not, and to conform to his requirements or not, is a government in harmony with the purpose of the gospel, and with God's will concerning government as it must exist in this fallen world.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 3 , p. 24.

NO text of the Sacred Scriptures is more misinterpreted and misunderstood than Rom. 13:1. God never ordained injustice and oppression. Except in the nation of Israel, it is not, and never has been, personal sovereigns in themselves that have been referred to in the statement that "the powers that be are ordained of God." Is it not the persons that be in power, but the powers that be in the person, that are ordained of God. The inquiry of Rom. 13:3 is not, "Wilt thou then not be afraid of the persons?" but it is "Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power?" It is the powers and not the person or persons by whom the power is exercised, that is under consideration. God has ordained civil power for the administration of justice, and when those entrusted with the administration of that power are guilty of injustice and oppression they are guilty of usurpation. Having exceeded the limits of their God-ordained power they are in that usurpation no more the ministers of God than is the Christian minister

the representative of Christ when he usurps and attempts to wield authority not given by the gospel commission.

IN their appeal to the Home Secretary, published in these columns two weeks ago, among other things, the directors of the International Tract Society, Limited, of London, very properly said:—

We have felt it not disrespectful to address you this note of remonstrance against the action of a law by which the work of our factory is stopped and our factory employÈs deprived of this means of earning a livelihood.

All just governments are instituted for the purpose of securing human rights. "The powers that be are ordained of God" for this very purpose; "they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing;" and Christians are entitled to share the benefits, the protection of government, equally with unbelievers. "I exhort, therefore," writes the apostle, "that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." 1 Tim. 2:1, 2.

Such being the purpose for which governments are ordained, and Christians being entitled to share the benefits, what could be more fitting than the act of the International Tract Society to the fact that the Factory Act, instead of protecting certain of the employÈs of the society, actually deprived them of the means of earning a livelihood! Fanaticism might have said, "We need not concern ourselves about our rights; God will protect us;" just as fanaticism has in some instances said, We need not work; God will feed us; and, We need not use remedies; God will heal us. But true faith uses rather the means that God has ordained for the securing of rights, the providing of food, and for the care of the body, asking his blessing the while upon the efforts put forth in his fear and for his glory.

The point made by the International Tract Society that the operation of the so-called Factory Act infringed the rights of its employÈs is well taken and is a credit both to the piety and the sagacity of its directors.

January 23, 1896

**"How Are the 'Powers that Be' Ordained?" *American Sentinel* 11, 4 ,
pp. 25, 26.**

THIS question is answered by the Scriptures: "The powers that be are ordained of God." ³⁵1

"There is not power ³⁶2 but of God," just as there is no life but of God; he is the source of *all* life and of *all* authority, and where either exists it is by the ordinance of God.

"For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, *or powers*: all things were created by him and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." ³⁷3

This is not saying, however, that all things created or ordained by God are used for the purpose for which he ordained them. "We wrestle not against flesh and blood," says the apostle, "but against principalities, *against powers*." ³⁸ 4 And again of Christ we read: "Having spoiled principalities *and powers*, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them." ³⁹5

In these texts it is declared that we wrestle against *powers*, and that Christ triumphed over *powers*; and yet these *powers* are among the things which he himself created; why then do we resist them, and why did Christ himself triumph over them? It is because they have been perverted from the purpose for which they were ordained and are used for another purpose, just as the powers which God gives to man are so often used in sinning against him. The power ⁴⁰ 6 that crushes out the life of the victim of lust or malice is just as truly from God as is the power that feeds the hungry or rescues the perishing; but the one is perverted and used to dishonor God; the other is used for the purpose for which it was was [*sic.*] ordained, and God is honored thereby. The latter exercise of power is legitimate; the former is usurpation. To illustrate: Suppose President Cleveland should declare war against Great Britain, would not everybody say he had not power to do it? that it was not an act of power but of usurpation? Certainly; because while such a thing is a physical and moral possibility, the President has no such authority. The people have ordained no such power in the President, but have, by the Constitution, vested it in Congress.

Since God is not the author of sin, and has given no man or set of men authority to practice oppression, all governmental injustice is as antagonistic to the divine ordinance of civil authority as a declaration of war by the President without the consent of Congress would be to the Constitution of the United States.

Satan, now the enemy of all righteousness, was once a mighty angel in heaven. He was created by God, and by his mighty power was ordained in him by the Creator; but he was not made a devil, nor was his power given to him for the ruin of man. He was created perfect. His God-given powers were to be used for the glory of his Creator, who thus addresses him after his fall:—

"Thou sealest up the sun, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering. . . . Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee." ⁴¹⁷ "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: . . . I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit." ⁴²⁸

It was by usurpation that Satan fell, and just as his power has been perverted, so man's God-ordained powers have been turned aside from the purposes for which they were given, and have been used to dishonor the Creator. The power of choice and of self-defense, the authority to protect the weak, to punish the evil-doer, and to reward the upright, which God gives to man, is too often used for injustice and oppression. But such acts are without the warrant of any divine ordinance; for God ordains no evil.

We never think of excusing the perpetrators of crime because the power that wields the bludgeon that strikes down beings created in the image of God, springs from the Creator. The Lord has given every man sufficient power to kill if he so wills, but he has given no man power to kill. The murderer is therefore without excuse. No more should we think of justifying acts of usurpation on the part of human governments, because "the powers that be are ordained of God." ⁴³⁹ Civil power is ordained of God; but the innate sense of justice implanted in every breast tells us that its sphere is not unlimited; ⁴⁴¹⁰ while the divine Word plainly declares that such power is "for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well." ⁴⁵¹¹

It is a self-evident truth that man is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. All wrong, therefore, under color of civil

authority, is an act of usurpation and not of God-ordained power. The power that is ordained of God is plainly declared in the Scriptures to be, not for rapine, outrage, and murder, as recently witnessed in Armenia; not for the persecution of honest men for conscience' sake, as is too often seen in our

26

own land; not to be a "terror to good works, but to the evil."

God never made a Herod, a Nero or a Torquemada; he created men in his own image and clothed them with power to do good to their fellowmen. But by usurpation these men made themselves the monsters of cruelty they were, just as Lucifer, the light bearer, became Satan, the adversary, and just as the Turkish officials in Armenia have by acts of unsurpassed barbarity and injustice demonstrated that instead of being the ministers of God "for good," revengers "to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil," they are the emissaries of Satan and enemies of mankind.

As Madame Roland, on her way to the guillotine, exclaimed: "O Liberty, Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name," so might the victims of fanatical hate in all ages, from the time of Rome to the present moment, and in all places, from the mountains of Armenia to the fertile fields of our own fair land, exclaim, "O Book of God, how much of human malice and cruelty has sought shelter in a perversion of thy sublime declaration: 'There is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.'"

"God in the Constitution" *American Sentinel* 11, 4 , p. 26.

TO the demand that is now being made upon Congress for such a change in the national Constitution as will transform it from a "godless" document to one that will acknowledge God's supremacy, it may be truthfully replied, God is already in the Constitution. He is in it just as he was in the Declaration of Independence. As a Methodist minister of Baltimore, Rev. W. F. Hamner, has well said, "That grand parchment is the product of God's Spirit. If you want to see God in it, read that clause which says that all men are born with equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

God is in everything that is just. Justice cannot be separated from him, any more than can truth and righteousness. There can no more be two sources of justices, truth, or righteousness than there can be two Gods. And God is in everything that gives true liberty to mankind. He created man a free being; so that liberty,—physical, mental, and

moral,—became man's birthright; and God's eternal purpose is to assert and restore that liberty where it has been lost. The mission of Jesus Christ to this earth was "to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." ⁴⁶1 And in defining the nature of the fast that is acceptable to him, God says: "Is not this the fast that I have chosen,—to lose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?" ⁴⁷2 God is the author and defender of human liberty.

It was therefore in the direct providence of God that there arose this great nation in the western hemisphere, built upon the divine principle of liberty and equal rights to all men. It was in full harmony with the mind and purpose of God that this doctrine should be proclaimed to all the world, as it was and is in the Declaration of Independence. And as it is the purpose of God that all men should be free to choose whether they will worship him or not, it is in accordance with his mind that our national Constitution declares, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

We repeat, therefore, God is in the Constitution. As certainly as it is inspired by the spirit of justice and of liberty to all in the things which it concerns, as the fundamental law of civil government in this Republic, God is in it, though it does not profess the fact. A person may loudly profess to be a follower of Christ; but the spirit which actuates him, and not his profession, is the real test which shows whether he is such or not. And so with the Constitution; its real nature is shown not by any profession it may make, but by the spirit which it breathes forth. And that spirit is the divine spirit of justice, equality, and liberty.

It is now proposed to change this grand document so as to put within it an "acknowledgment" of God, by changing its preamble to this form: "We, the people of the United States, acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority in civil government, our Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, and his revealed will as of supreme authority in civil affairs, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

Does this breathe forth the divine spirit of fairness and equality to all? Let us see. Who is it that makes this acknowledgment of the existence and authority of the Deity?—Answer: "We, the people of the United States." But hundreds of thousands, if not millions of citizens here do not believe in God, and very many who do believe in him, and rejoice in the gospel of his Son, would not have his will made the supreme law in civil affairs. What about such people? Why, simply this, that they are not the people of the United States, according to this preamble. By its terms they will be disfranchised. And we can say this on the authority of the *Christian Statesman* itself,—the organ of the party which is most active in demanding the proposed constitutional amendment; for that journal, in its issue of Nov. 1, 1883, published the following upon this point:—

What effect would the adoption of the Christian Amendment, together with the proposed changes in the Constitution, have upon those who deny that God is the Sovereign, Christ the Ruler, and the Bible the law? This brings up the conscience question at once. . . . The classes who object are, as "Truth Seeker" has said, Jews, infidels, atheists, and others. These classes are perfectly satisfied with the Constitution as it is. How would they stand towards it if it recognized the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ? To be perfectly plain, I believe that the existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel.

Certainly; when "we, the people of the United States" do that which no logically consistent "infidel" would do, it is plain that the latter cannot be counted on of "the people." There are a great many people of all classes and beliefs in this country whom logical consistency, enlightened judgment, and love of justice and liberty would debar from any participation in such action. None of these could, under the proposed amendment, be reckoned as among "the people." They are all, from the standpoint of this amendment, "infidels," and of course not qualified to participate in the management of a "Christian" Government. The scheme is in short but the means adopted by the puritanic intolerance of our day for re-enacting the traditional resolutions: (1) "Resolved, That the earth was created by the Lord for the use of the saints;" (2) "Resolved, That we are the saints."

Having thus declared themselves "the people of the United States," and having established the fact in the fundamental law of the land, it will simply remain for those who are not "the people" to acquiesce in the scheme or seek a habitation in some other quarter

of the globe. It will be said to them, We are the people; this is our land and Government; if you do not like it, get out. This much has already been said in advance, as witnesses the following sentence from a speech delivered by Rev. E. B. Graham at a National Reform convention held at York, Nebraska, and reported in the *Christian Statesman*, of May 21, 1885, thus:—

We might add, in all justice, if the opponents of the Bible do not like our government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the devil and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a government of their on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then, if they can stand it, stay there till they die!

And should this "Christian" idea of government spread around the globe, as these "reformers" would like to see it, there would be nothing left for the "infidels"—those who differ from them—but to "get off the earth."

That the term "infidel" as they use it, does include all who will not join with them in their "reform" scheme, is evident from their own statement as well as from the logic of their position. Rev. Dr. Jonathan Edwards, a leading exponent of this "National Reform," in a speech made at a National Reform convention held in New York in 1873, thus classified the enemies of the "reform" cause:—

The atheist is a man who denies the being of God and future life. To him mind and matter are the same; and time is the be-all and end-all of consciousness and of character.

The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he ever manifests himself and his will in a revelation.

The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or—worse—sheer imposture.

The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.

These all are, for the occasion, and as far as the amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together.

And with them "must be counted" all, of whatever denomination, who "use the same arguments and the same tactics against us," that is, who oppose the "reform" scheme with its "Christian" amendment as being un-American, unjust, impolitic, and wicked. If this

amendment is carried we shall soon have a new and enlarged definition of the term "infidel."

And by this scheme and this process these "reformers" would put God in the Constitution! Taking out of it that spirit of justice, fairness, and equality for all before the law which is now embodied, they would put in its place that unloving, intolerant spirit which says: We are the people; stand out of our way. If you do not believe as we do, get out of this land to some "wild, desolate country," and stay there till you die! And this they would call putting God in the Constitution! And this they would do—this era of religious controversy, bigotry, and bitterness, they would inaugurate—to "establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility," promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity!"

Verily, we do not want this reform "god"—the god of bigotry and intolerance—in the Constitution of this Republic. We want in it the God of justice, truth, love, and mercy for all men; and he is there already.

"'Jewish' and Christian" *American Sentinel* 11, 4 , p. 27.

THE *Cincinnati Weekly Enquirer*, of January 2, quotes the Rev. Mr. Dabb, a Protestant clergyman of New York City, as affirming in a recent discourse that the Sabbath institution is not Christian, but only a part of the ancient "Mosaic code," with which it passed away at the death of Christ. "The Jewish law," he said, "was given to the Jewish people and never to any other people. It was binding upon them, but never on Christians, or any other race."

The assertion would not be worth noticing did it not express an idea quite generally entertained by professors of Christianity. There is nothing which casts more confusion over the Sabbath question than this. Were it not for the idea that the Sabbath originated as a "Jewish" institution, and that what was Jewish is necessarily separate and distinct from what is Christian, the Sabbath question would not be today the difficult and perplexing one that it is to the people generally.

We desire, then, to call the attention of as many as possible to two important facts, implied in the foregoing statements; viz., (1) The Sabbath—the seventh-day rest—is not and never was "Jewish," and (2) Whatever was given by God to his people of old, pertained to Christianity as truly as do any of the ordinances enjoined upon the Church by Christ and his apostles.

The idea has in some way taken possession of the mind of Christendom that there is an antagonism between the "old dispensation" of "the law and the prophets," and the "new dispensation" of the preaching of Christ and his kingdom; that the "new dispensation" with its ordinances and precepts, necessarily superseded and abrogated that which pertained to the former times. This idea is as far from the truth as anything could be.

God did not have one plan and purpose for the world in Old Testament times and another plan and purpose for the world in this dispensation. He has had but one purpose, and that is the "eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord;" ⁴⁸ 1 namely, "that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are in earth." ⁴⁹ 2 This one great purpose he has steadily carried forward since the fall of man. Salvation through Christ was the theme of "the law and the prophets." The Old Testament is as truly the word of Christ as is the New Testament; for Peter tells us that it was the Spirit of Christ that testified through the prophets." ⁵⁰ 3 "Unto us," writes Paul, "was the gospel preached as well as unto them;" ⁵¹ 4 that is, to the ancient Israelites who went out from Egypt with Moses.

The gospel, we are told by the same writer, "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." ⁵² 5 And in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews we are pointed to the ancient worthies who through *faith* "subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire," etc. People in their day had faith in Christ, as truly as people have faith in him to-day. The power of God unto salvation, through that faith,—in other words, the gospel,—was preached to them as truly as it is to us. The gospel ordinances and ceremonies of their day, very largely, pointed forward to Christ, and as such necessarily passed away when Christ's death upon the cross became an accomplished fact. Since that time the Christian Church has had ordinances and ceremonies pointing back to that event. But whether before or after Christ's death, they pointed to him as the sacrifice for the salvation of mankind, and as such were the means of expressing faith in him.

The seventh-day Sabbath is never in the Scriptures called "Jewish," but is termed "the Sabbath of the Lord." And it is to-day, as it was then, the Sabbath of Jehovah,—the memorial of his creative power, which is also the power by which he redeems the sinner.

Abraham is called in Scripture the father of the faithful. "To Abraham and his seed were the promises made." ⁵³6 And we read, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." ⁵⁴7 Abraham was as truly a Christian as was Peter or Paul. And all those in every age who have believed on Christ for salvation, have been Christians in fact, whether known by that name or not.

Because the law of God was spoken to the Israelites from Sinai, it does not follow that that law was not for Christians. For, as we have seen, a very large number of those to whom it was spoken were Christians. As Christians, they observed God's Sabbath,—the seventh day; and that day was, and still is, the Sabbath for all Christians.

Jesus Christ himself was a Jew, and his apostles were Jews. And we also, if we are Christ's, are Abraham's seed, and therefore Jews in the true spiritual sense of the word; "for," we read, "he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of man, but of God." ⁵⁵8

To say, therefore, that the law of God spoken from Sinai "was given to the Jewish people and never to any other people," and was never binding "on Christians," simply betrays a fundamental misconception of the purpose and scope of the gospel. If Christendom would shake off this misconception, the whole question of the nature and obligation of the Sabbath, the foundation upon which it rests, and the proper means for securing its observance, would be wonderfully simplified. Seen in the light of the plain statements of Holy Writ, we find no difficulty in knowing what is our own proper attitude [*sic.*] toward the Sabbath, and what course we should pursue toward others with respect to its observance. But without that light, men can but fall deeper and deeper into error, both of belief and practice.

"Church Federation" *American Sentinel* 11, 4 , pp. 27, 28.

APROPOS to our article of a week ago upon this subject is a paper by R. M. Patterson, D. D., in the *Independent* of the 9th inst., under the heading, "Figures for Federation."

Referring to statistics which appeared in the *Independent* of the 2nd inst., Dr. Patterson says: "What a numerical array these tables

make for the churches: 127,906 ministers, 179,311 congregations, 24,218,180 communicants in the United States of America! But what a lamentable exhibition in the number of organization into which they are divided—151 in all!

"Of those which claim to be evangelical and are admitted by each other to be so, there are not less than 110,000 ministers, 160,000 congregations, and 16,000,000 communicants."

After noting the fact that these denominations have not, with but slight exception, any intercourse with each other, Dr. Patterson gives the following proposed basis of federation:—

1. The acceptance of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, inspired by the Holy Spirit as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of Christian faith.

2. Discipleship of Jesus Christ, the divine Saviour and Teacher of the world.

3. The Church of Christ ordained by him to preach his gospel to the world.

4. Liberty of conscience in the interpretation of the Scriptures and in the administration of the Church.

Such an alliance of the churches should have regular meetings of their representatives, and should have for its objects, among others,

1. Mutual acquaintance and fellowship.

2. Co-operation in foreign and domestic missions.

3. The prevention of rivalries between competing churches in the same field.

4. The ultimate organic union of the whole visible body of Christ.

Whether federation upon such a basis will ever be realized or not remains to be seen. Certainly there is a very strong current run-

ning in the direction if not of union at least of a confederacy of churches for the accomplishment of certain purposes; and we are sorry to say, all the objects are not entirely laudible. Another article⁵⁶¹ in these columns points out some of the evils of the so-called National Reform movement whose leaders have secured the introduction of a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. A federation of churches for any such purpose as that can be nothing but evil. As pointed out last week, religious combination to effect political objects are dangerous, and as a matter of fact the combination known as the American Sabbath Union officially [*sic.*] organized by fourteen "evangelical" denominations, and in many ways in touch with the National Reform

Association, has already exerted a powerful influence upon Congress, leading that body to declare in effect in its World's Fair legislation that Sunday is the Sabbath according to the fourth commandment. Since under threat of political boycott by this powerful religious combination, Congress has assumed to settle by legislative enactment one religious question, what assurance have we that a like influence would not secure from Congress other and similar measures directly affecting liberty of conscience?

Continuing the article to which we have referred, Dr. Patterson says:—

The Northern Presbyterian Church is committed to such a movement. Its General Assembly of 1890 at Saratoga unanimously pronounced in favor of a federation of all the evangelical churches of the land. Favorable progress has been made in negotiations among the Presbyterians and Reformed bodies, but this wider one is aimed at also. It is to be hoped that the correspondence that has been invited by the Congregational Council will be widely entered upon. The result cannot be attained very soon. In such a matter such large bodies must move slowly; but it is well that a beginning has been made. The Presbyterian General Assembly laid down no platform; but it declared in favor of an "official federation in which there shall be no renunciation by the different churches of their peculiarities or independent organizations, and no interference with their doctrines, government or internal affairs, but which shall aim, by the best available methods, to secure co-operation in religious work and in the promotion of such moral and social reforms as affect the welfare of the nation." The Congregational Council has constructed a platform. If it be not sufficiently safe or comprehensive, let some other be made; but let the correspondence proposed be entered upon with an earnest desire to wipe out the scandal of our inimical divisions, and get in close touch with each other in organized work for the Master and for the perishing millions among whom we mingle.

All this is doubtless pleasing from the standpoint of numbers. We all like to read about so many millions of Christians and to know that those Christians are working in harmony for the advancement of the gospel. But there is an element of danger in this proposed federation, and it is revealed in the paragraph quoted, by the words: "Which shall aim, by the best available methods to secure co-operation in religious work and in the promotion of such moral and social reforms as effect the welfare of the nation." Everybody knows that in the eyes of the powerful religious combination to which reference has been made, the "moral and social reform" which most directly and powerfully

"affects the welfare of the nation" is the enforcement of Sunday observance; and it is to secure this more than anything else that this still more gigantic confederacy of all the various first day denominations is proposed and urged.

It is true that there is a very general consensus of opinion that uniform marriage and divorce laws are needed, but not half the energy is put forth nor half the enthusiasm manifested in securing these that there is in the movement in the interests of Sunday legislation. It is true that the "moral" sentiment of the nation was thoroughly aroused against polygamy in Utah several years since, and that even the authorities of the Mormon Church were compelled to bend before the law backed up by that sentiment; but that it was little more than sentiment is shown by a few facts given by Dr. W. F. Crafts in his recent work, "Practical Christian Sociology." On page 64 of that work the author says:—

It is a curious fact that in 1887 these two evils [contemporaneous and consecutive polygamy] were exhibited side by side in Utah, where there were among the "Gentiles" about half as many divorces as marriages during that year.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL has no sympathy whatever with polygamy. We have repeatedly shown that it is destructive of natural rights and is therefore legitimately prohibited by civil law. But of what avail, from a moral standpoint, is the prohibition of "contemporaneous polygamy" if "consecutive polygamy" is permitted to flourish?

We published only four weeks ago a note from a Cincinnati paper regarding the marriage of a young woman of nineteen and a man of thirty, each of the parties having been divorced, the lady once, the gentleman twice. The lady's first husband had re-married and each of the gentleman's wives had been re-married and divorced again after being divorced from him. We are free to say that as between this consecutive polygamy and contemporaneous polygamy there is small choice. Indeed, as practiced in Utah, restrained as it is by a strong though mistaken religious zeal, the contemporaneous polygamy appears to be the lesser evil. But there is not that sentiment against consecutive polygamy that there is against polygamy as it exists in Utah; and why? Simply because it is sentiment rather than settled moral conviction, and herein lies one of the dangers in a federation of churches for the purpose of promoting moral and social reforms. Such combinations are swayed more by sentiment than by reason, and even-handed justice is not to be expected from them.

"The Spirit of the Inquisition" *American Sentinel* 11, 4 , p. 28.

THE *Southwestern Presbyterian*, of Dec. 5, 1895, says of Seventh-day Adventists:—

No law in the land commands these fanatics to keep Sunday as a sacred day, to assemble to worship at that time, but only to keep it a rest day from labor; but these sectarians persist in holding that it is a matter of conscience with them to work on the Lord's day, and thus show their contempt of the honest convictions of the rest of the Christian world. They are not martyrs, but law-breakers, and as such should be dealt with.

This breathes the spirit of the Inquisition. It is true that no "law" of the land in so many words commands Seventh-day Adventists or anybody else "to keep Sunday as a sacred day," "but only to keep it as a day of rest from labor." But such rest is by the leading advocates of Sunday laws themselves declared to be worship. W. F. Crafts says:—

One day in every week an invisible Lord commands us to halt in the most absorbing pursuits of our earthly life; in the pursuit of money and business; in the pursuit of pleasure; in the pursuit of politics and fame; in the pursuit of education; and we halt as a sign that we believe in that invisible Lord and are loyal to his law. There is no other sign of our faith and loyalty so impressive to a selfish world as this twenty-four hours halt in our work every week at Christ's command. The Lord's day is therefore the "sign," the ensign of our Lord Jesus Christ; . . . and this flag of Christ is carried round the world every week and is saluted by some in every land by the laying aside of tools and toil, in token of their loyalty to a living Lord.

All this and more is true of the Sabbath of the Lord, and it is for all this and more that Seventh-day Adventists observe the true Sabbath; and it is because this is true of the Sabbath and because it is not true of Sunday that Adventists refuse to acknowledge this false sign of faith and loyalty and thus profess to a selfish world adherence to something which they do not believe. Seventh-day Adventists believe that no other sign of their loyalty to the Creator of the heavens and the earth is so impressive as their twenty-four hour halt in their work every week in obedience to the fourth commandment; and believing this, they feel that they have no right to lessen the significance of that halt by obedience to a commandment of men which requires them to make another halt in honor of another day and another power; for God does not command the Sunday halt.

He who receives and uses a counterfeit coin is equally criminal with the maker of that coin; and so he who knowingly accepts and uses the counterfeit sabbath—the false sign of loyalty to Christ—partakes of the sin of those who made it.

The fourth commandment separates the Sabbath, the seventh day, from all other days and requires that all men shall respect that distinction. For Seventh-day Adventists to treat another day as they treat the Sabbath would be to disobey the commandment which requires them to keep the seventh day holy—to preserve the distinction which God himself has made between that and other days. It is for this reason and not from willful disregard of civil authority that Seventh-day Adventists refuse to observe Sunday. To do so would be to prove disloyal to Christ their King.

January 30, 1896

"A Lesson for Kings and Rulers" *American Sentinel* 11, 5 , pp. 33, 34.

AT the present time a strong and persistent effort is being made in our country by numerous and powerful "reform" organizations, to secure from the various departments of government a recognition of Jesus Christ as king and ruler of nations. The following words voiced by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in National Convention in 1887, furnish good evidence upon this point:—

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, national, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm; and that is that Christ shall be this world's king;—yea, verily, this world's king in its realm of cause and effect,—king of its courts, its camps, its commerce,—king of its colleges and cloisters,—king of its customs and constitutions. . . . The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics.

It need only be added that such powerful organizations as the Society of Christian Endeavor, the Epworth League, King's Daughters, etc., are working as earnestly as the W.C.T.U. to bring the kingdom of Christ into the "realm of law through the gateway of politics," or by the gateway of the ballot-box.

This being true, what can be more important than that those invested with civil authority should understand the method by which God himself designs to establish the kingdom of Christ in visible form

upon this earth; lest without such a knowledge they be led into working at cross-purposes with the plans of Providence.

It is true, the National Reform Association and other religious organizations have undertaken to enlighten them upon this point; but one chief danger of the situation is that they will accept the dictum of these organizations without verifying their statements by an appeal to the highest source of information. Already our legislators have shown an alarming willingness to be guided by the traditional maxim that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," and to seek no higher authority for enacting religious legislation.

But the Scriptures—not the people—voice the will of God. And that divine Word is not without its instruction to kings and rulers as well as to the common people, concerning the fulfillment of the divine purpose embodied in the kingdom of Christ. There is a valuable lesson of this kind in the second Psalm. That is a psalm of the kingship of Christ. As such it is worth the careful study of every person. It is our purpose to consider briefly its statements.

"Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us."

What are the "bands" and "cords" of the Lord and his Anointed? The question is answered in the eleventh chapter of Hosea. The Lord says: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. . . I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love; and I was to them as they that take off the yoke on their jaws, and I laid meat unto them." Verses 1-4.

As God drew his ancient people unto himself, so he would draw all men. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." ⁵⁷ 1 And, referring to his sacrifice, Jesus said: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." ⁵⁸ 2 Also he said: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." ⁵⁹ 3 All who do not resist this drawing will be drawn to God and be saved in his kingdom. Christ is the Anointed of God for this purpose. But not all men will be drawn to the Lord and his Anointed. There are many who say, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us."

God draws no one who is unwilling to be drawn. His bands are not riveted upon any; his cords may be cast off by whomever chooses to

do so. There is no compulsion in the gospel of Christ. The Saviour came not to force men to walk in any path, but to draw them into the way of righteousness by the cords of his love. In no other way can fallen men be brought again into harmony with God.

In this second Psalm, the kings and rulers of the earth are presented taking counsel together "against the Lord and against his Anointed." Their intentions evidently go further than a mere rejection of the gospel by themselves as individuals. As kings and rulers, their sentiments naturally find expression in legislation. And as only the representatives of the Lord and his Anointed are visibly present on the earth, their purpose of throwing off the bands and cords of God must be directed against these representatives. Their aim is to put down those that are holding out to all men the cords of God's love, as the best and only means of attaining to righteousness and salvation.

But what is the result of their counsel and their plans? We are told, "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision." No effort against the purposes of God can prosper, even though it be backed by all the power and wisdom of the world. The Church of Christ will give her message, the gospel will do its work, regardless of man's opposition. The project of earthly powers, devised by their wisdom, to stay the purposes of the Most High, is but folly, and a fit matter of derision to him; only it is a very serious matter for them. For "then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure."

We are told concerning the kingdom of Christ in the prophecy of Isaiah: "For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon His shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this." ⁶⁰⁴

The zeal of men is not the means of the establishment of Christ's kingdom. The second Psalm presents the same thought: "Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said

unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the

uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." ⁶¹⁵ "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof; the world, and them that dwell therein;" and he will give it and the kingdoms thereof to his Anointed. This wonderful transaction is presented in the prophecy of Daniel. The prophet says: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." ⁶²⁶

Many have been the attempts made by zealous but misguided men to put the kingdoms of this world, or a part of them, into the possession of Christ. All that human legislation and the force of arms could do, has been done to realize this long-cherished dream. But all such efforts were against that kingdom instead of for it. They were contrary to the divine purpose and plan of drawing men to God by the cords of love. They sought to force mankind into a condition of acceptance with God, and thus to usher in the happy era of Christ's kingdom of righteousness and peace. And in doing this they ruthlessly put out of the way, so far as was in their power, all such as opposed their purpose with the preaching of the true gospel of self-denial and love to all men.

The Anointed of the Lord receives the kingdoms of this earth not to perpetuate them, but to destroy them. His kingdom cannot be visibly set up on the earth while these remain. They are ruled by those who will not yield allegiance to him. They are of the world, and his kingdom is not of this world. John 18:36. And at the final day, when Christ shall come in the clouds of heaven as King of kings and Lord of lords, they will be, as foreseen by the apostle John, arrayed against him, to resist him as an invader of their realms. Rev. 19:11-19. And then will be fulfilled the latter part of the Lord's decree,—“Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.”

Thus will the kingdoms of this earth be transferred to the dominion of Christ, and thus will he do with them in the day when that transfer shall be accomplished.

"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." Serve him not in hypocrisy, nor mock him with empty forms and profession. Give him not the kiss of insincerity, as did Judas, but the kiss of love. Cast not off the cords of love whereby he would draw you to himself. Trust not in your own power and "imagine a vain thing," nor lead any to trust in the arm of flesh. The day is near when God alone shall be exalted among the heathen and in all the earth; and "blessed are all they that put their trust in him."

"No 'American Sabbath'" *American Sentinel* 11, 5 , p. 34.

AMS reported in the *World*, of January 21, the first vice-president of the New England Sabbath Protective League, Rev. Ruen Thomas, has declared that there is no "American sabbath." While presiding at a meeting of the league, January 20, he said: "I always object to the use of the phrase, 'The American sabbath,' as occasionally used by the secretary. There is no American sabbath; Americans did not originate the Sabbath."

This is a true statement, and in harmony with what the SENTINEL has often said. We are pleased to note such an opinion coming from an official of a "Sabbath Protective League." God made the Sabbath, by resting upon and sanctifying the seventh day, at the close of the creation week; and if people would disabuse their minds of the idea that we have in this country an "American sabbath," to be preserved like any American institution, they would see that God himself has, in the fourth commandment, enacted all the legislation necessary for the preservation of the Sabbath through all time.

We also note with pleasure that this New England "Sabbath League," "came out flatfooted," as reported, "against a revival of Blue Law practices." In this they set a good example, which we trust may prove contagious.

"A Conspiracy Against Our Public Schools" *American Sentinel* 11, 5 , pp. 34, 35.

IN treating "practical Christian sociology from the standpoint of education," Dr. Crafts says:—

Our "godless schools," so far as they are "godless," however made so, cannot be defended on American principles. We must retake those surrendered guns and reoccupy the only defensible position for an American Christian nation, namely, that our public schools shall again teach Christian morals in an unsectarian

manner as a necessary basis of social security and good citizenship.⁶³1

Recognizing some, at least, of the difficulties that would beset an attempt to carry out this suggestion, our author says:—

In these days of a more complex and more critical population, it might be wise in some cases to put in place of the extemporaneous freedom of former years and the timid secularity of recent times, carefully prepared schedules of Bible readings and text-books of morals from which controverted points had been excluded, so far as practicable, by mutual agreement of Protestant and Roman Catholic authorities, six-sevenths of whose creeds, as we shall show, is "common Christianity" that can be taught in unison for six days per week, leaving the sabbath for sectarian teaching in the case of these who do not believe that even then it is better to teach the "common Christianity."⁶⁴2

"Such a plan is practicable," adds Dr. Crafts, "for it is *practiced*." He then cites "the case of the Pennsylvania Reform School at Morganza, where our 'common Christianity,' with special reference to Christian morals, has been taught daily to the whole school for many years by Protestant teachers from an unsectarian Christian text book, written for this purpose by a Roman Catholic priest, Father Canevan, of Pittsburg; a text book which has been approved by his bishop, approved also by a Presbyterian editor⁶⁵ 3 on the board of the management and by other Protestants."

This wonderful book is entitled, "Easy Lessons in Christian Doctrine," and the reader will be interested to know just what it teaches. This very proper curiosity we shall endeavor to gratify sufficiently to indicate the character of the book and to illustrate fairly the practical workings of the system recommended by the author of "Practical Christian Sociology."

"Easy Lessons in Christian Doctrine" is a pamphlet of fifty-three pages, four by five and one-half inches in size, in two parts. Part I., thirty-two pages, is made up of twenty-three lessons in Roman Catholic doctrine, concerning creation, the trinity, the fall, the redemption, the commandments, and the judgment. Part II. is a short history of the Christian religion reaching from creation to the day of Pentecost.

We cannot notice each lesson in detail, but shall quote sufficient to prove our statement that the lessons are lessons in Roman Catholic doctrine. The phraseology throughout betrays a Roman Catholic writer, one who has been instructed in Roman Catholic religious books. For instance, the word "justice" is used where the King James

version always uses "righteousness;" "Sem" where the King James uses "Shem;" "Pasch" where the King James always uses "Passover."

But we will let the book speak for itself. The following passage upon the subject of sins, distinctly sets forth the Roman Catholic doctrine of mortal and venial sins, but here this papal doctrine is made "easy" by calling them "grievous offenses" and "small offenses":—

Ques. Are all actual sins equally great?

Ans. No; all sins are not equally great; there are grievous offenses against the law of God, and there are also small offenses against the law of God.

Q. What are the effects of grievous offenses against the law of God?

A. Grievous offenses against the law of God kill the soul, by depriving it of the true spiritual life of grace, and make it liable to eternal punishment in hell.

Q. What are the effects of small offenses against the law of God?

A. Grievous offenses against the law of God kill the soul, by depriving it of the true spiritual life of grace, and make it liable to eternal punishment in hell.

Q. What are the effects of small offenses against the law of God?

A. Small offenses against the law of God do not rob the soul of the true spiritual life of grace; but they hurt the soul by lessening its love for God, and by disposing to great sins.

Q. Is it a great misfortune to fall into grievous sin?

A. It is the greatest of all misfortunes.

The next thing after this piece of papal doctrine is to find a purgatory for those souls who are "hurt" by the small misfortune of "small offenses" against the law of God; and this is done in the following "easy" lesson:—

Ques. Did Christ's soul descend into the hell of the damned?

Ans. The hell into which Christ's soul descended was not the hell of the damned, but a place or state of rest.

Q. Who were in this place of rest?

A. The souls of the just who died before Christ.

Q. Why did Christ descend into this place?

A. To announce to those spirits that were in prison the joyful tidings of their redemption.

Q. When did the souls of the just who died before Christ go to heaven?

A. When Christ ascended into heaven.

Q. Where was Christ's body while his soul was in limbo, or the place of rest?

A. In the sepulcher, or grave.

This limbo is an "easy" word for the latin *limbus partum*, and is essentially the Roman Catholic purgatory. This indeed is evident from the doctrine of the whole lesson. How the editor of the *Presbyterian Banner* or even the author of "Practical Christian Sociology" could indorse such teaching is more than we can explain. The fact that they do, shows to what lengths "Protestants" are willing to go in this matter.

Lesson three of Part II. sets forth the Roman Catholic doctrine of Gen. 3:15, which, according to to [sic.] the Catholic Bible, reads as follows:—

I will be enmities between thee and the woman

35

and thy seed and her seed. *She* shall *crush* thy head and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.

Having thus, by a mistranslation, artfully eliminated Christ, the seed, from the latter part of this text, this "easy" lesson giving his work and honor to another, continues:—

Ques. How was a Redeemer promised?

Ans. To show how hateful sin was to him, God cursed the serpent which had deceived Eve, condemning him to crawl upon the ground and to eat the dust; besides, he said enmity should exist between the serpent and the woman, but in the end *the woman* would *crush* his head.

Of course it is but a step from this to the papal assumption that the church is the woman which is to crush the serpent's head by dominating the world through her visible head, the pope of Rome. And this the author of "Practical Christian Sociology" calls teaching "Christian morals in an unsectarian manner"!

Nor is this all. Lesson five of Part II. easily inculcates the "easy lesson" of the papal *unbloody sacrifice* of the Mass, as follows:—

Ques. What were the principal religious rites and festivals of the Mosaic law?

Ans. The principal religious rites of the law given to Moses were sacrifices offered to God; they were either *bloody*, in which were offered heifers, and sheep, and goats, and doves; or *unbloody*, in which were offered *cakes*, and *unleavened bread*, and *wine*.

It is not a matter of surprise that a Roman Catholic bishop should indorse this book, but that the author of "Practical Christian Sociology" and the editor of the *Presbyterian Banner* and "other

Protestants" should indorse it show how far the so-called Protestant profession has become like the Roman Catholic. When Roman Catholics and Protestants unite, it is only by surrender on the part of the latter. Roman Catholicism has not abated one jot of her claims nor modified in one tittle her doctrine; and the only way it is possible for Roman Catholics and Protestants ever to unite is by the Protestants becoming Roman Catholic, if not in name at least in doctrine and methods. Rome is willing that the Bible should be taught in the public schools if she is permitted to put her gloss upon it; she is even anxious that "Christian morals" should be taught if only she prepares the "easy" lessons. She is willing that all the so-called "moral" and "Christian" reforms should receive aid from the State either in money or influence, if she is allowed to so color them that they contribute directly or indirectly to her upbuilding, but not otherwise. "Rome never changes."

But how far would the author of "Practical Christian Sociology" carry this matter of Christian instruction in the public schools? Let the book itself answer the question:—

"A Christian nation," may consistently insist "with malice toward none and charity for all," that the public schools of a "Christian nation" shall teach an authoritative Christian morality. ⁶⁶⁴

But this still leaves unanswered the question how far shall this teaching go? Again we quote:—

Compulsory hygienic education, "with special reference to alcoholics and narcotics," shows that health and strength as well as morals and religion call for total abstinence not only from alcoholic beverages but also from tobacco, and the impurity which both provoke and promote. And the hygienic necessity of sabbath rest also to the best health and longest life is soon to be added in connection with Dr. A. Haegler's chart.

Dr. Haegler calls attention to the chemical facts of expenditure and repair in constituents of the blood, as demonstrated by Pillerkofer and Voit, who showed that the nightly rest after the day's work did not afford a complete recuperation of the vital forces and was insufficient to keep the mind and body in tone; but that, if this reparation is not supplemented by an occasional longer period of rest, the system is subjected to a gradual falling in pitch. ⁶⁷⁵

Here stands revealed the goal that "Practical Christian Sociologists" would reach; they would teach a "morality" that included the religious observance of Sunday, for in his book, "The Sabbath for

Man," Dr. Crafts insists that a purely civil rest is not sufficient. "Take the religion out," says he, "and you take the rest out."

And in giving this "instruction" Dr. A. Haegler's utterly misleading chart is to be used?

It is true that abstinence from labor one day in seven, if it is not accompanied with dissipation, gives physical rest, but rest is not the great object of the Sabbath, and to so teach children is monstrously wicked. Of course Sunday is not the Sabbath, but the scheme to teach "an authoritatively Christian morality" means the teaching of the children that Sunday is the Sabbath and that the great object of the Sabbath is rest. As well might they teach that baptism is for the putting away of the filth of the flesh!

It is not true that the object of the Sabbath is physical rest. People who keep no sabbath live quite as long and enjoy quite as good health, other things being equal, as do those who have the regular weekly rest. March 11, 1890, the writer heard Bishop Andrews, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who had just returned from China, say: "In China they have no septennial division of time, no weekly rest day, merely annual festivals. They work right along all the time with no day of rest as such; *yet they live to a very advanced age*. This fact has led one of the most careful thinkers who has ever been sent as missionary to China, to raise a serious question whether the great purpose of the Sabbath is not for worship and communion with the other world."

"The Sabbath was made for man," but not alone nor even primarily for his physical necessities. "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them."⁶⁸⁶ But "Practical Christian Sociology" proposes to teach the children of all the people at public expense that the great object of the Sabbath is physical rest, and to impress this falsehood upon their minds by means of an utterly misleading chart. As we have intimated more than once in the past, such sociology may be practical but it is not Christian.

"Some 'Facts' Well Overlooked" *American Sentinel* 11, 5 , pp. 35, 36.

THE *Christian Statesman*, in its issue of January 11, discourses upon "The Logic of Christianity," and presents some strange "facts" which it says should not have been overlooked by people professing

to be Christians, concerning their responsibility as citizens under this Government.

"The mission of Christianity in the world," it says, "is not fully understood by a large number of church members. They overlook the fact that by the gospel of the kingdom the world is to be transformed, and the kingdoms of this world made the kingdoms of our Lord."

But why has this "fact" been overlooked by Christian people? Is it not because the Scriptures nowhere teach it? For the teaching of Scripture on this point is that when the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord, they will be dashed in pieces by him, and broken "like a potter's vessel." (See Ps. 2:8, 9; Dan. 2:34, 35, 44, 45; Rev. 11:15, 18; 19:19-21.) This clearly shows that these kingdoms will not be reconciled to him by the gospel. When God's kingdom is to be set up on the earth, every earthly kingdom must first be swept away, because it is utterly impossible to incorporate earthly governments into the kingdom of Christ. But all those individuals will be saved who through faith have been created new in Christ. An individual can, by the power of God, be "born again," and thus fitted for the kingdom of God; but to speak of a civil government as being "born again" is manifestly absurd.

The *Statesman* argues that because an individual professor of Christianity "must find a place in his creed for God as supreme, for Christ as Saviour, . . . and for the Bible as the rule of life," and because the Church must proclaim her belief in these truths, therefore the nation ought to do the same; in other words, that the character of a government is to be determined by the same test which determines the character of an individual or a family or a church. But the party who talk about "Christian" governments and think to make this one of them by the proposed "Christian amendment" to the Constitution, persistently refuse to recognize the plain fact that civil government is not a moral entity. No comparison can be made between it and an individual, a family, or a church, on moral grounds. The proper object of human existence in this world is the glory of God; but the proper purpose of civil government is the protection of human rights, and each of them is good in character according as each fulfills the purpose of its existence.

To employ the same test of character for a civil government that is proper for an individual, would lead to strange conclusions. For example, no individual is good, according to the Bible standard, who will not forgive those who injure him. No matter if they trespass

against him repeatedly, he is still to forgive, even as God, whose child (if a Christian) he claims to be, forgives those who trespass against him. He must pray, "Forgive us our trespasses, even as we forgive those that trespass against us." Must the State, therefore, in order to be good, forgive its criminals, provided, they say, I repent, and ask to be forgiven? Would that be a good government under which evil characters might commit crime day after day and escape by merely asking to be pardoned? Would not such a government, on the contrary, be one of the worst imaginable? Certainly it would; and this illustrates the absurdity of the idea that a government is not a good one unless it conforms to the moral standard set up for individuals.

We repeat, civil government is not and from its very nature cannot be a moral entity. Individuals can delegate power to their representatives, but they cannot delegate morality. One individual cannot be the moral representative of others.

The *Christian Statesman* says that infidel's surpass some Christians in their power of discernment" upon this subject, and cites in evidence some words of Mr. Samuel Putnam, as follows:—

"It is the impression of some that a Supreme Court decision, or an act of Congress, or of the President, can make this a Christian State. But this is impossible. Nothing can make this a Christian State except the Constitution. Ten thousand decisions of the Supreme Court, or ten thousand acts of Congress or of the President, can't make this a Christian State." "The Constitution is a secular Constitution; and nothing can make it a Christian Constitution save the

36

Constitution itself. God himself can't get into the Constitution except the American people put him in there by constitutional amendment."

It does not speak well for the *Statesman* party that they have to take up the logic of infidels respecting Christianity, rather than that of persons who have experienced Christianity and know what it is. It is very true that no decision of the Supreme Court, or act of Congress, or of the President, can make this a Christian nation, any more than a vote of the Presbyterian General Assembly in favor of the doctrine of infant damnation could send infants to the place of torment. And it is equally true that this Government cannot be made Christian by an amendment to the Constitution, nor can the Constitution itself be Christianized by any such means. The Constitution is not "secular" in the sense of being opposed to God and Christianity, but only in the sense of being, from the nature of the purpose it is designed to serve, necessarily outside the sphere of moral belief and action. The idea

that God can be "put into" the Constitution by a vote and a change in its wording may be harmonious with the infidel conception of God, but is nevertheless little short of blasphemy.

How is an individual Christianized? Jesus tells us it is by being "born again." "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3:3-5. It is left for these would-be reformers to discover a new way of becoming Christian; namely, by a vote of the people. Or do they think that the State will thus be "born again" "of water and of the Spirit," thus to become fitted for eternal existence in the kingdom of God?

We are glad that the illustrious men who framed the Constitution and reared the fabric of our commonwealth, overlooked the "facts" which the "Christian amendment" party are trying to force their descendants to recognize.

"Christianity and Citizenship" *American Sentinel* 11, 5 , p. 36.

SOME pertinent questions which have arisen in the discussion of this subject are considered in the *Christian Work*, of January 16, by President Merrill Gates, of Amherst College. The attitude of "a few very earnest and well-meaning persons," who affirm "that in proportion as a man is interested in the building up of the Church of Christ, in just that proportion he will hold aloof as far as possible from all civic and political relations" is discussed, together with the oft-quoted words, of our Saviour, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's;" and the conclusion is drawn that "the whole spirit of the teaching of Christ is directly against the ignoring or the evasion of this responsibility divinely laid upon each citizen to see to it, so far as in him lies, that in proportion as the Spirit of Christ dwells in him, the life of the community in which he lives shall be cleaner, more law-abiding and nobler."

This conclusion touches a point which needs to be carefully considered in the light of both reason and revelation, if we would avoid confusion and error.

The vital question is, By what means is the Christian to discharge this responsibility to elevate the community in which he lives? There can be no doubt that the responsibility exists; but the methods

advocated by some for accomplishing the desired result are open to serious question.

In the first place, it should be noted that no one who really possesses the Spirit of Christ will be inclined to ignore or evade this responsibility. The whole tendency of the life of Christ on earth was to elevate, ennoble, make more law-abiding and peaceful, the community which was favored with his presence. No person ever accomplished more in this direction than did he; and as he did, so also his professed disciples may and should do. "He that believeth on me," said Jesus, "the works that I do shall he do also." John 14:12. The Spirit of Christ never lies dormant in any person. If it is possessed at all, it will control the life of its possessor in harmony with the will of God. And he who walks not as Christ walked, gives evidence by his life that the Spirit of Christ is not in him.

It is not law, nor the enforcement of law, that preserves order and peace in this world, so much as it is the love of order and peace which is implanted in the minds of the vast majority of the people. In other words, the people generally, in this country at least, prefer to live peaceably and orderly rather than to lead the lives of criminals. And this natural preference is due to the restraining influences of the Spirit of Christ, which are felt more or less fully in every heart. Were the Spirit of Christ withdrawn from the earth, law would be a mockery, and enforcement of law a meaningless phrase.

Yet civil government, with its legislative, judicial, and executive departments, is a necessity in this world, and Christians are bound to conduct themselves consistently with its proper maintenance. "The powers that be are ordained of God," and all earthly power that is exercised to secure justice and preserve human right, should have the support of every lover of justice and humanity. They should refuse to support only such exercise of civil power as is contrary to right, and a perversion of the power ordained of God.

No universal rule can, however, be laid down defining the duty of individuals in this respect. What course of action will, in any particular case, meet the requirements of truth and justice, is to be determined by an enlightened and conscientious judgment from the circumstances of the situation. The Christian has before him not only his own rights and those of others like himself, but the rights of God,—His right to be properly represented before his creatures here, and to have their loving service throughout all ages. The Christian's outlook is a vastly wider one than that of her men, and considerations drawn

from it must often oblige him to refuse support to things which seem quite proper from a narrower point of view.

The danger of the prevailing idea of Christian citizenship lies in the common tendency to exercise power, when it is secured, not simply for the maintenance of human rights, but for the advancement—as it is deemed—of Christian customs and institutions. The plea that such institutions should have the support of legislation is a very plausible one, and appeals strongly to the uninstructed mind. The project of making Christianity, in fact as well as in name, the "common law of the land," seems most laudable to very many who do not know or do not stop to consider that Christianity is a life, and not a form of words. We would that all our legislators, judges, and executives were Christians both in name and in truth. But were they such, it would not follow that we would have laws upholding and enforcing religious doctrines. On the contrary, this is just what we would not have; but every person would be left free to be religious or irreligious, as his own judgment might determine; for the Christian spirit is the spirit of love, and Christian teaching is that all persons must be drawn to God and Christianity by love, or not at all.

In no way can we do more for the good of the community in which we may live than by setting before it the example of a life in which is manifested the power of God unto salvation. This we should do, and we should advocate and support such exercise of the civil power as God has ordained for the preservation of God-given rights.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 5 , p. 40.

WE are told by Sunday-law advocates that God's words, "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," mean that no work is to be done on the first day of the week, or that one day out of seven is to be observed as a day of rest; but the same persons will not allow any such liberty of interpretation with respect to their man-made sabbath "law." That means a definite, particular day of the week every time. Thus they honor the statute of man above the law of God.

A GREAT many people justify Sunday laws upon the ground of physical necessity. Such legislation is said to be a proper exercise of the police power of the State for the preservation of health, etc. The fragile texture of this claim becomes apparent when we consider what class of men are calling for such laws. Are they the doctors, the

scientists, the boards of public health, the man most familiar with the facts of physical science and man's physical needs? No; they are the preachers. Were the clergymen to withdraw from the ranks of the Sunday-law agitators, there would be scarce a corporal's guard left. Yet we are asked to believe that Sunday legislation is not sought for religious reasons, but simply to meet a pressing exigency created by man's physical needs, which they have discovered, and which the physicians, scientists, and statesmen have somehow overlooked.

It is well to bear in mind that the only true liberty which anybody can possibly have is liberty in Christ. "He that committeth sin is the servant of sin;" and it is only because of the indifference of the Spirit of Christ in the world that men recognize one another's rights even to the extent that they do, so that even those who do not realize it are indebted to Christ for the physical liberty they enjoy.

February 6, 1896

"State Guardianship of Morality" *American Sentinel* 11, 6 , pp. 41, 42.

THE State, in whatever its agency appears, stands for force—compulsion. The State exists not to give advice, not to persuade, but to define and enforce. Within the sphere of its action, individual option is done away.

It is quite generally assumed that one proper function of the State is to be the public guardian of morality. But in this assumption lies the possibility of untold evil.

What is "morality"? What authoritative standard have we, outside of the word of Omniscience, by which to determine it? There are various standards among men, but these differ one from another. What is considered moral in one country is regarded as immoral in another. Not even in the same community do we find one standard adhered to by all individuals.

There are, it is true, many acts, the immorality [*sic.*] of which would nowhere, in civilized lands at least, be called in question. And the terms "moral" and "immoral" have come to be commonly used with reference to such acts, indicating a vicious nature rather than one that is simply irreligious. But no certain boundary line is known, in the public mind at least, separating between what is vicious and what is "irreligious." And when human legislation sets out to deal with acts

upon moral grounds, it can find no logical stopping place short of religious despotism.

State guardianship of morality means enforced morality,—morality as defined by the State and accepted as such by the majority of the people. And what will be viewed as moral or immoral will depend very largely, if not wholly, upon the form of the prevailing religion. The State will naturally turn to the Church for enlightenment upon questionable or controverted points.

From the assumption that the State is the properly-constituted guardian of morality, it is but a short step to the position that the State should also "protect" religion,—that religion, of course, which is the prevailing one. Religion and morality are found to be too closely connected to admit of dealing with the interests of one separately. When the State "protects" religion, it does so, of course, with a view to the highest welfare of its citizens. In that view force comes to be considered of value as a means of serving the interests of the soul.

This was the view commonly entertained not many centuries in the past. Our illustration, "Charlemagne Inflicting Baptism upon the Saxons," whom he had conquered in battle, is thoroughly characteristic of the times in which this theory prevailed. The unfortunate Saxons did not comprehend the doctrine of baptism, now, as their looks show, were they at all anxious to be baptized; but the conqueror inflicted the rite upon them, doubtless having in view the glory of God and the salvation of their souls. As the historian relates, also, he did this with especial reference to the preservation of the peace and prosperity of the State.

Among the acts which are counted immoral by many to-day, is the violation of the "Christian sabbath;" in other words, the act of performing ordinary labor upon the first day of the week. The doctrine of State guardianship of public morality is held to include the enforcement of the observance of this institution, by compulsory rest upon that day. There is a growing demand for more and stricter legislation to this end. But the Sunday sabbath, when enforced as now demanded, will be as great and as useless an infliction upon the people as was Charlemagne's "baptism" upon his Saxon prisoners.

As we have before observed, there is no rest in compulsory idleness. Voluntary idleness is bad enough, but compulsory idleness is ten times worse. The promoters of compulsory Sunday observance will not be satisfied with a law which enjoins merely cessation from work and amusement, for they do not aim at the result which would

follow from this alone. The evil of enforced idleness must finally result in a demand that the people be brought into the churches, where they may receive the benefit of religious services. It will be found that to enforce idleness is not to guard morality, but to promote immorality; and a religious observance of the Sunday will be viewed as a logical necessity of the situation.

But with what grace will the individual who wishes to be free to go about his work or engage in some amusement, proceed with an enforced religious observance of the "sabbath" day? The same, evidently, as that with which Charlemagne's Saxons submitted to the rite of "baptism;" and the effect will be of the same nature and value in the one case as in the other.

42

The truth is, that the State has no concern with morality, as such. The true American doctrine of the proper office of the State is set forth in the Declaration of Independence, where it is held as a self-evident truth that men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" that governments are instituted among men to preserve these rights. The State, therefore, by this doctrine, considers an act not with reference to its morality or immorality, but as being either subversive or not subversive of human rights. And when it cuts loose from this doctrine, and proceeds to deal with questions of morality, religious legislation soon follows, and despotism is the inevitable outcome.

Let the State keep upon the safe ground marked out in the Declaration of Independence, concerning itself only with that which relates to the preservation of the rights of its citizens, and leaving religion wholly free to do its work of uplifting and regenerating mankind.

"Plausible and Dangerous Teaching" *American Sentinel* 11, 6 , pp. 42, 43.

IT may seem to some readers of the SENTINEL that its efforts are largely expended in fighting a dragon of straw,—in pointing out and opposing sentiments and purposes which are not seriously entertained by men of prominence and influence among the people. It is this ignorance on the part of so many that constitutes one of the gravest features of the situation. While the custodians of liberty sleep in the fancied security of their treasure, insidious foes are rapidly

doing their work of invasion and spoliation. Counterfeit principles are being everywhere put in circulation, which are accepted by the people as the true principles of liberty and justice. Already the logic of propositions, "laws," and judicial decisions in which the people seemingly acquiesce, demand the surrender of the birthright liberties of American citizens.

Some propositions which show what is being widely taught and accepted as sound doctrine concerning things which have to do with the liberties of the people, occur in an article by Rev. Christopher G. Hazard, in the *Evangelist* (New York) of January 23, entitled, "Why Does Society Enforce the Sabbath?" We present them for the reader's consideration.

"It is the State," says Mr. Hazard, "that has made sabbath law, and it is the State that is enforcing it. The State has deliberately adopted a large part of the Decalogue, and the fourth commandment has been included in that part adopted. To this extent society has set up the Hebrew State, and is resolved to maintain it." If this be true, it is time that the people should fully understand the fact, and its significance.

Can the State rightfully adopt and undertake to enforce a part of the Decalogue? Can the civil power properly undertake to enforce a spiritual law? "We know," writes Paul, "that the law is spiritual." Rom. 7:14. The Saviour in his sermon on the mount showed in commenting upon the commandments forbidding killing and adultery, that they reach even to the thoughts of the heart. Hence if the State is to enforce this portion of the Decalogue, it must have some means of getting at the thoughts of a person's heart. And this the civil authorities tried to do back in the Dark Ages by means of the rack, thumbscrew, and similar instruments of the "holy Inquisition." Are we ready to grant that the State is authorized to pursue a similar course to-day?

But it may be answered, no one claims that the State laws against murder and adultery are violated by mere thoughts in such directions, but only by overt acts. Very well, then, such State laws are not a portion of the Decalogue. In other words, they are not laws against sin, but against crime. They forbid the overt act, as a violation of human rights; while the laws of the Decalogue forbid both the act and the thought that is back of it, as a sin against the Creator.

As concerns the fourth commandment, that precept of the Decalogue is certainly no less spiritual than are the sixth and the seventh. Like them, it cannot be kept by mere outward conformity to

its requirements. And so far from having power or authority to enforce this part of the Decalogue, the State has no authority even to enact a law of its own against Sabbath breaking. It has no authority even to define what the Sabbath is. If it has such authority, then it can also define what constitutes baptism, or the celebration of the Lord's supper.

But we are told further by the above-named writer, that "as moral law, the Sabbath has civil value. It has been well said, that where parents are dishonored, society cannot continue, and that therefore no man's days can be long in the land; and to this may be added that where the Sabbath is dishonored, morality cannot continue, and the prosperity of the State cannot follow." This sounds plausible, certainly; but there is nothing in it beyond the sound. It amounts simply to this: Morality as a feature of individual character has a civil value. Certainly it has; but does it follow from this that the State should undertake to enforce morality? Conversion—making a bad man good—has a very high civil value. Converted, the thief ceases to steal, the violent man to assault and murder, the forger and counterfeiter to cause financial loss and disorder; in short, if all the bad men were only converted, and would remain so, we would not need a police force, society would be safe, and incalculable trouble and loss would be avoided. But does it follow that the State can properly undertake the work of changing men's hearts? The psalmist said, after he had grievously sinned, "Create in me a clean heart, O God." Ps. 51:10. That is what conversion is, and only He who has creative power can do it.

The State cannot compel children to honor their parents, save in appearance, and that

43

only to some extent. As well might it undertake to compel one person to love another person. No more can it enable or compel a person to keep the Sabbath. It can compel him to stop working; but as Mr. Hazard himself says, "The Lord emphasized the truth that the Sabbath is not the day of the do-nothing. It is not consecrated to idleness." Idleness under the pretense of Sabbath keeping is mocking God; for God made the Sabbath "a delight" (Isa. 58:13, 14.), a day of activity in worship and communion with him. What the State wants, on any and every day, is not more idle men, but more good men.

Nor is it true that "where the Sabbath is dishonored . . . the prosperity of the State cannot follow." For some men honor the seventh day, while others honor the first, and communities which do the former are certainly as orderly and prosperous as those which do the latter; yet one of these days cannot be the Sabbath. Nor does history give any warrant for believing that national prosperity is necessarily dependent upon the observance of any day of the seven.

We grant that the Sabbath institution is a human necessity; we believe it as strongly as any one can. And Mr. Hazard truthfully observes, "As well think to change God's ordinance of night as God's ordinance of the Sabbath." But this is just what men have thought to do; for while God's ordinance is, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," men have changed it so that the world are now taught that the first day is the Sabbath; and Mr. Hazard and others would have this change sanctioned and enforced upon all persons by law. Of course, the Creator has not sanctioned and does not recognize any such change; for he was wise enough to make the Sabbath just as he wanted it and just as it would best serve the needs of mankind, in the beginning; and this all men will find out at the final day reckoning. The Sabbath is a human necessity, as a spiritual institution. The physical-necessity argument is considered separately elsewhere in this paper.⁶⁹¹

Speaking of the law against Sabbath breaking in the time of the ancient Israelite theocracy, Mr. Hazard says: "There was no tyranny over conscience in the case, and there is none. In things moral and social the State has right over the conscience of the minority in it, to compel it." Has the State such right? Are the American people ready to accept such doctrine? If they are, then the scenes of the Dark Ages are ready to be repeated in this land; for no worse principle was ever cited in justification of any act of oppression or prosecution.

Think of it: "In things moral, . . . the State has right over the conscience of the minority in it, to compel it!" Is this the doctrine that is to be gathered from the pages of history or of revelation, or deduced from reason in the light of the nineteenth century? Is it a true saying, after all, that "might makes right"? Is the State to define morality? and not only that, but to compel the conscience of individuals in moral things, who happen to be in the minority? God himself does not undertake to compel the conscience.

The author of this proposition cites as an example under it the case of a man who has "a conscience distorted to fit stealing," or

"another" who "may fail to see the use and value of the Sabbath," in which case, he says, the State will see it for him. But if a man should plead conscience for stealing, the State would disregard his plea not on the ground that his conscience was bad or that he was in the minority, but simply on the ground that he had violated human rights, which it is the purpose of the government to protect. The State would not make itself lord of his conscience; it would not concern itself with his conscience at all. It would simply take cognizance of the fact that the rights of some of its citizens had been violated, and as the appointed protector of those rights, its proper action in the matter would be clear, without any reference to the criminal's plea of conscience.

It may be that the Rev. Mr. Hazard does not see that this doctrine of the right of the State to coerce the conscience of the minority, would hold as well in heathen lands as in our own, and hence would justify all the idolatry and wicked practices which are esteemed necessary and right by the majority in such countries; it may be by the majority in such countries; it may be that he does not see that it would justify all the persecutions carried on in Catholic countries, or any that the majority in this country might see fit to inaugurate; but it is none the less harmful for that.

We are told further that because the Sabbath appears to be "against men before it is seen to be for them," "the State, like a wise father, enforces it first that it may be appreciated afterwards." We do not acknowledge any such "father." Our paternal needs are fully provided for by the "fathers of our flesh," and our all-wise, all-powerful Father in heaven, who created them and us. We want no "father" created by a popular vote. We want no religion defined and approved by the civil power; we want no conscience instructed by it. We want no Sabbath keeping or appreciation of religious privileges by State direction.

Our conscience is our own,—the gift of God. His word—not the vote of the majority—is its guide. And as that word never directs any one to violate human rights, but enjoins love on the part of each toward his fellowmen, its guidance will be no menace to the peace and prosperity of the State. Majorities in this world have always been wrong in religious belief and practice; and we will "not follow a multitude to do evil." We will take our religion from the Bible, and will obey also the laws of the civil power, save only when they are in plain conflict with the law of God.

"Dr. Haegler's Chart" *American Sentinel* 11, 6 , pp. 44, 45.

IN our issue of last week brief allusion was made to the singular fact(?), overlooked by the physicians and scientists, but discovered by the clergymen, that Sunday rest is absolutely essential to mankind for the preservation of physical health.

There is, however, one exception to the rule, which should be noted. One physician, Dr. A. Haegler, stands abreast of the clergy in knowledge of the facts of physical science, and has prepared a "chart," showing the result to an individual of the omission of Sunday rest, as compared with the result when Sunday is regularly observed. We present herewith this remarkable production.⁷⁰ 1 It will be observed that the person who disregards Sunday rest goes steadily down hill, physically, until, as may be supposed, he sinks, a complete bodily wreck, into the gulf of physical perdition; while the one who has regularly abstained from work on Sunday naturally and easily maintains the level of his physical health.

As an illustration of an idea, this chart serves its purpose well. The only trouble is, it must stand without any support in truth. The "facts" of the illustration do not exist.

An illustration is not an argument. The one conveys an idea, the other demonstrates its truth or falsity. The demonstration of the truth of what this chart represents is yet to be had.

An appeal to the facts of history or of present human existence is sufficient to show the utter fallacy of this illustration. The number of people in this world who have regularly observed Sunday as a day of rest, or who so observe it to-day, is comparatively small. The weekly rest-day is found only in those lands where the people profess Christianity. In what are known as "heathen" lands, it is not observed. Nor has it ever been known as a practice among the heathen nations of past times. Yet, in point of physical perfection, the heathen compare favorably with the people of so-called Christian nations. The physical giants of ancient times were not among the Sabbath-keeping Israelites, but among the heathen nations whom God dispossessed of the land which he would give to his people. There were men such as Goliath of Gath, Og, king of Bashan, and the Anakim, of whom the ten spies said in their report, "We were in their sight as grasshoppers." Coming to the testimony of later times, we find that the ancient Greeks were the most noted men of their age in point of

physical perfection and prowess; yet they had no weekly day of rest. Nor did the conquering Romans know such an institution. And for our own times we have such testimony as the following from Bishop Andrews, of the Methodist Church, on his return from China:—

In China they have no septennial division of time, no weekly rest-day, merely annual festivals. They work right along all the time with no day of rest as such; yet they live to a very advanced age. This fact has led one of the most careful thinkers who has ever been sent as a missionary to China, to raise a serious question whether the great purpose of the Sabbath is not for worship and communion with the other world.

But it is not necessary that we go to pagan lands for these comparisons. Multitudes of people in our own country either spend Sunday in work or in some other manner requiring as much physical exertion as their ordi-dinary [*sic.*]labor. But it is safe to assert that Dr. Haegler himself could not distinguish between these men and others who regularly rest and go to church on Sunday, by any evidence to be gathered from a physical examination.

The truth is, that it is not mere rest—idleness—that man's physical system demands, but change—recreation. We except, of course, the daily demand for that nearly complete cessation of physical activity which is obtained in sleep. No one, however, advocates spending the Sunday in sleep. It is assumed that men are to be on that day in the full possession of their physical and mental activities; otherwise what would become of the church services? But when these faculties are fully awake they want exercise. This is a law of man's being. An all-wise Creator has wisely made activity the normal condition of the human system. Mere idleness without sleep is more exhaustive of nerve force and vitality, than is exercise. In these statements we are only telling what is well known to intelligent people.

It is not work that wears, but worry; not exercise that breaks down the system, but excess; not discipline that destroys its faculties, but dissipation. A thousand and one causes operate in determining the individual's physical status. Intemperance, inherited defects, uncontrolled passion, the cares and worries of life, too prolonged or violent exertion, weakness and excess of every kind and degree, affect our physical well-being. Yet Dr. Haegler in his chart presumes to differentiate between all these causes, not in one case merely but for all individuals, and distinguish the physical effect due to the observance or non-observance of a weekly rest day!

We might refer to the Sabbath institution as set forth in God's holy Word, and show that it is designed by the Creator not as a day of idleness, but of activity in spiritual exercises; but the purposes of this article do not require it. It is sufficient to say, in conclusion, that the clergymen who are calling for "laws" to compel people to "rest" on Sunday, both ignore Dr. Haegler's chart in their own practice—Sunday being pre-eminently their "busy day"—and also in their hopes and

45

desires respecting others. They are perfectly willing that men should be as active as they please on Sunday, provided that activity is directed in religious channels, and for purposes they may specify as proper.

A chart which would portray the disastrous effects upon individuals and upon society of enforced Sunday idleness, would be a much more useful one, and would have a foundation in reality.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 6 , p. 48.

OUR first-page illustration, "Charlemagne Inflicting 'Baptism' upon the Saxons," is taken from Ridpath's "History of the World," Vol. 2. The historian relates that in the spring of A.D. 777, Charlemagne, "having satisfactorily regulated the affairs of Italy," "conceived the plan of extending the empire of religion in the opposite directions of Saxony and Spain. In furtherance of this purpose he convened at Paderborn, in the year 777, a general assembly of his people, and there the scheme of conquest was matured. The German chiefs had generally obeyed his summons, and were present at the assembly; but Wittikind, king of the Saxons, was conspicuous by absence." In a foot note the historian adds:—

It was at this assembly of the Saxon chiefs that Charlemagne gave his refractory subjects their option of baptism or the sword. The impenitent barbarians, yielding in action but obdurate in mind, were compelled to kneel down at the bank of a stream while the priests, who accompanied Charlemagne's army, poured water upon their heads and pronounced the baptismal ritual. The king soon had cause to learn the inefficiency of such a conversion from paganism.

Thus it appears that Charlemagne had in view not only the conversion of the Saxons, but more particularly the peace and safety of the State, which he thought would be promoted by changing them from pagans to Christians. The trouble with his plan was that the forced acquiescence of the Saxons in a religious ceremony did not

work the least change in their hearts for the better, any more than does the forced observance of Sunday in the hearts of men to-day.

February 13, 1896

"Religious Liberty in Virginia" *American Sentinel* 11, 7 , pp. 49, 50.

VIRGINIA, a State which has long stood second to none in guaranteeing liberty of conscience, seems about to enact additional Sunday statutes.

The text of the proposed "law" was published in these columns [*sic.*] last week. It is designed to affect only railroad and steamship companies, but it violates the principles of the separation of Church and State, so ably advocated by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, more than a century ago, just as truly as though it proposed to interfere with the individual citizen.

Human rights antedate all governments. They existed as soon as man was created, and are entirely independent of civil authority; and it seems strange that the legislators of any American commonwealth should entertain for a moment the idea that rights are conferred by the State; and yet such is the thought underlying all religious legislation.

The Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson, presents the matter in its true light, namely, that men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," and "that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men."

Subsequently to writing the immortal Declaration, Mr. Jefferson wrote:—

Our legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their power; that *their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, and to take none of them from us*. No man has a natural right to commit aggression on the equal rights of another; *and this is all from which the laws ought to restrain him*; every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of the society; *and this is all the laws should enforce on him*.⁷¹¹

And again in the same letter Jefferson says: "When the laws have declared and enforced all this [natural rights and duties], they have fulfilled their functions; and *the idea is quite unfounded, that on entering into society we give up any natural right*."

Mr. Jefferson very pertinently remarks that "the trial of every law by one of these tests would lessen much the labors of our legislators, and lighten equally our municipal codes."

Tried by the rule stated by Jefferson, the Sunday bill now before the Virginia legislature will be found to far exceed the rightful limits of legislative power.

The late Alexander H. Stevens entertained views similar to those held by Mr. Jefferson. He said:—

In forming single societies or States, men only enter into a compact with each other—a social compact—either expressed or implied, as before stated, *for their mutual protection in the enjoyment by each of all their natural rights*. The chief object of all good governments, therefore, should be the protection of *all the natural rights of their constituent members*.

Upon entering into society *for the purpose of having their natural rights secured and protected, or properly redressed*, the weak *do not give up or surrender any portion of their priceless heritage* in any government instituted and organized as it should be.

In no other State have such questions been any more thoroughly discussed than in Virginia. "Early in the autumnal session of the legislature of 1785," says Bancroft,⁷² 2 "Patrick Henry proposed a resolution for a legal provision for the teachers of the Christian religion. In the absence of Jefferson, the opponents of the measure were led by Madison, whom Witherspoon⁷³ 3 had imbued with theological lore. The assessment bill, he said, exceeds the functions of civil authority. The question has been stated as if it were, Is religion necessary? The true question is, Are establishments necessary for religion? And the answer is, they corrupt religion. The difficulty of providing for the support of religion is the result of the war, to be remedied by voluntary association for religious purposes. In the event of a statute for the support of the Christian religion, are the courts of law to decide what is Christianity? and, as a consequence, to decide what is orthodoxy and what is heresy? The enforced support of the Christian religion dishonors Christianity. Yet, in spite of all the opposition that could be mustered, leave to bring in the bill was granted by forty-seven votes against thirty-two.⁷⁴ 4 The bill, when reported, prescribed a general assessment on all taxable property for the support of teachers of the Christian religion. Each person, as he paid his tax, was to say to which society he dedicated it; in case he refused to do so, his payment was to be applied toward the maintenance of a county school. On the third reading the bill received

a check, and was ordered by a small majority to be printed and distributed for the consideration of the people. Thus the people of Virginia had before them for their choice the bill of the revised code for establishing religious freedom, and the plan of despoinding churchmen for the supporting religion by a general assessment.

"All the State, from the sea to the mountains and beyond them, was alive with the discussion. Madison, in a remonstrance addressed to the legislature, embodied all that could be said against the compulsory maintenance of Christianity and in behalf of religious freedom as a natural right, the glory of Christianity itself, the surest method of supporting religion, and the only way to produce moderation and harmony among its several sects. George Mason, who was an enthusiast for entire freedom, asked of Washington his opinion, and received for answer that 'no man's sentiments were more opposed to any kind of restraint upon religious principles.' While he was not among those who were so much alarmed at the thought of making people of the denominations of Christians pay

50

toward the support of that denomination which they professed, provided Jews, Mahometans, and others who were not Christians, might obtain proper relief, his advice was given in these words: 'As the matter now stands, I wish an assessment had never been agitated; and, as it has gone so far, that the bill could die an easy death.' ⁷⁵⁵

"The general committee of the Baptists unanimously appointed a delegate to remonstrate with the general assembly against the assessment, and they resolved that no human laws ought to be established for that purpose; that every free person ought to be free in matters of religion. ⁷⁶⁶ The general convention of the Presbyterian Church prayed the legislature expressly that the bill concerning religious freedom might be passed into a law as the best safeguard then attainable for their religious rights. ⁷⁷⁷

"When the legislature of Virginia assembled, no one was willing to bring forward the assessment bill, and it was never heard of more. Out of one hundred and seventeen articles of the revised code which were then reported, Madison selected for immediate consideration the one which related to religious freedom. The people of Virginia had held it under deliberation for six years, in December, 1785, it passed the House by a vote of nearly four to one. Attempts in the Senate for amendment produced only insignificant changes in the preamble, and

on the sixteenth of January, 1786, Virginia placed among its statutes the very words of the original draft by Jefferson with the hope that they would endure forever: 'No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; opinion in matters of religion shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect civil capacities. The rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind.'" ⁷⁸⁸

"Thus," says Madison, 'in Virginia was extinguished forever the ambitious hope of making laws for the human mind.'"

It will be observed that the opposition to the proposed legislation for the support of teachers of the Christian religion was not from an infidel but from a Christian standpoint. Madison was himself "bred in the school of the Presbyterian dissenters under Witherspoon at Princeton," ⁷⁹⁹ and the Virginia Presbyterians and Baptists of that day were certainly not open to the charge of hostility to Christianity. The fight against the bill, supposed to be for the preservation of Christianity, was made wholly in the interests of Christianity and of God-given rights.

Mr. Madison's first reason for opposing the bill was because "religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence."

His second reason was, "Because, if religion be exempt from the authority of the society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the legislative body," whose jurisdiction, he argued, was both derivative and limited.

Mr. Madison's third reason for opposing religious legislation in Virginia in 1785 is just as applicable to the legislation proposed now. "Who does not see," he asks, "that the same authority which can establish Christianity in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians?"

Equally pertinent would be the question now: Who does not see that the same authority that can require the observance of one Christian institution, may establish with the same ease any other real or supposed Christian institution and require its observance? There can be but one reason for hedging the Sunday about with legal restrictions and prohibitions, namely, its supposed sacred character; and who does not see that it would be just as legitimate for the legislature to guard or enforce in like manner any other institution of the Church?

Again, Mr. Madison, and those who joined with him in this memorial, objected to the "bill establishing a provision for teachers of the Christian religion" on the ground that it violated "that equality which ought to be the basis of every law." This is equally true of the present bill. It violates equality because it requires in some degree the observance of a religious institution. Said Mr. Madison: "Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess, and to observe the religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we cannot deny an equal freedom to them whose minds have not yet yielded to the evidence which has convinced us." The present Sunday bill, like all such measures, takes no account of the right of every man not to observe Sunday.

Again, as pointed out in the fifth division of Mr. Madison's memorial, the bill now before the Virginia Legislature, equally with the bill then under consideration, implies the right to employ religion as an engine of civil policy; and also to use the civil power to support and enforce religion.

As it is religious sentiment which demands such legislation as that now proposed in Virginia, so it is religious sentiment which enforces such legislation. In fact, by such laws the State simply clothes the Church with civil power, and within certain proscribed limits, makes it the "duty" of the magistrate to adjudicate religious questions and enforce religious discipline. And this is equally true of the Sunday "laws" already upon the statute books of Virginia. Section 3800 provides that:—

The forfeiture declared by the preceding section shall not be incurred by any person who conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as a Sabbath, and actually refrains from all secular business and labor on that day, provided he does not compel an apprentice or servant not of his belief to do secular work or business on a Sunday, and does not on that day disturb any other person.

Such an exemption is itself evidence of the religious character of the "law." Thus even the attempts of legislators to do justice and to recognize the right of every citizen to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, show such legislation to be alike in flagrant violation of the Virginia Bill of Rights, of the "Act Establishing Religious Liberty," and of the natural rights of man.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that the Legislature of Virginia will not only reject this present Sunday bill, but will make haste to repeal the various measures of religious legislation now upon the statute books

of that State, and thus vindicate the principles so ably announced and defended over a century ago by Jefferson and Madison, the ablest statesmen of that day, and by Witherspoon, the Christian minister, educator, and patriot.

"Religious 'Laws'" *American Sentinel* 11, 7 , p. 50.

THERE is nothing more unchristian than a man-made religious "law."

Religious legislation is solely a prerogative of the Creator. When man presumes to enact such legislation he assumes to put himself in the place of God. His religious legislation, so far from being Christian, becomes from its very assumption to be such, actual blasphemy.

"Every word of God is pure; he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. 30:5, 6. Religious legislation presumes to add to the words of God.

Every word of God is law. It is law because it is right, because it is truth, because it is just, and because it will certainly be carried into effect. And therefore any religious legislation by man becomes but a man-made addition to the word of God, and subjects its authors to the reproof of the Almighty, which will demonstrate them to be liars, and appoint their portion with the lovers of untruth.

"Maryland History and Roman Catholic Claims" *American Sentinel* 11, 7 , pp. 51, 52.

CECIL CALVERT, the second Lord Baltimore and lord proprietary of Maryland, was a Roman Catholic, and for this reason Roman Catholics take great credit to themselves for what they call "the establishment of religious liberty in Maryland." The *Monitor*, of San Francisco, in its issue of January [*sic.*] 18, says:—

We were always inclined to believe that the early history of Catholic Maryland offers at the same time the most magnanimous example of Catholic tolerance and liberality and the most ungrateful specimen of anti-Catholic bigotry. It will be remembered that when Calvert founded Maryland he threw open the colony to every sect and creed. The Puritan who fled from Virginian persecution found a welcome and secure home under the persecuted Baltimore. But when the royal house in England fell before the Covenanters the Puritans whom Calvert had sheltered turned on their host and established the reign of religious intolerance in his free colony.

Baltimore re-established his authority and his first deed—the most glorious in our history—was to pass the famous act of religious toleration.

The fact is, as we have repeatedly shown, that the circumstances were such that Lord Baltimore could not do otherwise than to grant a good degree of religious toleration in his colony. England was at that time "Protestant" and Maryland was not settled by Roman Catholics but very largely by Protestants.

Of the landing of the first emigrants Bancroft says:—

Upon the 27th [of March, 1634], the emigrants, *of whom at least three parts of four were Protestants*, took quiet possession of the land which the governor had bought. ⁸⁰¹

It is probable that the relative proportion of Catholics and Protestants in Maryland remained about the same, and though the government was in the hands of the lord proprietary, who was a Catholic, it would have been quite impossible for him, even had he desire to do so, to have denied toleration to so large a majority of his subjects.

Again Bancroft says:—

In the mixed population of Maryland, where the administration was in the hands of Catholics, and *the great majority of the people were Protestants*, there was no unanimity of sentiment out of which a domestic constitution could have harmoniously risen. ⁸¹²

This was about the time of the conflict in England between the Parliament and Charles I., and Lord Baltimore had to look well to his rights in order to retain any authority at all. Leonard Calvert, the proprietary's deputy, went to England in 1643 to consult with his brother, Lord Baltimore, about affairs of the colony. Claybourne was claiming Kent Island, and the Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Puritans, who formed a large proportion of Lord Baltimore's subjects, were restless under the authority of a Catholic, and were desirous of establishing Protestantism, so-called, as the religion of the colony.

In 1645, a petition was presented to the House of Lords, asking that the government of Maryland might be settled in the hands of Protestants. For some reason this petition was not acted upon, and "the politic Lord Baltimore," says Bancroft, "had ample time to prepare his own remedies. To appease Parliament, he removed Greene [the Roman Catholic Governor], and in August, 1648, appointed in his place Wm. Stone, a Protestant of the Church of England." ⁸²³

It was in April of the following year that the act establishing religious toleration, was passed. Bancroft says: "To quiet and unite the colony, all the offenses of the late rebellion were effaced by a general amnesty; and, at the instance of the Catholic proprietary, the Protestant governor, Stone, and his council of six, composed equally of Catholics and Protestants, and the representatives of the people of Maryland, *of whom [only] five were Catholics*, at a general session of the assembly held in April, 1649, placed upon their statute books" ⁸³⁴ this act of toleration.

We do not deny that Lord Baltimore was a liberal minded man, or that he entertained charitable feelings toward Protestants. But even had such not been the case, his environment and the circumstances under which he received and held his charter were such that he could not well have taken any other course than that which he did take in granting to his subjects religious toleration. England was "Protestant" and the charter granted Lord Baltimore by Charles I., established in effect the Anglican Church as the church of Maryland. It gave the lord proprietary authority to found "churches and chapels, and places of worship in convenient and suitable places within the premises; and of *causing the same to be dedicated and consecrated, according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England.*" ⁸⁴⁵

It will be seen at once that it was quite out of the question for Lord Baltimore to establish the Catholic religion in Maryland; he did the only thing that was possible for him to do under the circumstances to secure even toleration for those of his own faith: he established religious toleration for all who professed faith in Christ; and the fact that representative Catholics appeals to the history of Maryland,

52

in proof of the tolerant spirit of Catholicism, demonstrates the paucity of such evidence. That State seems to be the only spot of earth upon which Roman Catholics can base any plausible claim to having established religious freedom; and as we have seen, the facts of history do not bear out that claim even in this single instance. That a degree of religious toleration was established in Maryland was due not to the liberality of Rome but a combination of circumstances which Rome was not able to control.

(For a more exhaustive examination of this subject see the AMERICAN SENTINEL of Sept. 26, 1895.)

"Governmental Accountability" *American Sentinel* 11, 7 , p. 52.

WE take the following words from the *Christian Statesman* of January 25:—

The duty of serving the Lord is binding equally everywhere. Can it be that God has bound men by moral law every place but one? Can it be that he has left the great organization of government with its tremendous power and possibilities for both good and evil, unaccountable, without moral and organic power for its control? This is true if the folly of modern State philosophy be true, that religion has nothing to do with politics.

The above is part of an address delivered before the "National Christian Congress," at Atlanta, Georgia, Dec. 19, 1895, by Rev. C. N. Donaldson. We respectfully take issue with the latter concerning what he affirms must be true from the standpoint of separation between religion and politics.

By the statement that religion and politics should not be mixed, it is not meant that politics should be conducted in an anti-religious or unrighteous manner, but that religious doctrines and institutions lie without the sphere of politics, and hence cannot properly ask for or be given political recognition.

The distinction between the two is simply this: The sphere of religion covers all thought and action pertaining to an individual's duty toward God, and of necessity entirely excludes all human action in a representative capacity. The sphere of politics, on the other hand, relates only to the protection of individuals in the enjoyment of their rights, and is inseparable from that action in representative capacity which religion excludes.

There is a Christian principle, indeed, which should govern men in political action as in everything else; but that principle does not require that religious dogmas and institutions should have the support of the civil power. On the contrary, it requires the very opposite, since to give religion such "support" would be contrary to justice and a denial of the power and authority of God.

Christian principle in politics requires that an individual should act honestly and fairly to the best of his ability in making secure to all persons within the range of his action, those inalienable rights with which all have been endowed by their Creator. And as these include the right of an individual to think for himself and to act in harmony with his convictions of right and duty—so long as he invades no other person's rights,—it is clear that religious legislation can have no support from the person who is governed by Christian principle in his political action.

Christianity means freedom—freedom to all persons to enjoy every God-given right and privilege, even those from which men have cut themselves off by sin. Christianity—the gospel—is the world's great proclamation of emancipation; and those who would in its name restrict their fellowmen by putting their own religious ideas into the civil law, and enforcing them by the civil power, show themselves to be deplorably ignorant of what Christianity is.

"Purifying the Fountain" *American Sentinel* 11, 7 , pp. 52, 53.

IN a discussion of "The People's Responsibility for the 'Christian' Amendment," in the *Christian Statesman*, of January 25, Rev. J. S. Martin declares that "our only security against the destruction threatened by the great flood tide of governmental evils that are coming in upon us, lies in the purification of the fountain whence they flow."

It is very true that a stream cannot be purified without purifying its fountain head. But how is the fountain head of governmental corruption to be purified? Is it by a "Christian" amendment to the Constitution? We trow not.

We are not prepared to impeach any person in office under this Government, high or low, on a charge of official corruption. That is not the business or purpose of the SENTINEL. Our aim is to point out the truth that any attempt to remedy governmental evils by so-called Christian legislation, either through a "Christian" amendment to the Constitution or in any other way can only make the trouble incalculably worse than it is.

The fountain head of all corruption in this world is the human heart. Well has the prophet said, "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." No man knows the depravity that is lurking in his own heart. Much less, then, is he able to guard against it by human enactments. There is just one way in which the heart of an individual can cease to be deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, and that is by the exercise of the power of God.

The action proposed by the Rev. Mr. Martin would not reach the fountain head of the difficulty at all. The scheme to Christianize

the Constitution is in the highest degree absurd and impotent for the purpose at which it aims. Man cannot Christianize himself; how much less, then, can he impart Christianity to anything. He can make the laws over which he has control, just; and that is all that can be asked

for any law. Justice is law, and justice is all of Christianity that can pertain to any law of man. A human statute is valuable just in proportion to its approximation to the unwritten law of justice. The true science of legislation is to discover and apply this law.

While a correct form of government is essential, it is also true that this would avail but little without respect for right and justice in the hearts of the citizens under it. As surely as this respect is lessened and the hold of depravity strengthened in the hearts of men, in public or private life, so surely will affairs under this Government go on from bad to worse, without regard to the "Christian Amendment" which some are seeking to incorporate into the Constitution.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 7 , p. 56.

THE "National Reform" doctrine of governmental accountability to the moral law, could it be carried into effect, would be but a scheme to rob justice of its due and thwart the decrees of God. For God's plan of moral government for the world is based upon individual accountability, and that only, as is seen from the fact that there is no other salvation offered than individual salvation. The Word of God nowhere intimates any purpose on his part to save an earthly government. But it does plainly state that in the final day he will reward every person according to his deeds; and if some individuals could have the responsibility for some of their deeds shifted from their shoulders to the "government," on the ground of having performed them in the capacity of government officials, they would go free, while it would remain for God to deal with the intangible specter of civil government, apart from his dealings with mankind as individuals. It must be obvious to every intelligent, unbiased mind that after individual accountability has been reckoned with at the bar of final judgment, there will be no accountability left to be considered. Individuals may delude themselves with ideas of governmental responsibility, but they cannot deceive God nor cheat justice of the smallest fraction of its rightful due.

A SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST missionary in Russia writes to the *Present Truth*, of London, saying:—

One of our German churches in the South, of some forty members, has of late been forbidden to assemble on the Sabbath. As they persisted, the whole church was imprisoned twice, twenty-four hours each time, and then they have four times been fined fifty

cents (2s.) each, and threatened that in case they do not pay their fine, everything they have will be sold; but their trust is in the Lord.

This is only the logical outcome of State regulation of sabbath observance. One reason why Sunday work by Sabbatarians is objected to in various places is, that it is "of pernicious example," "immoral," etc. It was said in Western Tennessee, "We are not going to have you Adventists teaching our children, by your example, that Sunday is not the Sabbath, *and that Saturday is.*" The observance of the day as sacred to rest and worship certainly teaches that it is the Sabbath; hence, if government prohibits Sunday work because of its testimony against Sunday sacredness, it is only logical that it shall also forbid Sabbath rest.

February 20, 1896

"The Eastern Question" *American Sentinel* 11, 8 , pp. 57, 58.

AFFAIRS in the vicinity of Constantinople and in Asia Minor are more pacific than they were a few weeks ago; but the Eastern Question is not settled, nor will it be until the Turk shall have been driven from Europe.

The real problem that demands solution is not, What shall be the fate of the Turkish Empire? That has long been a foregone conclusion. The Eastern Question is, in brief, To whose lot shall Constantinople and the control of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorous fall when the Turk is driven from Europe? Christendom long since decreed the utter destruction of Ottoman supremacy, and could the crowned heads of Europe agree among themselves as to the disposition of the territory of the Sultan, the Turkish Empire could not last a month. Ottoman autonomy exists to-day solely because of the mutual jealousies of the great powers of Europe.

In 1840, the Sultan, Abd-ul-Mejid, who had just come to the throne, finding himself unable to cope successfully with Mehemet Ali, the rebellious Pasha of Egypt, virtually surrendered his sovereignty into the hands of the powers of Europe by accepting their ultimatum in the Egyptian embroglio and transmitting it to the Pasha, who yielded, not to the Sultan but to the powers; since which time Turkey has existed merely by the sufferance of the other nations of Europe, and is well described by the sobriquet, "the Sick Man of the East." (See ⁸⁵¹ on second page.)

Every great power in Europe looks with covetous eyes upon the city of Constantinople. England, Austria, and Russia, especially have each cherished the hope of one day adding to

58

their possessions this busy mart of the Orient. But hitherto ambition has been restrained by the certain knowledge that the occupation of "Key of the East" by any one of the powers would be the signal for a general European war too awful in its probable consequences to be risked even for such a prize.

Nevertheless the conquest of Turkey, the possession of Constantinople, and the command of the passage between the Mediterranean and the Black Seas have long been the avowed purpose of Russia. Peter the Great cherished this ambition two centuries ago and left it as a sacred legacy to his successors. In his will, the great Czar said:—

Take every possible means of gaining Constantinople and the Indies (for he who rules there will be the true sovereign of the world); excite war continually in Turkey and Persia; establish fortresses in the Black Sea; get control of the sea by degrees, and also of the Baltic, which is a double point, necessary to the realization of our project; accelerate as much as possible the decay of Persia; penetrate to the Persian Gulf; re-establish, if possible, by the way of Syria, the ancient commerce of the Levant; advance to the Indies, which are the great depth of the world. Once there, we can do without the gold of England.

How undeviatingly this policy has been followed by the Czars will appear from an extract from Russian history:—

In 1696, Peter the Great wrested the Sea of Azov from the Turks, and kept it. Next, Catharine the Great won the Crimea. In 1812, by the peace of Bucharest, Alexander I. obtained Moldavia, and the prettily named province of Bessarabia, with its apples, peaches, and cherries. Then came the great Nicholas, who won the right of the free navigation of the Black Sea, the Dardanelles, and the Danube.

Great as were these advances Russian ambition was not satisfied; and in 1853 the Czar attempted to establish "a protectorate over all Christians in Turkey belonging to the Greek Church. This claim not being allowed by the Port, a Russian army entered the Danubian principalities. "After ineffective negotiations war was declared by the Sultan on the 4th of October." ⁸⁶²

In this, the Crimean war, England and France allied themselves with Turkey; Russia was defeated and lost some territory previously

gained; but, in 1870, when all Europe was intently watching the desperate conflict between France and Germany, the Czar announced to the powers that he would no longer be bound by the Treaty of Paris, made in 1856, which excluded his ships and arsenals from the Black Sea; and since that time the Euxine has been practically Russian territory.

But the long-cherish goal of Muscovite ambition had not been reached, and only a few years later eastern Europe was again darkened by an ominous war cloud. Russian intrigue was at work, and in 1875 Bosnia and Herzegovina revolted; and in a few months Bulgaria was involved in the rebellion. Servia and Montenegro also took up arms. The atrocities attending the efforts of the Turks to suppress rebellion were such as to excite the indignation of the civilized world. But the resources of European diplomacy were exhausted in fruitless attempts to gain from the Porte some real security for better government in the distracted provinces, and in April, 1877, Russia again declared war.

The neutrality of Austria had been secured by a secret agreement permitting that country to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina, if Russia should extend its influence beyond the Balkans. England would doubtless have interfered [*sic.*] but the Bulgarian massacres had excited such horror and indignation that Britain was forced to remain neutral. Lord Beaconsfield, then Prime Minister, stipulated, however, that Egypt should not become the scene of hostilities, and that the Russians should not occupy Constantinople, except temporarily. In this way Turkey was left without an *active* ally, and the following February the Russian army reached the suburbs of the coveted city; but the Czar, knowing that England would not permit him to reap the full fruits of his victory, concluded a treaty of peace with Turkey, March 3, 1878, and shortly withdrew his troops from Ottoman territory.

As a result of the war, several independent and semi-independent principalities were created out of what had formerly been Turkish territory; and in these, Russian influence continued to manifest itself. They have been saved from Muscovite greed only by the influence of England and Austria, made potent by English cannon and Austrian columns.

Russia had gained the Black Sea, but could advance into Asia Minor only by aggressions in Armenia. To this end revolt was encouraged there, until a few months since open rebellion afforded

pretext for Mohammedan hate to manifest itself in the massacre of those who bore the name of Christians. This doubtless was the cause of the atrocities which so horrified the world only a few weeks ago. From a human standpoint, only one thing prevented summary interference on the part of the "Christian" powers, and that was jealousy of each other. But God makes even the wrath of man to praise him, and the remainder of wrath he restrains.⁸⁷³ Universal war would greatly retard the progress of the gospel, and so God holds in check these warlike elements until his work is accomplished in the earth. How often during the past twenty years have men said, the final catastrophe can be averted only a few months at most, then universal, devastating war must come. But heavenly messengers restrain the armies of earth. "I saw four angels," says the inspired penman, "standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any tree. And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God: and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea, Saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads."⁸⁸⁴

Many times the speedy dismemberment of Turkey has appeared to be inevitable. But though without friends or allies Turkey has received aid either directly or indirectly in every emergency, and has thus been preserved as a nation; but nobody doubts that the time will come, when, having filled up the cup of its iniquity, the Ottoman power will be swept from the face of the earth.

To the testimony of the unmistakable trend of political events is added the declarations of the Word of God. The prophecy declares plainly that notwithstanding the fact that the Turk has been supported more or less directly in the past by other powers, he will finally be driven from Europe. "He shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain," says the inspired Word, "yet he shall come to his end, *and none shall help him.*"⁸⁹⁵

"Between the seas in the glorious holy mountain" refers unmistakably to Jerusalem, located between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. Palestine is Turkish territory, and the Mohammedan, equally with the Christian, regards Jerusalem as holy ground. And what is more natural than that driven from Europe and fired by religious fanaticism, the Turk should make the "City of David" his capital?

But such a transfer of the Ottoman seat of government will be no means settle the Eastern Question: it will only change its form. Turkish hate and fanaticism will beget like feelings in "Christian" breasts, and Christendom will demand the expulsion of the Turk from the "Holy City." "He shall come to his end and *none* shall help him." And what then? Let the prophecy answer: "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever. But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." ⁹⁰6

The seal of the book of Daniel has been broken. Knowledge of the Scriptures, as well as of the arts and sciences, has increased wonderfully, and in the light of the divine Word the present status of the Eastern Question points unmistakably to the soon coming of the "King of kings and Lord of lords" ⁹¹7 to claim the promise of the Father and to fulfill his word: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." ⁹²8 "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." ⁹³9 And in these events only will be found the final settlement of the Eastern Question.

"What They Want" *American Sentinel* 11, 8 , pp. 58, 59.

THE "National Reform" conception of the State,—the conception upon which Sunday legislation is demanded of Congress and other law-making bodies,—is that the State is the creature of God, and therefore amenable to God's moral law,—that law which says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," etc.

But the "National Reform" party do not purpose to abolish or change the form of this Government. They want it to be "Christian"—to be a government of God on earth, but they do not purpose to abolish the various offices which are now filled by the people's representatives. They do not advocate a formal transfer of the government of God, by a general abdication of office in his favor. They are probably aware that the Almighty would take no notice of any such action; and moreover, it would seriously interfere with their

59

plans if he should do so. They would have the various functions and offices of government remain as they are; at least, they have given no hint of any purpose to the contrary.

The question then arises, In this government of God on earth, who would do the governing? We are told of course that God would govern; but how would this be done? He will not descend himself, nor send angels down from heaven, to take control of affairs. No; it will still remain for men to fill the quondam positions of public trust. But how is it to be known what men are suitable for these positions? How is the divine will to be made known in this respect? Where now is the pillar of cloud, from which God communicated with his people of old? Where is the visible shrine of his glory to which men may seek, or where the Urim and the Thummim, by which his will was wont to be made known? Where are the seers and prophets by whose anointing it may be manifest what men are chosen of God? There are none, must be the confession of the religious world. And still the necessity remains of selecting such men for public office as will make this a government of God.

How then can it be done? Will the choice be left to the people themselves? That would not do, for more than half the people of the land are not even professedly Christians. Hence they could not select the proper candidates for office. But the "reform" party are not unprepared for this emergency. They have a solution of the problem, and it has been already announced. It appeared in an article by Rev. W. F. Crafts, in the *Christian Statesman* of July 5, 1888. It was stated in one sentence, thus:—

The preachers are the successors of the prophets.

This throws a flood of light upon the whole situation. Anciently, the prophets made known the ones whom God had appointed to office; the same will now be done by the preachers. And obviously no

preachers can so fittingly assume this task as those who have so long recognized and advocated its necessity!

And thus is seen the purpose of the demand for a "Christian" government: This must be a government of God; it must therefore be a government by Christian officials; the officials must therefore be chosen by the preachers. In short, if only this is made a government of God, we [the preachers] will do the governing! And that is what we want, and are determined to have!

And what the people will then have in place of their present free government, is set forth in the article, "Clerical Civil Government," on page 60.

"Going to the Root of the Matter" *American Sentinel* 11, 8 , p. 59.

REFERRING to the so-called Christian amendment, the *Truth Seeker*, of this city, says:—

Freethinkers go to the root of the matter by refusing to admit the existence of the being the Christians describe as God; by denying that civil government has any other source than the people who establish it, and by opposing all religious legislation as a fraud, a usurpation, and a tyranny. This ground is perfectly tenable under the Constitution and it is the only refuge from the tide of religious fanaticism and political hypocrisy that is floating the theocrats on the Washington.

This is a mistake. It is much easier to go to the root of the matter while acknowledging the being of God, and that rights have a higher source than the will of the people. "There is no power but of God," and "the powers that be are ordained of God." But, as we have many times show, as God has ordained these powers, so he has limited them, and in this fact is our only security.

The Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson, an avowed liberal, recognizes both the being of God, and that he is the author of rights, and consequently of government. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," wrote Jefferson, "that all men are created equal; that *they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.*" These words recognize the Creator and the divine origin of rights. If civil government had no other source than the people, then there could be no rights superior to the will of the people; and the pagan motto, "Whatever is, is right," would be true in government as in everything else. But the Declaration of Independence distinctly

affirms the divine origin of human rights and makes those rights superior to human government, because they are God-given.

Government is ordained of God to be "a terror to evil-doers and a praise to them that do well." He has, therefore, ordained no invasion of the rights which he himself gave, and whatever liberty freethinkers enjoy to-day is due to the recognition by their fellowmen of the fact that they, equally with other men, are by their Creator endowed with certain unalienable rights; consequently they and they only go to the root of this matter who recognize God as the Creator, and who, acknowledging his right to command them, maintain their God-given right to worship him according to the dictates of their own consciences, and who also consistently maintain that every other man has the same God-given right not to worship if he so elects.

"Clerical Civil Government" *American Sentinel* 11, 8 , pp. 60, 61.

A KNOWLEDGE of what this Government will become when its legislators surrender fully to the demands of the clergy, and its laws are modeled after (their ideas of) the will of God, is not dependent upon theory or logic. It is furnished us by the plain testimony of historical facts.

There is nothing new under the sun,—not even the "National Reform" theory of government. Indeed, that theory is older than the theory expressed in our national Constitution, and has been many times put upon trial. History is full of instruction upon this point; but her lessons are never sufficiently learned by the generality of mankind. This is why history—evil history—so persistently [*sic.*] repeats itself.

We have not to go back very far into the past to find the information sought. Nor are we obliged to turn to Roman Catholic lands. Indeed, those most active in National Reform work are the descendants of the old Scottish Covenanters, and it is the Scottish Covenanter theory of government which they are seeking to establish in this country. That theory was once well established in Scotland, and very interesting to enlightened people in this age is the record of the proceedings under it. That record may be found in "Buckle's History of Civilization." First, however, by way of introduction, we quote the following from the "Encyclopedia Britannica," article, "Presbyterianism":—

For the spiritual tyranny which they [the Covenanters] introduced the reader should refer to Mr. Buckle's famous chapter;

or, if he thinks those statements to be partial or exaggerated, to original records, such as those of the Presbyterian of St. Andrews and Cupar. The arrogance of the ministers' pretensions and the readiness with which these pretensions were granted, the appalling conceptions of the Deity which were inculcated, and the absence of all contrary expression of opinion, the intrusions on the domain of the magistrate, the vexatious interference in every detail of family and commercial life, and the patience with which it was borne, are to an English reader alike amazing. "We acknowledge," said they, "that according to the latitude of the Word of God (which is our theme) we are allowed to treat in an ecclesiastical way of greatest and smallest, from the king's throne that should be established in righteousness, to the merchant's balance that should be used in faithfulness." The liberality of the interpretation given to this can only be judged of after minute reading.

Turning now to "Buckle's famous chapter" (chapter V. of his "History of Civilization"), we find the following (the notes, in brackets, being from Buckle's foot-notes in proof of his statements):—

"According to the Presbyterian polity, which reached its height in the seventeenth century, the clergyman of the parish selected a certain number of laymen on whom he could depend, and who, under the name of elders, were his councillors, or rather the ministers of his authority. They, when assembled together, formed what was called the Kirk-Session, and this little court, which enforced the decisions uttered in the pulpit, was so supported by the superstitious reverence of the people, that it was far more powerful than any civil tribunal. By its aid, the minister became supreme. For, whoever presumed to disobey him was excommunicated, was deprived of his property, and was believed to have incurred the penalty of eternal perdition."

"The clergy interfered with every man's private concerns, ordered how he should govern his family, and often took upon themselves the personal control of his household. [Clarendon, under the year 1640, emphatically says, "The preacher reprehended the husband, governed the wife, chastised the children, and insulted over the servants, in the houses of the greatest men."—*Note 26.*] Their minions, the elders, were everywhere; for each parish was divided into several quarters, and to each quarter one of these officials was allotted, in order that he might take special notice of what was done in his own district. Besides this, spies were appointed, so that nothing could escape their supervision."

Sunday observance was enforced in a manner which, to even the strictest National Reformer, would have been unexceptionable:—

"Not only the streets, but even private houses, were searched, and ransacked, to see if any one was absent from church while the minister was preaching." [In 1652, the Kirk Session of Glasgow "brot boyes and servants before them, for breaking the sabbath and other faults. They had clandestine censors, and gave money to some for this end." And by the Kirk-Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen, it was "thochy expedient that ane Baillie with tua of the session pas throw the towne everie sabbath-day, and nott [note] sic as they find absent fra the sermons ather afor or after none [either before or after noon]: and for that effect that thoy pas and *sersche sic house as they think maist meit*, and pas athort the streittis." "Ganging throw the towne on the ordinar preiching days in the welk, als weill as on the sabbath-day to cause the people to resort to the sermons. "The session allous the searchers to go into houses and apprehend absents from the Kirk.]"—Notes 28, 29.

The preacher was exalted to a position which, in the public mind, must have been but little short of the place of deity:—

"To him [the minister], all must listen, and him all must obey. Without the consent of his tribunal, no person might engage himself either as a domestic servant, or as a field laborer. If any one incurred the displeasure of the clergy, they did not scruple to summon his servants and force them to state whatever they know respecting him, and whatever they had seen done in his house. [In 1652, Sir Alexander Irvine indignantly writes, that the Presbytery of Aberdeen, "when they had tried many wayes, bot in vaine, to mak probable this their vaine imaginatione, they, at lenthe, when all other meanes failed thame, by ane unparalleled barbaritie, enforced mny serwandis to reweall upon oathe what they sawe, herd, or knewe done within my house, beyond which no Turkische inquisitione could pase."—Note 31.] To speak disrespectfully of a preacher was a grievous offense; to differ from him was a heresy; even to pass him in the streets without saluting him, was punished as a crime. His very name was regarded as sacred, and not to be taken in vain. And that it might be properly protected, and held in due honor, an assembly of the church, in 1642, forbade it to be used in any public paper unless the consent of the holy man had been previously obtained."

The "law and order" leagues, city vigilance leagues, and "societies for the prevention of crime," were very numerous:—

"The arbitrary and irresponsible tribunals, which now sprung up all over Scotland, united the executive authority with the legislative, and exercised both functions at the same time. Declaring that certain acts ought not to be committed, they took the law into their own hands, and punished those who had committed them. According to the principles of this new jurisprudence, of which the

clergy were the authors, it became a sin for any Scotchman to travel in a Catholic country. It was a sin for any Scotch innkeeper to admit a Catholic into his inn. It was a sin for any Scotch town to hold a market either on Saturday or on Monday, because both days were near Sunday. It was a sin for a Scotchwoman to wait at a tavern; it was a sin for her to live alone; it was also a sin for her to live with unmarried sisters. It was a sin to go from one town to another on Sunday, however pressing the business might be. It was a sin to visit your friend on Sunday. . . . On that day horse exercise was sinful; so was walking in the fields or in the meadows, or in the streets, or enjoying the fine weather by sitting at the door of your own house. To go to sleep on Sunday, before the duties of the day were over, was also sinful, and deserved church

61

censure." [The records of the Kirk Session of Aberdeen, in 1656, have this entry: "Cite Leobell Balfort, servand to William Gordone, tailyeor, being found sleeping at the Loche side on the Lord's day in tyme of sermon."—*Note 186*].

At the "Kirk," the prayers averaged nearly two hours in length, and the "sermons" about three hours and a half; yet it was a great sin even for the children to become tired before they were ended:—

"Halyburton, addressing the young people of his congregation, says: 'Have not you been glad when the Lord's day was over, or at least, *when the preaching was done* that ye might get your liberty? Has it not been a burden to you, to sit so long in the church? Well, *this is a great sin.*'"—*Note 186*.

"Heresy," or "pretended liberty of conscience," was the crime of crimes, and to be punished accordingly:—

["Rutherford's Free Disputation against Pretended Liberty of Conscience" says: "We hold that toleration of all religions is not farre from blasphemy." "If wolves be permitted to teach what is right in their own erroneous conscience, and there be no 'magistrate to put them to shame,' Judges 18:7, and no king to punish them, then godliness and all that concerns the first table of the law must be marred." "Wilde and atheistical liberty of conscience."—*Notes 199, 200.*]

"They taught that it was a sin to tolerate his [the heretic's] notions at all, and that the proper course was to visit him with sharp and immediate punishment. Going yet further, they broke the domestic ties, and set parents against their offspring. They taught the father to smite the unbelieving child and to slay his own boy sooner than to allow him to propagate error. ["A third benefit (which is a branch of the former), is zeal in the godly against false teachers, who shall be so tender of the truth and glory of God and the safety of the church (all which are endangered by error), that it

shall overcome natural affection in then; so that parents shall not *spare their own children*, being seducers, but shall either by an heroick act (such as was in Pineas, Num. 25:8), *themselves judge him worthy to die, and give sentence, and execute it*, or cause him to be punished, by bringing him to the magistrate. . . . The toleration of a false religion in doctrine or worship, and the exemption of the erroneous from civil punishment, is not more lawful under the New Testament than it was under the Old."—*Hutcheson's Exposition on the Minor Prophets, the Prophets, the Prophecies of Zechariah*—Note 201.]

"As if this were not enough, they tried to extirpate another affection, even more sacred and more devoted still. They laid their rude and merciless hands on the holiest passion of which our nature is capable, the love of a mother for her son. Into that sanctuary, they dared to intrude; into that they thrust their grant and ungentle forms. If a mother held opinions of which they disapproved they did not scruple to invade her household, take away her children, and forbid her to hold communication with them. Or if, perchance, her son had incurred their displeasure, they were not satisfied with forcible separation, but they labored to corrupt her heart, and harden it against her child, so that she might be privy to the act. In one of these cases mentioned in the records of the church of Glasgow, the Kird-Session of that town summoned before them a woman, merely because she had received into her own house her own son, after the clergy had excommunicated him. So effectually did they work upon her mind, that they induced her to promise, not only that she would shut her door against the child, but that she would aid in bringing him to punishment. She had sinned in loving him; she had sinned, even, in giving him shelter; but, says the record, 'she promised not to do it again, and to tell the magistrates when he comes next to her.'

"She promised not to do it again. She promised to forget him whom she had borne of her womb and suckled at her breast. She promised to forget her boy, who had oftentimes crept to her knees, and had slept in her bosom, and whose tender frame she had watched over and nursed. . . . To hear of such things is enough to make one's blood surge again, and raise a tempest in our inmost nature. But to have seen them, to have lived in the midst of them, and yet not to have rebelled against them, is to us utterly inconceivable, and proves in how complete a thralldom the Scotch were held, and how thoroughly their minds, as well as their bodies, were enslaved.

"What more need I say? What further evidence need I bring to elucidate the real character of one of the most detestable tyrannies ever seen on the earth? When the Scotch Kirk was at the height of its power, we may search history in vain for any institution which

can compete with it, except the Spanish Inquisition. Between these two there is a close and intimate analogy. Both were intolerant, both were cruel, both made war upon the finest parts of human nature, and both destroyed every vestige of religious freedom."

It may be said, of course, that all this was back in the seventeenth century, when men were narrow and bigoted in their ideas, and intolerant in matters of religion. Yes, that was the seventeenth century, when men were bigoted and self-opinionated and revengeful, and hated others who differed from them, and lusted for power in both civil and spiritual affairs; and this is the nineteenth century, when human nature is exactly the same that it was then. To-day men are narrow-minded, bigoted, full of prejudices and passions, and as eager to obtain power and to use it for any purpose they may see fit, as they ever were in the past. Let the "National Reform" party succeed—let there be a resurrection of the Scottish Covenanter theory of government in this land, and there will be a chapter in our national history parallel to that in Scotland's history to which we have referred.

We present no arraignment of clergymen, as such; we ourselves believe and preach the gospel of salvation through Christ. If we did not, the AMERICAN SENTINEL would not be published. But there are clergymen and clergymen—some who are eager to get control of civil affairs in order that they may be conducted on a "Christian" basis, and others who see that compulsion in religious matters is contrary to the gospel, and ruinous to both the Church and the State. The clergymen who would assume control of civil affairs if they could, are not to be trusted. And, sad to say, they are a numerous and growing company in our fair land, and are able to marshal a mighty host of adherents.

The proper administration of civil affairs for the preservation of peace and order, is through the regularly constituted and authorized officials of the government, and not through the clergy, or through "Law and Order" leagues, "City Vigilance" leagues, Epworth leagues, "Christian Endeavor" leagues, societies for the "Prevention of Crime," or anything else of the sort. If the regularly-constituted officials of the government are not trustworthy, let others be appointed in their place; if they are not sufficiently numerous, let the number be increased. But let religion be kept out of politics, and to all those of whatever profession who would seize upon the civil power in the interests of a religious theory of government, let it be emphatically [*sic.*] said, "Hands off."

"Divine Right" ⁹⁴¹ *American Sentinel* 11, 8 , pp. 61, 62.

IT is the *divine right* of every man to believe or not believe, to be religious or not religious, as he shall choose for himself. God himself, in Jesus Christ, has said: "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." John 12:47, 48. Thus the God of heaven, the Author of Christianity, has left every soul free to believe or not believe, to to [*sic.*] receive or reject, his words, as the man may choose for himself. And when any man chooses not to believe, and chooses to reject his word, the Lord does not condemn him.

Whoever, therefore, would presume to exercise jurisdiction over the religious belief or observances of any man, or would compel any man to conform to the precepts of any religion, or to comply with the ceremonies of any religious body, or would condemn any man for not so complying, does in that thing put himself above Jesus Christ, and, indeed, above God, for he exercises a prerogative which God himself refuses to exercise.

The word of God is the word of life. To whomsoever that word comes, whosoever heareth it, to him in that word there comes life from God—eternal life. Then he who rejects that word rejects life. He who rejects life does in that very thing choose death. And he who chooses death by the rejection of life does in that pass judgment of death upon himself. And so it stands written, "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and *judge yourselves* unworthy of everlasting life," etc. Acts 13:46. Thus it is that God judges no man for rejecting his word; and this is how it is that that word shall judge men in the last day. "In that day" that word of life will stand there as the witness to all that eternal life came to all, but was rejected, and nothing but death remains. And when the death is received, each one receives simply what he has chosen, and in that the God of love does not condemn, but is sorry instead.

Now to the Christian church is committed this word of life as she is sent into the world. She is to "preach the word." To her it is written, Do all things without murmurings and disputings; that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as

lights in the world; *holding forth the word of life.*" Phil. 2:14-16. Thus the true Church is in the world "in Christ's stead," (2 Cor. 5:20), to hold forth, to bring to men, the word of life. In so doing she judges no one, she condemns no one, she sets at naught no one, for she "is subject unto Christ" in everything (Eph. 5:24), and he ever says, "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge [condemn] him not."

In this word of Christ also establishes the divine right of every man, at his own free choice, to dissent from, and to disregard in every way, any doctrine, dogma, ordinance, rite, or institution of any church on earth. And no man can ever rightly be molested or disquieted in any way whatever in the free exercise of this divine right.

A Subtle Subterfuge

Professedly this right has always been recognized by both Catholicism and the different sects of Protestantism, but in nearly every instance the profession of recognition of the right has been only a pretense; for, while professing to recognize the right in one way, in another way, and by a sheer subterfuge, it has been denied and attempt made to sweep it entirely away. This subterfuge is for the church to get her dogmas or institutions recognized in the law, and then demand *obedience to the law*, throwing upon the dissenter the odium of "lawlessness and disrespect for the constituted authorities," while she poses as the champion of "law and order," the "conservator of the State, and the stay of society"!

Of all the hypocritical pretenses that were ever employed, this is perhaps the subtlest, and is certainly the meanest. It flourished throughout the Middle Ages, when anything and everything that the Church could invent was thus forced upon the people. Its slimy trail can be traced throughout the history of the "Protestant" sects, in thus forcing upon the people such peculiar institutions as were characteristic of the sect that could obtain

62

control of the law. And now it is made to flourish again, by all the sects together, in thus forcing upon the people the one thing in which they are all agreed, and in which they have obtained control of the law, ⁹⁵² the observance of Sunday, "the Christian sabbath," supported by such auxiliary organizations, such wheels within wheels, as the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, the "Law and Order Leagues," the "Civic Federations," W.C.T.U., Y.M.C.A., Y.P.S.C.E., and so on through the rest of the alphabet.

Sunday, not only according to their own showing, but by every other fair showing that can be made, is a religious institution, a church institution, only. This they all know as well as they know anything. And yet every one of these organizations, principal or auxiliary, is working constantly to get this church institution fixed, and more firmly fixed, *in the law*, with penalties attached that are more worthy of barbarism than of civilization; and then, when anybody objects to it, they all cry out that "it is not a question of religion; it is simply a question of *law*. We are not asking any religious observance; all that we ask is *respect for law*"!!

The Christian, Protestant, and American answer to all this is that neither the Sunday institution nor any other religious or ecclesiastical institution, *has any right to a place in the law*, this does not take away the right of dissent. The divine right of dissent from religious or ecclesiastical institutions abides ever the same, whether the institution is out of the law or in the law. And when the institution is fixed in the law, the right of dissent then extends *to that law*. The *subterfuge* cannot destroy the *right*.

The Courts Indorse the Subterfuge.

From the church organizations the courts have caught up this cry. And, though acknowledging that the Sunday institution is religious; that it is enacted and enforced at the will of the church; and that the logic of it is the union of Church and State; yet they insist that, as it is in the law, and the law is for the public good, no right of dissent can be recognized, but the dissenter "may be made to suffer for his defiance *by persecutions*, if you call them so, on the part of the great majority." ⁹⁶³

This argument is as old as is the contest for the right of the free exercise of religious belief. It was the very position occupied by Rome when the disciples of Christ were sent into the world to preach religious freedom to all mankind. Religious observances were enforced by the law. The Christians asserted and maintained the rights to dissent from all such observances, and, in fact, from *every one* of the religious observances of Rome, and to believe religiously for themselves, though in so doing they totally disregard the laws, which, on the part of the Roman State, were held to be beneficial to the population. Then, *as now*, it was held that, though religious belief was the foundation of the custom, yet this was no objection to it,

because it had become a part of the legal system of the government, and was enforced by the State for its own good. ⁹⁷4 But Christianity *then* refused to recognize any validity in any such argument, and so it does now.

February 27, 1896

"God's Word vs. Man's Word" *American Sentinel* 11, 9 , pp. 65, 66.

WHEN the Jews sent priests and Levites to inquire of John the Baptist, "Who art thou?" he replied, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias." ⁹⁸1 He was, in so far as he attracted the notice of men, the personification of the voice of God.

The same may be said of the great reformers who have lived in other ages of the world. They have stood out from amidst the multitudes of their day, as salient figures in a conflict between God's word and the word of man; yet not as being themselves the cynosures of the public gaze, but as color bearers, holding high the standard of eternal truth—the word of the living God.

So it was with John Wycliffe, the first of the great reformers of modern times. Our illustration presents him standing before a convocation of Catholic prelates at Oxford. The scene is one characteristic of his whole experience as a reformer. He was never long free from the presence of the champions of popish dogmas and traditions. They opposed him with the word of man in its most exalted form,—the decrees of councils, the traditions of "the fathers," and the bulls of "infallible" popes; and he replied to them with "Thus saith the Lord." Sometimes surrounded by friends, but never leaning upon human support, he faced the foes of freedom and divine truth without flinching, and in his work was revealed again the truth of the prophet's utterance, "All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field; the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, . . but the word of our God shall stand forever." ⁹⁹2

The life of Wycliffe as a reformer is but a record of the battles of the word of God with religious error in the form of the traditions and commandments of men, and of its triumphs over them. Wycliffe himself well knew that the conflict waged by them was not with him. When some monks came one day to enjoy the sight of the reformer lying ill upon what seemed his death-bed, and to predict to him the

speedy downfall of his work, he raised himself upon his couch, and piercing them with his gaze, replied, "With what do you think you are contending? with a feeble old man, tottering upon the brink of the grave? No; but with truth—truth, which is mightier than you, and will one day vanquish you!" The monks withdrew discomfited.

The opposing forces of truth and error are still ranged against each other to-day; for the contest is not yet ended. To-day the same power that opposed Wycliffe stands glorying in its might, trusting even that all the world will yet bow in worship at its feet. It is holding forth the word of the mortal being whom it has pronounced "infallible," with the commandments and traditions of men, as superseding the precepts of God. Nor does it flatter itself without reason, in human judgment, for all the world is looking upon it in wonder and admiration; all nations are working to confirm its decrees. In particular, that power is the Papacy; but in general, it is any earthly power, papal or Protestant, which clings to the evil principle of trust in the word of man.

The issue is joined to-day for a decisive combat. God's Word declares, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." On the other hand, the word of man—traditions church precept, and the civil "law"—declares the first day to be the Sabbath. The first-day sabbath is Rome's heralded token of the supremacy of her word in spiritual things; and in anticipation of her long-awaited triumph, she says in her heart, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." ¹⁰⁰³

66

She is stretching forth her hand to seize again her long-lost supremacy on earth. But in the heavens a mandate has gone forth, "It is time for thee, Lord, to work; for they have made void thy law."

The dramatic scenes of Wycliffe's time are to be reënacted. The champions of divine truth are again to stand before kings and rulers; the word of the Infinite is again to be seen towering in divine majesty above the precepts of mortal man. The triumphs of truth in every age culminate here. We have reached the climax of the great controversy. Over the issue of which day is the Sabbath—which of the signs of two opposing spiritual powers is to be given the honor of men—the battle will be fought to its conclusion. On the one hand stands the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day,—the sign of the Godhead of Him whose word has creative power; and on the other hand is the man-made sabbath—Sunday—the sign of that opposing power which has set its

word above the word of the most High, claiming the right to change the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first. On that side and under that banner will stand all who, whether Catholic or Protestant in name, have given real or apparent assent to this change. In many places this assent is now called for by the civil law; but the word of the Creator upholds a different institution, and demands allegiance to it. Shall we choose Scripture? or tradition?—the word of God? or the word of man? The choice will determine our position in the conflict, and our final destiny.

"A 'Barrier' to the Church" *American Sentinel* 11, 9 , p. 66.

WHEN the Saviour was about to be received up into heaven, having finished his mission upon earth, he said to his disciples, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations . . . all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:18, 20.

Thus the followers of Christ were given the assurance that he would be with them even to the end of the world, having all power in heaven and in earth.

But now, it seems, the Church has met an impassable barrier to her progress. So we are told by Rev. C. N. Donaldson, in the *Christian Statesman*, of February 1. "What," he says, "stands as a mountain barrier to the Church's enlargement is the nation's rebellion against God." The Church has irresistible power, but has met an immovable obstacle! The nation must cease its "rebellion"—the barrier must take itself out of the way—before she can advance!

When the Saviour spoke these words of assurance to the little company whom he had led out from Jerusalem, on the day of his ascension, the nation of which they were subjects was the empire of Rome. It was an idolatrous nation, neither knowing nor caring about the God of the Christians. It was in rebellion against him, if ever a nation could be. Yet the gospel spread with marvelous rapidity throughout the empire, and thousands were converted to Christ in a single day. There was no "mountain barrier" to the Church then in "the nation's rebellion against God."

What is the trouble to-day? Has the promise of Christ failed? Is the fault with Christ, or with "the Church"? Has the power of the gospel

ceased, or has "the Church" separated from Christ until she has lost it?

Christ has a Church to-day, of which he is the head; but his Church is not the church that seeks to an earthly government for power.

Are not the sins of "the Church" the real barrier that stands like a mountain in her path? Isa. 59:1, 2.

"Serving the Church" *American Sentinel* 11, 9 , p. 66.

"THE nation and kingdom that will not serve thee (*i.e.*, the church) shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." This among other texts of Scripture is quoted in the *Christian Statesman*, of January 18, by Rev. J. S. Martin, for the purpose of impressing upon the people their responsibility for the proposed "Christian" amendment to the Constitution. It will be understood, of course, what "the church" is,—namely, himself and his associates who are asking and lobbying for this amendment! So at least its advocates seem to think.

But will the nation accept their mere dictum in this matter? When the nation starts out to "serve the church" according to the ideas of those demanding religious legislation, how is the identity of "the church" to be determined? Will preponderance of numbers be the criterion? If so, then the Roman Catholic denomination is "the church." This the papal church has always affirmed, and is doubtless as ready to receive the humble service of the United States Government to-day, as it was in past centuries to be served by the governments of the Old World.

But the amendment party doubtless do not contemplate giving any such advantage to the Catholic Church. They are thinking only of themselves. They are too short-sighted to discern that such an effort as they are asking of this Government in behalf of "the church" will set all the various denominations—each one of which is preeminently "the church" in its own opinion—against one another, and rekindle the smoldering fires of religious controversy to an appalling extent.

It is very certain that the text of Scripture invoked by the Rev. Mr. Martin does not call upon any government to determine which of the discordant sects is "the church," or to enact any kind of religious legislation.

"Christ's Will as the Civil Law" *American Sentinel* 11, 9 , p. 66.

THE aim of the proposed "Christian" amendment to the Constitution, is to make the "revealed will" of Jesus Christ our "supreme authority in civil affairs." In other words, it is to make that revealed will the civil law of the land.

What is the revealed will of Jesus Christ? For a complete answer, it would be necessary to cite all that has been divinely revealed to man; for in both the "law and the prophets" ¹⁰¹1 which were until John the Baptist, and the writings of the apostles, it was the "Spirit of Christ" ¹⁰²2 that testified the things that were spoken. But in brief, it may be said that the revealed will of Jesus Christ is the gospel of salvation through faith in him. And it is now proposed to make this the civil law of the land!

The revealed will of Christ is that all persons shall be saved from sin. And the gospel is "the power of God unto salvation [from sin] to every one that believeth." ¹⁰³3 The power of God is seen in his work of creation. "He spake, and it was; he commanded, and it stood fast." ¹⁰⁴4 Through faith in Jesus Christ, by the power of God, we are re-created in him. ¹⁰⁵5 Being crucified with him, we also live with him—or rather, he lives in us, ¹⁰⁶6 and while dead to self, we are alive unto God. We yield ourselves to his will, saying Amen to all his word, and by the infinite power of God, which was manifested in the creation of the world and all things in six days, we are put to death with Christ and created new, so that we are without sin. Being thus without sin, we are free from death, and fitted for eternal life with God. This is the "mystery of godliness"—the plan by which God saves men in his kingdom.

All this is the revealed will of Jesus Christ; and it is now seriously proposed to incorporate this into the civil law of this land! Did ever absurdity reach a more appalling height?

"The power of God unto salvation" is not experienced by all, but only by "every one that believeth." It is Christ's revealed will that every person should believe on his name: in other words, he wants all persons to be saved. But belief is a matter of free choice; for we are not automatons, but free moral agents, in order that we may develop character. Now it is proposed to make Christ's revealed will the civil law,—that is, to force all men to believe on him whether they want to or not! A "Christian" scheme, truly!

Christ wills that all men should love one another. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another." ¹⁰⁷7 This is to be made the civil law, and men are to be forced to love each other, or punished by the usual legal penalties! This also is very "Christian," as well as reasonable!

Christ wills that all men should keep his Father's commandments. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." ¹⁰⁸ 8 But in a state of sin, men cannot keep God's commandments; "because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." ¹⁰⁹9 But now it is proposed to make Christ's will the civil law; so now that law will say to the sinner. No matter about your inability to do the will of God, you must do it whether you can or not. If you do not, you will be fined or imprisoned, or otherwise punished! How preëminently "Christian" is this!

We read that "without faith it is impossible to please him [God]." ¹¹⁰10 As it is the will of Christ that all men should have faith, the civil law (under this "Christian" amendment) will say to all, Have faith, or you will be accounted a criminal. We shall then see people converted by wholesale, no doubt!

Let this amendment be adopted, and an era of bigotry, hypocrisy, strife and persecution will be ushered in, the like of which this country has never witnessed.

The only way in which the revealed will of Christ can be carried into effect is by the power of God, through the operations of the Holy Spirit. And therefore this scheme to make his will the civil law of the land, is one which substitutes man's littleness for God's infinity,—man's ignorance for God's wisdom, man's sinfulness for God's righteousness. And this scheme is labeled "Christian"! Verily it is true that "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light!" ¹¹¹11

March 5, 1896

"The Power of the Reformation" *American Sentinel* 11, 10 , pp. 73, 74.

THE weapons of Christian "warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." ¹¹²1

When the gospel commission was given, eighteen hundred years ago, to a handful of despised Jews, Rome ruled the world; and it was a capital offense to introduce into that empire any new religion.

The gospel commission challenged, therefore, the authority of the Cesars. It said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."¹¹³ 2 Rome said: "Whoever introduces new religions, . . . shall, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death."¹¹⁴3

But Christ said, "Go;" and his followers obeyed. He organized no army to accompany them; he provided no safe-conduct bearing the seal of the empire; he simply said: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."¹¹⁵4 It was the word of God against the powers of earth; and that word which "is quick [living], and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword,"¹¹⁶5 "went forth conquering, and to conquer."¹¹⁷6

As the powers of earth had persecuted the Master, so they also persecuted his servants. As foretold by the Saviour, the world hated them even as it hated him. The authority of Rome, wielding fire and sword, was repeatedly invoked against the gospel and those who proclaimed it; but its progress was irresistible. The more Rome oppressed the truth the more it spread. "The blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church."

At last "Christianity" ascended the throne of the Cesars and swayed the scepter of the world; but it was no longer the Christianity of Christ. His weapons "are not carnal, but mighty through God." But now the Church relinquished "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God,"¹¹⁸7 and seized a material sword. She had exchanged the power of God for the power of the State, and in so doing had apostasized from Christ.

From century to century a worldly church, living in adulterous union with the kings of the earth, lending herself to their ambitions and receiving in return such power as they had to give, sank deeper and deeper into the slough to spiritual darkness; until at the close of the fifteenth century she made merchandize of the grace of God and waxed rich from the sale of indulgencies, issuing licenses to sin and granting "pardon" for money! Notwithstanding Peter's rebuke to Simon, the sorcerer,¹¹⁹8 the gift of God was offered in exchange for filthy lucre.

And then came the Reformation. It was not a schism in the Roman Catholic Church; it was not a revolt against the pope of Rome; it was

not primarily even an effort to attain to purity of doctrine: it was a return to the simplicity of the gospel, the acceptance of "the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." ¹²⁰9

Martin Luther's soul, panting after God even as the "hart panteth after the water brooks," ¹²¹10 failing to find him in penances, discerned him in the still small voice which whispers, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." ¹²²11 That moment the Reformation began in his own heart, and the story of his experience welling up to his lips and flowing from his tongue proved to be to other thirsty souls the same gospel message given by the apostles fifteen centuries before, and the same divine power was in it.

As depicted in our illustration, the wrath of evil men was stirred, but God overruled it for his glory. The divine word was fulfilled: "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain." ¹²³12 The clenched fist might be thrust forth, but it touched not the devoted preacher of the gospel of justification by faith; the half-drawn sword clung, as it were, to the scabbard; the hand that grasped the murderous knife seemed

74

palsied by the power of the word of God; the divine promise, "Lo, I am with you always," was fulfilled, and all the authority of Leo X., backed up by the power of Charles V., was not sufficient to cope with the simple word of salvation spoken by Luther and his co-workers.

"Our first object," said the Reformer, "must be to win men's hearts; and for that purpose we must preach the gospel. To-day the word will fall into one heart, to-morrow into another, and it will operate in such a manner that each one will withdraw from the mass and abandon it. God does more by his word alone than you and I and all the world by our united strength. God lays hold upon the heart, and when the heart is taken, all is won." ¹²⁴13

"I will preach, discuss, and write; but I will constrain none, for faith is a voluntary act. See what I have done! I stood up against the pope, indulgences, and papists, but without violence or tumult. I put forward God's word; I preached and wrote—this was all I did. And yet while I was asleep, or seated familiarly at table with Amsdorff and Melancthon, . . . the word that I had preached overthrew popery, so that neither prince nor emperor has done it so much harm. And yet I did nothing: the Word alone did all. If I had wished to appeal to force, the whole of Germany would perhaps have been deluged with blood.

But what would have been the result? Ruin and desolation both to body and soul. I therefore kept quiet, and left the word to run through the world alone. Do you know what the devil thinks when he sees men resort to violence to propagate the gospel through the world? Seated with folded arms behind the fire of hell, Satan says, with malignant looks and frightful grin: 'Ah! how wise these madmen are to play my game!' But when he sees the word running and contending alone on the field of battle, then he is troubled, and his knees knock together; he shudders and faints with fear." ¹²⁵14

But having attained popularity some of the Reformers, like the bishops of the early church, forget the true source of power and fell. "The Reformation," says D'Aubigne, "was accomplished in the name of a spiritual principle. It had proclaimed for its teacher the Word of God; for salvation, faith; for king, Jesus Christ; for arms, the Holy Ghost: and had by these very means rejected all worldly elements. Rome had been established by *the law of a carnal commandment*; the Reformation, by *the power of an endless life*.

"If there is any doctrine that distinguishes Christianity from every other religion, it is its spirituality. A heavenly life brought down to man—such is its work; thus the opposition of the spirit of the gospel to the spirit of the world, was the great fact which signalized the entrance of Christianity among the nations. But what its Founder had separated, had soon come together again; the Church had fallen into the arms of the world, and by this criminal union it had been reduced to the deplorable condition in which we find it at the era of the Reformation.

"Thus one of the greatest tasks of the sixteenth century was to restore the spiritual element to its rights. The gospel of the Reformers had nothing to do with the world and with politics. While the Roman hierarchy had become a matter of diplomacy and a court intrigue, the Reformation was destined to exercise no other influence over princes and people than that which proceeds from the gospel of peace.

"If the Reformation, having attained a certain point, became untrue to its nature, began to parley and temporize with the world, and thus ceased to follow up the spiritual principle that it had so loudly proclaimed, it was faithless to God and to itself.

"Henceforward its decline was at hand.

"It is impossible for a society to prosper if it be unfaithful to the principles it lays down. Having abandoned what constituted its life, it can find naught but death.

"It was God's will that this great truth should be inscribed on the very threshold of the temple he was then raising in the world; and a striking contrast was to make this truth stand gloriously prominent.

"One portion of the reform was to seek the alliance of the world, and in this alliance find a destruction full of desolation.

"Another portion, looking up to God, was haughtily to reject the arm of the flesh, and by this very act of faith secure a noble victory.

"If three centuries have gone astray, it is because they were unable to comprehend so holy and so solemn a lesson." ¹²⁶15

It was not to be expected that, emerging from the darkness of Romanism, the Reformers would step at once into the full light of the gospel of Jesus Christ; but the world had a right to expect that they and those who should come after them would go on unto perfection.

The protest of the German princes was the declaration of independence that made possible our own American declaration of God-given, inalienable rights; and cherished and practiced as it might have been, it would have proved under God an emancipation proclamation to a world enslaved by ecclesiasticism.

But after more than three and a half centuries what do we see?—Religion and religious institutions established by law everywhere, and the papacy fast recovering her lost prestige. Nearly all of Europe has religious establishments supported by taxation. Even in France the priests are stipendiaries of the State. While in our own land the Sunday institution, the "test of all religion," ¹²⁷16 is enforced upon all by civil statute, and a powerful lobby is demanding of Congress, under threat of political boycott, the enactment of additional measures of religious legislation. Sad as is the fact, three centuries, yea, nearly four centuries, have gone astray "because they were unable to comprehend so holy and so solemn a lesson" as the gospel commission and the protest of the German princes; and because they knew not "the Scriptures, nor the power of God." ¹²⁸17

"Religious Legislation" *American Sentinel* 11, 10 , p. 74.

RELIGIOUS legislation is always legislation against the true religion. It cannot possibly be anything else.

Religious legislation means enforced religious observances. Thus it is contrary to Christianity, which means religious observances through faith.

The scope of human legislation falls infinitely short of the scope of divine truth; and Christianity is divine truth. It is as high as the throne

of God and as broad as the universe. What folly, therefore, for finite man to undertake to enforce it, in any respect, by legislation which is the expression of his own finite conceptions!

Such legislation would contract the infinite to the finite, and drag the divine down to the level of the human, instead of elevating the human to the level of the divine, as Christianity seeks to do.

What folly, also, and worse than folly, for fallen man to set his sin-stained hand to the infinitely pure and holy law of God! For Christianity is a law; even "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus." Rom. 8:2. Such an act is a repetition, in aggravated form, of the folly of Uzza in trying to steady with his hand the ark of God. See 1 Chron. 13:9, 10.

The force which directs Christianity in this world and makes it effective in the uplifting of mankind, is the holy Spirit. It alone is competent for such a work. Human agency can be properly brought into it only as a means directed and controlled by the Spirit. Whenever it is not so controlled it can only mar the work. And it is so controlled when, and only when, it is operating in perfect harmony with God's Word. The Holy Spirit operates always by the power of God, and never by the power of the human arm.

Being thus against Christianity, religious legislation is never from God, and can never accomplish anything but evil.

"The Unstable Wall" *American Sentinel* 11, 10 , pp. 74, 75.

"And one built up a wall; and lo, others daubed it with untempered mortar."

So wrote the prophet Ezekiel concerning the teachers that should presume to speak in the name of the Lord, when the Lord had not commanded it. Eze. 13:10.

Such a wall exists to-day in the institution of the Sunday sabbath. We have only to read the allegations put forth by its adherents in its support, to know that it is constructed with untempered mortar.

For example, we notice some allegations contained in a recent sermon by Rev. J. H. Brookes, D.D., of St. Louis, Mo., on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the "American Sabbath Union," and reported in the *Mail and Express* (N.Y.) of february 22.

In his sermon Mr. Brookes labored of course to show from the Scripture that the Sunday institution is the true Sabbath; but no such proof can be obtained without perverting Scripture, and perverted

Scripture is the most dangerous form of untruth. It is the untempered mortar with which the Sunday wall is daubed.

The speaker admitted that the Sabbath was instituted at Creation, and that the fourth commandment has never been abolished, but is binding upon all men to-day. But he attempted to treat the Sabbath institution as something distinct from the seventh day!

"Observe," he said, "it is not said, Re-

75

member the seventh day to keep it holy, but 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy'; and 'Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day,' not the seventh day, 'and hallowed it.'"

Immediately before speaking this part of the fourth commandment, God had declared, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." See Ex. 20:8-11. In view of this fact, how utterly puerile is such an "argument" as that here noticed! How utterly untempered the mortar which the speaker put into the Sunday wall!

"In the original institution," he continued, "it is true that it is said, 'God blessed the seventh day' (Gen. 2:3); but the change of language when the law was given shows that the seventh day was blessed not because it was the seventh day, but because it was the Sabbath day." Let us compare the record in Genesis with the language of the law. Turning to the second chapter of Genesis, we find these words:—

Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made: and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work God created and made." Gen. 2:1-3.

Turning now to the law, we find that the fourth commandment declares, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work: . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11.

In Genesis we are told that the Creator blessed and sanctified the seventh day. The fourth commandment tells us that "the seventh day is the Sabbath," and that God "rested the seventh day; wherefore God blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." Where is "the change of language" which authorizes the statement that the seventh day and the Sabbath day were not one and the same at the time the law was spoken on Mt. Sinai, as they were at the Creation?

In instituting the Sabbath, there was, according to the record, no blessing or sanctifying [*sic.*] done except that mentioned in Gen. 2:3, which was the blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day. When God had blessed and sanctified that day, the Sabbath institution was complete, as designed for the use and benefit of mankind. The fourth commandment refers back to this event, reaffirming that "the seventh day is the Sabbath," and that God "blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." And yet the Rev. Mr. Brookes calmly proceeded to say, "The fourth commandment, therefore, does not require the hallowing of the seventh day of the week"!

He then alluded to the fact that when a person journeyed around the earth, he (apparently) gained or lost a day, according to the direction of his journey, citing this as an argument against keeping the seventh day. Would he also cite it as an argument against keeping Sunday? Should we fail to keep the seventh day because the world being round, we cannot all begin or end it at the same time? The argument would be just as good for not eating, sleeping, or transacting business. As a matter of fact, no one has any difficulty in knowing exactly when the seventh day begins, or when it ends, whether he be in North America or in China. If he desires to keep that day, there is nothing at all in nature to prevent his doing so.

Mr. Brookes referred to the death penalty executed upon Sabbath-breakers under the theocracy of Moses' time, as another reason for not keeping the seventh day. The same "reason" would apply to the keeping other commandments besides the fourth. There were penalties for worshiping false gods, dishonoring parents, murder, theft, adultery, and many other offenses, which are not in force to-day; are we therefore at liberty to disregard the commandments prohibiting such things?

The theocracy of Moses' time has passed away, but God's law has not passed away. The penalty for Sabbath-breaking, and for violation of any other of the commandments as well, is still death. But the execution of that penalty rests with God, and not with men. God also, and not man, is the Judge; and when the set time of his judgment arrives, that penalty will be executed upon all who are then found transgressors of his law. But now he invites all men to find pardon and eternal life through the gospel of his Son.

Man has nothing to do with the commandments of God, except to live a life of obedience to them by faith in Christ. Man's laws, in so far as they are just, concern only the preservation of human rights, their

object being to enable men to live securely in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. God's law is spiritual, and therefore entirely beyond the sphere of human authority and power. His law deals with sin; man's law deals only with crime.

In the frequent references to "the eighth day" made in the specifications concerning the ordinances and services of the ceremonial law, as set forth in Leviticus, the Rev. Mr. Brookes affirmed that he saw "intimations" of the Sunday sabbath. What must we think of such a claim to supernatural discernment on the part of one who professes total inability to see that the fourth commandment and the first verses of the second chapter of Genesis are harmonious in declaring the seventh day to be the Sabbath?

For example, he cited the reference to the yearly "feast of tabernacles" found in Lev. 23:39: "Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days: on the first day shall be a sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a sabbath." "There is, then," he said, "not only a seventh-day Sabbath but an eighth-day sabbath," and added, "This fact seems to have been entirely overlooked by the Seventh-day Adventists and Baptists, who are flooding the country with their literature, and seeking to drag the people back to Sinai, instead of leading them up to Calvary"!

We presume no reader of the SENTINEL needs to be told that the days of the month do not necessarily synchronize in numerical order with the days of the week. The fifteenth day of the tenth month may have been any day of the week, from Sunday up to Saturday, just as Christmas or one's birthday, may fall on any day of the week. Consequently "the eighth day" from the fifteenth day of any month can have no special connection whatever with any day of the week. If the fifteenth day of the tenth month,—the first of the feast—was Saturday, the eighth day would also be Saturday; and it is certain that "the eighth day" of this feast fell as often on the seventh-day Sabbath as it did on Sunday, just as certain as it is that the fourth of July falls as often on the seventh day of the week as on Sunday. And it fell as often on Tuesday, Wednesday, and the other days of the week, as it did on Saturday or Sunday. The argument is just as good for a Tuesday or Wednesday sabbath, as for anything else.

Yet the Rev. Mr. Brookes gravely announced to his audience that "it is worthy of notice that in this crowning feast of the year . . . there is a distinct reference to the Lord's day, or the Christian Sabbath. 'On

the first day shall be a sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a sabbath' (Lev. 23:29). There is, then, not only a seventh-day Sabbath but an eighth-day sabbath"! Truly, this "fact" of a "distinct reference" in this to the Sunday sabbath, has been "entirely overlooked by the Seventh-day Adventists and Baptists," as well as by other people possessed [*sic.*] of common sense and a regard for the truth.

This was not the extent of Mr. Brookes' daubing of the Sunday wall with untempered mortar, but it is sufficient for the purpose of this article, which is to show the reader the unstable character of this institution, even when fortified by its ablest defenders. Mr. Brookes did as well as any man could do in establishing the Sunday sabbath by the Word of God. It is an impossible task, since no such proof exists. The Word of the Lord has not spoken it.

Yet the "American Sabbath Union" whose seventh anniversary was (fittingly) commorated [*sic.*] by this discourse, exists for the purpose not only of persuading people to trust in this wall daubed with the untempered mortar of abortive Scriptural proof, but of compelling them to do so by the use of civil pains and penalties, whether they have any confidence in it or not!

It is worth while in conclusion, to notice what the Lord says about this wall. While the true prophets of the Lord are proclaiming his word, announcing the end of all things at hand, the hour of God's judgment come, and the seventh-day Sabbath as a part of that eternal law by which the world will be judged, other prophets are opposing the message of warning with the cry of "Peace, peace," saying in effect to the people that there is no need of reform. However, we will not prolong this article, but let the reader turn for himself to the thirteenth chapter of Ezekiel, and read verses 1-16.

"Sunday Laws Are Antichristian" *American Sentinel* 11, 10 , pp. 75, 76.

THE ground of objection to Sunday laws is much broader than can be covered by the mere necessity of guarding against the violation of human rights. Sunday laws are antichristian; and it is just as important, to say the least, that no law should be enacted which would be in opposition to the work of God, so that laws should be passed for the preservation of the rights of the people.

Of course, all invasion of human rights is contrary to the gospel; but Sunday laws strike directly against the conception of God as the

Creator. They exalt another day than the day set apart by the Creator as the memorial of his power and the sign of his Godhead. Hence they represent the working of a power that stands directly opposed to God.

The Creator rested from his work of creation upon the seventh day. He blessed and sanctified that day, making it the Sabbath for mankind. He gave men his Sabbath in order that they might know, as they observed it, that their God was the Creator. They might know that their God was one in whom they could trust, being he who made the heavens and the earth by his word.

The need of mankind in this respect has certainly not lessened to-day. As men realize their inherent sinfulness and weakness, they seek for some power in which they can trust for deliverance from the chains they have vainly endeavored by their own strength to rend asunder. They realize that only a power

76

which passes their conceptions can raise them from the depths of sinful depravity to a condition of holiness and perfection. And the Sabbath presents to them just that power which they seek. It points them to the Creator, as the One who can make them new in Christ by the power of his word, just as he made all things by that word in the beginning.

The whole power and influence of Sunday laws, however, is against the realization of this blessing. For they command the observance of the first day of the week, which God neither blessed, nor rested upon, and tend to nullify and obliterate the observance of the seventh day. They tend directly to obliterate the conception of God as the Creator and Redeemer, by exalting a day which does nothing to call the mind to the power of which creation and redemption are the manifestations, and by striking against the observance of the day divinely set apart and made the Sabbath for that very purpose.

Such laws are therefore antichristian, and destructive of the highest interests and blessings of mankind.

March 12, 1896

**"The Bible, Protestantism, and the Papacy" *American Sentinel* 11, 11 ,
pp. 81, 82.**

THE two distinguishing features of Protestantism are the supremacy of the word of God and the right of private judgment.

So closely connected are these principles that the latter is only the logical result of the former; for the word of God being the supreme tribunal, the church itself must be judged by it, and even the most humble of the people have the right of appeal to it.

"The Bible, I say, the Bible only," writes Dowling, "is the religion of Protestants. Nor is it of any account in the estimation of the genuine Protestant *how early* a doctrine originated if it is not found in the Bible. . . . The consistent and true-hearted Protestant, standing upon this rock, 'the Bible and the Bible only,' can admit no doctrine upon the authority of tradition." ¹²⁹¹

In that grand protest from which springs the very name of Protestantism, the German princes, rejecting tradition together with papal and imperial authority in all spiritual matters, declared thus for the word of God: "Seeing . . . that this Holy Book is in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness: we are resolved, with the grace of God to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of his only word, such as it is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it. This word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God." ¹³⁰²

In this protest the Reformers assert not only the supremacy of the divine word, but the right of private judgment, for, "he who builds on this foundation shall stand." This is as true of a single individual as of ten thousand, for no matter how large the number in the aggregate, every soul builds for himself, and must stand or fall for himself. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." ¹³¹³

"The principles contained in this celebrated protest," write D'Aubigne, "constitute the very essence of Protestantism. Now this protest opposes two abuses of man in matters of faith: the first is the intrusion of the civil magistrate, and the second the arbitrary authority of the church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate; and the authority of the word of

God above the visible church. In the first place, *it rejects the civil power in divine things*, and says with the prophets and apostles: *We must obey God rather than man*. In presence of the crown of Charles the Fifth, it uplifts the crown of Jesus Christ. But it goes farther; it lays down the principle that *all human teaching* should be *subordinate to the oracles of God*." ¹³²⁴

As the fundamental principles of Protestantism are the supremacy of the word of God and the right of private judgment, or what is the same thing, the right to have and exercise a conscience in matters of faith, so the distinguishing features of the Papacy are a denial of the sufficiency of the divine word and of the right of private judgment. In fact, both are bound up in one, for if, as the Papacy insists, the individual must take his faith from the church, he must accept his conscience, ready-made, from the same source. Obviously, whatever militates against this in the least degree, must be regarded by the Papacy as harmful; hence papal opposition to the reading of the Scriptures by the people.

That this opposition to the Scriptures is real and not imaginary is evident from the writings of Roman Catholics themselves. "It is not necessary," says a standard Roman Catholic authority, "for all Christians to read the Bible. . . . Parts of the Bible are evidently unsuited to the very young *or to the ignorant*, and hence *Clement XI. Condemned the proposition that 'the reading of Scriptures is for all.'*"

"These principles are fixed and invariable, but the discipline of the church with regard to the reading of the Bible in the vulgar

82

tongue has varied with varying circumstances. In early times the Bible was read freely by the lay people, and the fathers constantly encouraged them to do so, although *they also insist on the obscurity of the sacred text*. . . .

"Next dangers came in during the Middle Ages. When the heresy of the Albigenses arose there was a danger from corrupt translations, and also from the fact that *the heretics tries to make the faithful judge the church by their own interpretation of the Bible*. To meet these evils, *the Councils of Toulouse (1229) and Tarragona (1234) forbade the laity to read the vernacular translations of the Bible*.

"*Pius IV. required the bishops to refuse lay persons leave to read even Catholic versions of Scripture unless their confessors or parish priests judged that such reading was likely to prove beneficial*. During this century, *Leo XII., Pius VIII., and Pius IX., have warned Catholics against the Protestant Bible societies*." ¹³³⁵

"The church," says Cardinal Gibbons, "is the only divinely-constituted teacher of revelation.

"Now the Scripture is the great depository of the word of God. Therefore, the church is the divinely-appointed custodian and interpreter of the Bible. For her office of infallible guide were superfluous, if each individual could interpret the Bible for himself."

¹³⁴⁶

It appears from this, as before remarked, that the Roman Catholic Church opposes the reading of the Bible because it tends to develop independence of thought and action, and is in itself a negation of the claim that to "the church" is committed the faith and even the very consciences of all men.

It is true that the Papacy says, "A man is always bound to follow his conscience, even if false and erroneous. . . . Nor can any injunction of any authority, ecclesiastical or civil, make it lawful for a man to do that which his conscience unhesitatingly condemns as certainly wicked." ¹³⁵ 7 But this does not mean that the Roman Catholic Church recognizes the supremacy of the Scriptures or the right of private judgment.

Says Cardinal Gibbons: "The church is indeed tolerant in this sense, that she can not confound truth with error; nor can she admit that any man is conscientiously free to reject truth when its claims are convincingly brought home to his mind." ¹³⁶⁸

And again the cardinal says: "A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshiping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God." ¹³⁷⁹

As already seen, Rome, through her popes and councils, forbids her children to read even her own version of the Scriptures, except under such restrictions as forbid the right of private judgment. Our illustration shows how Rome prevented the reading of the Bible in London in the era of the Reformation. Tyndale had given England the New Testament in the language of the people, but Henry VIII., upon whom Leo X. had bestowed the title, "Defender of the Faith," was bitterly opposed to the reading of the Scriptures.

"The bishops" says D'Aubigne, "led the attack. 'We must clear the Lord's field of the thorns which choke it,' said the archbishop of Canterbury to Convocation on the 29th of November, 1529; immediately after which the bishop of Bath read to his colleagues the list of books that he desired to have condemned. There were a number of works by Tyndale, Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle,

OEcolampadius, Pomeranous, Brentius, Bucer, Jonas, Francis, Lambert, Fryth and Fish. *The Bible in particular was set down.* 'It is impossible to translate the Scripture into English,' said one of the prelates.—'It is not lawful for the laity to read it in their mother tongue,' said another.—'If you tolerate the Bible,' added a third, 'you will make us all heretics.'" ¹³⁸10

In this matter "Rome had every reason," remarks the historian, "to be satisfied with Henry VIII. Tonstall, who still kept under lock and key the Testaments purchased at Antwerp through Packington's assistance, had them carried to St. Paul's churchyard, where they were publicly burnt. The spectators retired shaking the head, and saying: 'The teaching of the priests and of Scriptures must be in contradiction to each other, since the priests destroy them.'" ¹³⁹11

It was thus Rome opposed the Scriptures 366 years ago, and she uses the same tactics yet when she can. Only a few weeks since we printed in these columns the facts concerning the burning of forty-seven Bibles and fifty Testaments in Bahia, Brazil, no longer ago than last June by order of a Roman Catholic vicar. ¹⁴⁰12 And everybody knows Rome's undying hostility to the reading of the common version of the Scriptures everywhere. The Douay or Catholic version of the Scriptures is never printed without notes; thus even where Rome permits the reading of the Bible, she first injects into it the poison of tradition and the vagaries of the so-called Fathers of the Christian Church.

But as we said before, the opposition to the reading of the Bible comes not so much from enmity to the Scriptures themselves, as from the papal principle of the denial of the right of private judgment. It is of no avail for people to read a book which they cannot understand, and which they have no right to understand for themselves. It follows that to permit the reading of the Scriptures is to invite independence of thought and of action in matters of religion. The man who reads the inspired declaration, every man "shall give account of himself to God," feels that he has an individual responsibility toward God which no other man can discharge for him; and reasoning is not necessary to convince him not only that he has the right of private judgment, but that it is his duty to exercise that right in the fear of God; but this Rome can never admit, for to admit it is to abdicate the throne of spiritual dominion which she has usurped, and to which she owes her power over the nations.

"A World-wide Difference" *American Sentinel* 11, 11 , pp. 82, 83.

THERE is a world-wide difference, and much more than that, between man's law and the law of God.

This difference may not be apparent in the wording of the laws, as they are compared one with the other; but it is none the less real.

For example, the law of God says, "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not steal." Man's law also specifically forbids killing and stealing. But man's law against murder, even though expressed in the exact language of the sixth commandment, is not God's law. It is not a reenactment of God's law. It falls as far short of that law, in its breadth and depth and purpose, as man falls short of God.

God's laws are not only prohibitions, but they are promises. With the command, God also gives power to perform it. Man could not possibly keep God's law by his own power; his very nature is contrary to it. "The carnal mind is enmity [*sic.*] against God; for it is not subject to the law of God neither indeed can be." God must supply the power necessary for the fulfillment of his law in man, if ever any man is to keep it. And he does this by the power of the life of Christ.

That plan and that power are set forth by the apostle Paul in the words, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Gal. 2:20. Christ lives in the believer; his life is the life of Christ; and that life is now, as it ever has been, in perfect harmony with God's law.

Thus the law of God is not a measure of man's power towards God, but of God's power toward man. It is a promise of what God will do for every individual who will come unto him by faith. That law operates by God's own power, and not by the power of man.

In brief, the law of God commands love to God, and love to man. It requires us to love God with all the mind and strength, and our neighbor as ourself. But who can love by his own will? "God is love," and "love is of God." God must supply the power by putting love—which is putting himself—into man's heart.

God's law deals with the heart. An evil thought is a violation of his law. "The word of God is living, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Heb. 4:12.

Man's word—man's law—on the other hand, cannot rise above the level of man's own human power and wisdom.

Man can neither reenact nor enforce the law of God. God's law says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Man also has

83

made a sabbath "law," which commands the observance of the first day of the week. But it is with this law as with his laws against murder, theft, or adultery,—it is not the law of God. Yet in making it, man assumes to reenact and enforce the Sabbath law of God, since the Sabbath is an institution pertaining solely to man's relation to God.

It is proper that human laws should forbid murder, theft, adultery, etc., in order that men may live in the enjoyment of their natural rights. But of the Sabbath God says, "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord." Eze. 20:20. The Sabbath being a *sign* between God and his people, it cannot properly pertain to any other relation than that between God and his people. It cannot pertain to the relations between human beings.

Since therefore man's word is infinitely below God's word, in power and wisdom and truth, and it is infinitely beyond man's power either to make a sabbath as God did or to reenact or enforce the law of God, and since the Sabbath is God's distinctive sign between himself and his people (because it points him out as the Creator and therefore the true God) man's sabbath law is nothing else than a most daring piece of presumption. And quite in keeping with its character as such is the fact that it contradicts the law of God by setting up the first day of the week instead of the seventh, as the Sabbath.

It ought therefore to be speedily removed from every civil code in which it has found a place.

"False Standards of Righteousness" *American Sentinel* 11, 11 , pp. 83, 84.

LOW standards of righteousness are a characteristic of the times in which we live. Speaking of this age, the Apostle Paul wrote to Timothy: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come, for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud; . . . having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3:1-5. The world is full of religious formalism and phariseism, but there is little seen of the power of godliness.

Low standards of righteousness always pertain to religious formalism. And a low standard of righteousness is a false standard, just as formalism and phariseeism are false standards of religion. And because of these low standards of righteousness, which do not reach above the level of formalism, many people are deceiving themselves with the idea that the world is growing better.

In this country we hear much about "civic righteousness," and we also see much that illustrates the meaning of the term. We also see an increasing effort being made, especially by the forces of the religious world, to set up this "righteousness" in the place of soul righteousness, and to lead people to put their trust in it. We see legislators being influenced to believe that by the manufacture of such "righteousness" they are making the people better, and saving the nation from divine wrath. All this is a danger delusion.

For example, we notice some comments of the New York *Independent*, of February 13, on some of the evils lately suppressed by law in this country, under the heading, "The Passing of Pugilism." The statements of the *Independent*, besides carrying much influence in themselves, represent the ideas held by a prominent, if not a large, class of the American people.

"There is now," says the *Independent* (italics ours), "no inch of soil in the United States where prize fighting can be legally carried on. Congress passed a bill last week, and the President promptly signed it, which makes it a crime in the District of Columbia, or in any Territory of the United States, or in any strip of country under Federal control, to hold a prize fight. *This is a final victory for good morals* and humanity over a species of entertainment that has come to rank with bull fights and other degrading sports.

"The time was when the prize fights were considered a very choice kind of amusement for the general public. . . . *But the public standard of morality is so much higher than it used to be* that prize fighting has become as intolerable to the public conscience as dueling, the lottery, and other forms of vice. No clearer proof of this could be asked than the entirely successful efforts by the governor of Arkansas and the governor of Texas in preventing the threatened encounter last year."

Now the simple truth is that the "public standard of morality" in the days of our ancestors when pugilism was not prohibited in this country, was not only as high as it is to-day, but much higher. Ask the white-haired survivors of those earlier times if there was then any such carnival of murder, riot, robbery, arson, lust, and general

immorality as is heralded by the newspapers of our land to-day. They will answer, No. Ask them if the house of God was desecrated by church lotteries, fairs, theatricals, and ridiculous shows, as it is to-day, or if infidelity found utterance in the pulpit then as it does to-day? They will tell you, No.

As to recently-enacted laws against pugilism, it is almost too well known to need mentioning, that the actuating motive of such legislation was mere policy, and not a horror of the thing prohibited. Each State wishes to be considered as respectable in the public eye as any other State. One State does not wish another to say to her, What is not good enough for me is good enough for you. Even Mexico, while allowing and encouraging the bloody and brutal bull-fighting exhibitions, forbade the proposed pugilistic encounters as strictly as they were prohibited in the United States. The higher "public standard of morality" did not figure in the matter at all.

The *Independent* continues: "It is a good time to point out to those who think the world is going to the bad, . . . that they misread the signs. *There is a whole series of indications going to show that the moral tide is rising instead of falling.* There was a time when some of the people of this country looked with more or less tolerance on the slave trade. Within a generation millions of our citizens have defended slavery. . . . The slave trade in the world has been almost entirely broken up; all of the continents except one are practically free from slavery."

It is true that there is now no place in our country where an individual of the negro race can be legally held in involuntary servitude; but alas, that form of slavery is not the only one by which it is possible for men to oppress their fellow-beings. There are multitudes of white slaves in our land to-day, made so by human rapacity, greed, lust, and conscienceless use of power. There are hundreds of thousands of unfortunates in the lower stratum of society as it exists in our great cities—not to mention the "submerged tenth"—condemned by human selfishness to a slavery as cruel and as hopeless and as real as any that this country ever knew. And while this state of things continues, and is growing worse, as it is to-day, it is useless to point to the abolition of negro slavery as evidence of a rising tide of public morality. Had it not been for the terrible convulsions of the body politic in the civil war, that feature of American life might not yet have been eliminated from our land.

"We have also," continues the *Independent*, "banished the lottery. That was a form of iniquity which seemed to be deeply rooted in one of our States; but in one of the most brilliant contests ever waged against wrong by an aroused conscience, it was finally and forever defeated and banished from the soil of the United States." The history of that contest is, however, very much like the history of the contest against pugilism. There is very good reason to believe that conscience had far less to do with the banishment of the evil than had the policy of conforming to the common standard of respectability.

We are further told that, "It is in the last decade that the Mormons have surrendered polygamy as an article of their faith and have promised henceforth to respect the conscience of the country. There will be an end to the abomination in form as well as in fact when men who have contracted such marriages have passed away, they having agreed meanwhile to be the husband of one wife only."

This is again a most misleading fact in its bearing upon the question here considered. For of the three forms of polygamy known to society in this country, there can be little doubt that the one suppressed was less evil than the others. Open polygamy as formerly practiced in Utah has been prohibited; but secret polygamy, in which only one of the parties concerned is granted the name of wife and the privileges of that relation, is practiced in every part of the Union, and by a far greater number of people than were ever participants in the polygamy of the Mormons. This fact cannot be questioned; nor are our legislators themselves, many of them, guiltless upon this point.

The third form of this evil has been termed "consecutive polygamy," and this has the sanction of our courts of law. It is seen where parties who have entered into the marriage relation, separate upon some one of the many slight grounds recognized by our courts as legally sufficient, and reënter the same relation with other parties. The fearful prevalence of this "consecutive polygamy" is a widely-recognized fact, and one which has led to a strong agitation in our country for more stringent laws regulating marriage and divorce. And while it does prevail, as it does to-day, it is useless to point to the suppression of Mormon polygamy as a victory of public morality.

The *Independent* also refers to the victories recently gained in the fight against "gambling;" but here again we may be misled. For the worst form of gambling remains unsuppressed, in open and bold defiance of law and public sentiment. Gambling with dice and cards has been to some degree suppressed; but what has been done to

suppress gambling in its higher and more "respectable" and more ruinous forms? We allow men to gamble with and "corner" the necessities of life, not only to their own ruin, but to the loss of millions of others, whom they plunge into poverty and suffering. And it is a serious question whether this may not lead ere long to a social revolution which will drench the land with blood.

It is a great mistake to imagine that immorality can be suppressed, or righteousness established, by human law. The seat of immorality, or of righteousness, is the heart; and that no human law can reach. We must, of course, have laws against those evils which

84

are destructive of human rights; and it lies within human power to enact and enforce laws which will protect the people in the enjoyment of their rights, to a great degree. But such laws do not make men moral, and are not designed for that purpose. They can create an outward appearance of morality, but the whited sepulchres to which the Saviour likened the Pharisees, had a good outward appearance. The Pharisees were very moral in outward appearance.

When men mistake the outward appearance of morality for the thing itself, they are in a position to become the victims of the worst deceptions, and to commit the gravest errors of legislation from which mankind has ever suffered.

March 19, 1896

"Religion and Revolution" *American Sentinel* 11, 12 , pp. 89, 90.

A LITTLE more than a hundred years ago, the civilized world stood within the shadow of the greatest tragedy of modern times. It was the eve of the French Revolution. Thrones which stood in fancied security were to be rudely shaken, and institutions and doctrines which had grown venerable under the sanction of time and tradition, were to be overturned and lost in the great upheaval.

To-day, we are still in the era of revolution. The causes from which political and social mutations take their rise, having their seat in the selfishness of human nature, are not eradicated by the changes which they produce. Neither the lapse of time nor the civilization of the nineteenth century, afford us immunity from their operation.

There are ominous signs upon the horizon of our own national future. In a manner more or less perceptible to all, the air is darkened by the shadows of coming events. It is fitting at such a time that we

should note the real causes which culminated in the convulsion of a century ago, and the extent to which, as concerns them, history may be repeating itself to-day.

The French Revolution is commonly spoken of as an outburst of atheism. That this was a prominent feature of the Revolution no one denies; but it is proper to inquire, What produced the atheism? Man is not naturally an atheist. And if we look into the condition of society and the church, as it was in France just prior to the Revolution, we shall find abundant cause for the irreligion which at that time burst forth like a devastating flood upon the realm.

"There were twenty-three thousand monks in France," says Ridpath; "there were sixty thousand curates and vicars; there were thirty-seven thousand nuns; there were two thousand five hundred monasteries; one thousand five hundred convents, and sixty thousand churches and chapels. In all there were a hundred and thirty thousand persons who enjoyed themselves in the work of saving France from her sins. But they did not begin with themselves.

"There were a hundred and forty thousand nobles in France. . . The noble families numbered thirty thousand. On each square league of territory, and for each one thousand of the inhabitants there was one castle, one noble family. France was not only saved but she was ennobled. It required a great deal of land to support properly the dignity and office of one of her saviours. The abbey of St. Germain des Pres owned about nine hundred acres. One fifth of all the lands of France belonged to the clergy, one fifth to the nobility, one fifth to the communes and the king. This made three fifths." ¹⁴¹¹

This three fifths of the land was the richest and most valuable land in France. Of the value of that part belonging to the clergy we are told: "Its possessions, capitalized, amount to nearly four billion francs; the income from this amounts to eighty or a hundred millions, to which must be added the dime or tithes,—a hundred and twenty-three millions per annum; in all two hundred millions, a sum which must be doubled to show its equivalent at the present day; and to this must be added the chance contributions and the usual church collections."

¹⁴²²

Coming to particulars, it is stated that four hundred monks at Premontro possessed a capital of forty-five million livres, from which they derived a remedy of more than one million livres. The Benedictines of Cluny, two hundred and thirty-eight in number, enjoyed an income of one million eight hundred thousand livres. The

abbot of Clairvaux had a yearly income of more than three hundred thousand livres; the archbishop of Strasburg had an income of more than a million, etc.

In Mexico, when the French monarchy under Maximilian was overthrown, the value of the church property was \$300,000,000, and its income was more than that of the Mexican Government. In the United States, the amount of untaxed church property, as shown by the census of 1890, is \$679,630,139. Of this the Roman Catholic Church,—the church of France and Mexico, holds \$118,069,746; but even she is second to the Methodist Church, which holds in the aggregate of her various bodies property valued at \$132,140,179.

In France, at the time of the Revolution,

90

there were twenty-six millions of people of the laboring classes, and upon them rested the burden of supporting themselves, the privileged classes, and the government. They were taxed without mercy, while the nobles and clergy were exempt.

As a straw showing which way the wind is blowing, it is worthy of note that a bill has been recently introduced into the New York legislature, which provides for exempting from taxation "the personal property of every minister of the gospel, or priest of any denomination, or every such minister or priest who is permanently disabled by impaired health from performing the active duties of the ministry, and every such minister or priest who has reached the age of seventy-five years; and the real estate of such minister or priest or such disabled or aged minister or priest, provided such real or personal estate do not exceed the value of one thousand five hundred dollars."

The parallel is being even more rapidly drawn with respect to the theory of government. Of the epoch which ushered in the Revolution, the historian says: "At this epoch nearly the whole activity of France was displayed in the *government*. The government was everything. It was meant to be so. The doctrines of paternalism in the State were completely triumphant. The theory reduced to a formula ran thus: It is the duty—the business—of the State to teach men what things to do, and of the Church to teach them what things to believe. As for man, it is his business to be governed. That is—and was—the object of his creation. He must receive with unquestioning simplicity and obedience whatever is doled out to him by the noble and the priest to

whom his management, his interests, his destiny, in this world are entrusted."

There was in such a system no development of manhood, no formation of stable character, no quickening of the conscience. The moral nature was dwarfed; all the better impulses of human nature were palsied; hate and malignity were engendered; and the scenes depicted in our illustration were only the inevitable result when once restraint was thrown off.

To-day, in our own land, the doctrine of paternalism is fast displacing the theory of government espoused by the founders of the Republic. The sphere of individualism has been contracted to very narrow limits. Men are taught that their first duty to the State is obedience to the law, whether the law be good or bad; they are taught to set "law" above justice, thus virtually ignoring their prerogative of self-government, which asserts that they are free from obligation to any form of legalized wrong.

The Church, with all her religious allies, has entered the arena of politics, and assumes the right to dictate the law for nation, State, and city. The Church and the aristocracy of wealth, control the government; and the people—the mere toilers and producers—exist to be governed and to pay the taxes. The doctrine of individual inalienable rights is relegated to the background; the scheme of government has been transferred from the basis of individual rights, recognized by the Declaration of Independence, to the undefinable one of the "best good of the majority." And the clergy and the "nobles," the "better classes," speak for the majority.

The French Revolution was a struggle for the mastery between the privileged classes and the people. "It was," says Ridpath, "simply a revolt, an insurrection of the emancipated mind of France against the tyranny of her social, civil and religious institutions—a rebellion of man against his masters—a struggle of the human spirit to break an intolerable thralldom which had been imposed upon it by the past." The spirit of self-exaltation, making unscrupulous use of the power pertaining to wealth and station, had made the multitudes slaves both in soul and body, to human taskmasters. It had bound them in the chains of both a civil and a spiritual tyranny. And when the spirit of liberty in the breasts of the downtrodden asserted itself and burst those chains, the popular demonstrations against the Church and religion were as natural as were those against the nobles and royalty.

The atheism of the French Revolution was the legitimate fruit of the spiritual despotism imposed upon the people by the Papacy. In the papal system, the spirit of self-exaltation finds its fullest and most conspicuous embodiment. By it a mortal man, under the name of pope, is exalted to the place of God, while other fallible mortals, such as cardinals, bishops, and priests, are held up to their fellow-mortals as invested with the authority and prerogatives of God. And when man is put in the place of God, the result is always a spiritual tyranny. It cannot possibly be otherwise; for the power and wisdom of man cannot rise to the level of divinity. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty;" ¹⁴³ 3 but the spirit of man cannot give liberty in the religious life. The despotism breeds revolt; and revolt, when directed against religion, naturally manifests itself in atheism. The papal religion is full of the seeds of this baleful fruit.

"The religion of the French Revolution," says Prof. Goldwin Smith, "was a State church which, deserted by the convictions of the people, but retaining their outward allegiance, reduced them to hypocrisy and to atheism."

There is nothing in Christianity that tends to the violence of revolution. The revolution accomplished by Christianity is the revolution of the individual. Christianity means freedom through the Spirit and power of God; and having this soul freedom, men are more desirous of imparting the same blessing to others than of laying violent hands upon the fabric of government. They seek to promote the welfare of themselves and of mankind through the uplifting power of the gospel of Christ, rather than by the violence of carnal warfare; and while conducting themselves at all times as the champions of the cause of humanity and the rights of the people, will if possible, follow after the things which make for peace.

Had the people of France known the freedom of the gospel instead of the despotism of the Papacy, the terrible scenes of the French Revolution would never have been. But the seeds of atheism, and of resistance to the restraints of both God and man, had been sown by a religion which put man in the place of God, tradition and dogma in the place of God's word, and the law of man in the place of conscience. The prevailing conditions gave opportunity for its perfect development, and the world shuddered at the harvest. But the lesson was not sufficiently understood and appropriated by mankind. And now, in these United States, as well as elsewhere in the civilized world, the same influences are at work to bring man into a position

where they will be ready to make a like mad and blind effort to reform government and society, and realize the good to which they feel they have a birthright claim. But the hope of mankind lies in the divinely-revealed assurance that the Author of liberty and of every blessing is about to take the affairs of earth into his own hands, to root out of it all things that are evil, and to usher his righteous people into the eternal era of happiness and peace.

"The Only Remedy" *American Sentinel* 11, 12 , pp. 90, 91.

"IS it not perfectly manifest," says the *Christian Statesman*, of February 22, "after all our comparatively fruitless efforts to cure our festering political corruption by other means, that the only adequate remedy is to bring our nation into acknowledged subjection to the perfect and purifying law of Christ?" This it says in behalf of the so-called Christian Amendment which it is trying to have fastened upon the national Constitution.

The "purifying law of Christ" does not

91

consist in the written words of an acknowledgment, but is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," which makes the believer free from the "law of sin and death."¹⁴⁴ 1 It is the very life of Christ, which he lives in the believer's heart.¹⁴⁵ 2 It is therefore altogether above and beyond the reach of the United States Constitution. Only a very low and altogether earthly view of the purifying law of Christ could ever have conceived it as being applicable to the nation through the Constitution.

It is an easy thing to make an acknowledgment or profession of Christianity; but mere profession accomplishes nothing. So long as the hearts of legislators and of the people are filled with the natural depravity of human nature, so long will "our festering political corruption" remain uncured, whatever profession may be inserted into the Constitution.

"Keeping Sunday Religiously" *American Sentinel* 11, 12 , p. 91.

AMS an argument in behalf of Sunday "laws," it is said that such legislation as is called for does not infringe upon any person's rights of conscience, since it does not require that Sunday should be kept religiously.

Just what would constitute a religious observance of Sunday, in the minds of those who makes use of this "argument," we are not told. But it is not their nor any person's ideas upon this point that determine the propriety of Sunday legislation from the standpoint of interference with conscience. That must be determined by the truth, as defined by Him whose word is truth. And the truth is that refraining from work upon the first or any other day of the week, so as to acknowledge that day as a weekly rest day, is a religious act. It must of necessity have this significance.

A weekly rest day is wholly a religious institution. It was given to man as such by the Creator. Gen. 2:2, 3; Ex. 20:8-11; Eze. 20:12, 20. Rest from secular work is an essential part of the keeping of the Sabbath commandment. And from the very fact that the Sabbath is wholly a religious institution—since it is "the Sabbath of the Lord"—and that rest from secular labor is an essential part of its observance, such weekly rest upon Sunday must have a religious significance. Being exactly similar to the Sabbath rest which God commanded, so far as regards the performance of secular work, it is either that rest itself or a counterfeit of it; in either of which cases its significance is religious.

A counterfeit dollar bill has the significance of money, and is intended by its maker to serve the purpose of money. So it is with the Sunday sabbath. It must of necessity have the significance of the institution which it professes to be, or of which it claims to be a pattern; and that significance is wholly religious.

Hence the weekly Sunday rest which is demanded by Sunday "laws" is a religious act, and the plea that such "laws" do not require any person to keep Sunday religiously, is of no force. By the very fact of requiring Sunday rest, they require a religious observance, and hence go entirely beyond the legitimate sphere of civil legislation.

Let the truth be kept in mind that the Sabbath is wholly a religious institution. This is shown by the fact, already pointed out, that it is "the Sabbath of the Lord." God has stated expressly that the Sabbath is his and not man's. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." See Ex. 20:8-11; Isa. 58:13; Eze. 20:12, 20. In the light of this fact, the impropriety of human sabbath "laws" may be seen in full. The Sabbath is God's sign between himself and his people. It is the mark of his Godhead, pointing out him who has creative power, and who is therefore the true God. Hence man has no business to meddle with it. Even a trademark is recognized in human law as the property

of its originator. No other party is allowed to appropriate it. How much more, then, is God's Sabbath sacred to him—to the high and holy purpose specified in his law, as the memorial of him who has power to create and redeem! Yet men speak of the Sabbath as though it were their common property, to be put to their own uses and legislated upon as they see fit!

The American Government is very jealous—and properly so—of its currency. It punishes counterfeiting with severe penalties. It will not allow any imitation of that which constitutes its currency, whether of coin or paper, and whether it be intended to serve the purpose of money or not. Its secret service officials promptly seize and confiscate all such imitations, no matter if obviously intended to serve only as medals or as advertisements. And why will not men recognize the principle in its application to that which is infinitely more sacred and important,—the memorial or "sign" (Eze. 20:12, 20) of God between himself and his people? Why will they not treat God's sacred things with at least as much respect as is made obligatory with regard to man's things? Oh that all men would recognize the iniquitous folly of enacting sabbath "laws," and cease to intrude with their human legislation upon that which is holy unto the Lord.

"The Origin and Nature of Sunday 'Laws'" *American Sentinel* 11, 12 , pp. 91, 92.

THE various bills relating more or less directly to Sunday now before Congress and several of the State legislatures, render timely an examination of the origin and nature of Sunday "laws."

The first "law" of this character, a copy of which has been preserved to us, is Constantine's edict of A.D. 321. Sozomen says that it was "that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion." And this statement of Sozomen's is indorsed by Neander. ¹⁴⁶¹ This reason given by Sozomen reveals the secret of the legislation; it shows that it was in behalf of the church, and to please the church.

By reading the above edict, it is seen that they started out quite moderately. They did not stop *all* work; only judges, towns-people, and mechanics were required to rest, while people in the country might freely and lawfully work. The emperor paraded his soldiers on Sunday, and required them to repeat in concert the following prayer:—

Thee alone we acknowledge as the true God; thee we
acknowledge as Ruler; thee we invoke for help; from thee have we

received the victory; through thee have we conquered our enemies; to thee are we indebted for our present blessings; from thee also we hope for future favors; to thee we will direct our prayer. We beseech thee, that thou wouldst preserve our Emperor Constantine and his pious sons in health and prosperity through the longest life.

¹⁴⁷²

This Sunday law of A.D. 321 continued until 386, when "those older changes effected by the Emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered, in fact, as guilty of sacrilege." ¹⁴⁸³

Then as the people were not allowed to do any manner of work, they would play, and as the natural consequence, the circuses and the theaters throughout the empire were crowded every Sunday. But the object of the law, from the first one that was issued, was that the day might be used for the purposes of devotion, and the people might go to church. Consequently, that this object might be met, there was another step to take, and it was taken. At a church convention held at Carthage in 401, the bishops passed a resolution to send up a petition to the emperor, praying "that the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday, and from feast days, to some other days of the week." ¹⁴⁹⁴

And the reason given in support of the petition was, "The people congregate more to the circus than to the church." ¹⁵⁰⁵

In the circuses and the theaters large numbers of men were employed, among whom many were church-members. But, rather than to give up their jobs, they would work on Sunday. The bishops complained that these were compelled to work; they pronounced it persecution, and asked for a law to protect those persons from such "persecution." The church had become filled with a mass of people, unconverted, who cared vastly more for worldly interests and pleasures than they did for religion. And as the government was now a government of God, it was considered proper that the civil power should be used to cause all to show respect for God, whether or not they had any respect for him or not.

But as long as they could make something by working on Sunday, they would work rather than go to church. A law was secured forbidding all manner of Sunday work. Then they would crowd the circuses and the theaters, instead of going to church. But this was not what the bishops wanted; this was not that for which all work had been forbidden. All work was forbidden in order that the people might

go to church; but instead of that, they crowded to the circus and the theater, and the audiences of the bishops were rather slim. This was not at all satisfying to their pride; therefore the next step, and a logical one, too, was, as the petition prayed, to have the exhibitions of the circuses and the theaters transferred to some other days of the week, so that the churches and the theaters should not be open at the same time. For if both were open, the Christians(?), as well as others, not being able to go to both places at once, would go to the circus or the theater instead of to the church. Neander says:—

Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hindrance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart. ¹⁵¹⁶

Assuredly! An open circus or theater will always prove a great hindrance to the devotion of those "Christians" whose Christianity is the least an affair of the life and of the heart. In other words, an open circus or theater will always be a great hindrance to the devotion of those who have not religion enough to keep them from going to it, but who only want to use the profession of religion to maintain their popularity, and to promote their selfish interests. On the other hand, to the devotion

92

of those whose Christianity is really an affair of the life and of the heart, an open circus or theater will never be a particle of hindrance, whether open at church time or all the time. But those people had not enough religion or love of right, to do what they thought to be right; therefore they wanted the State to take away from them all opportunity to do wrong, so that they could all be Christians. Satan himself could be made that kind of Christian in that way: but he would be Satan still.

Says Neander again:—

Church teachers . . . were in truth often forced to complain that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church. ¹⁵²⁷

And the church could not then stand competition; she wanted a monopoly. And she got it. And the "church" wants a monopoly to-day.

This petition of the Carthage Convention could not be granted at once, but in 425 the desired law was secured; and to this also there was attached the reason that was given for the first Sunday law that

ever was made; namely: "In order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance." ¹⁵³⁸

It must constantly be borne in mind, however, that the only way in which "the devotion of the faithful" was "disturbed" by these things, was that when the circus or the theater was open at the same time that the church was open, the "faithful" would go to the circus or the theater instead of to church, and, *therefore*, their "devotion" was "disturbed." And of course the only way in which the "devotion" of such "faithful" ones could be freed from all disturbance, was to close the circuses and the theaters at church time.

In the logic of this theocratical scheme, there was one more step to be taken. It came about in this way: First, the church had all work on Sunday forbidden, in order that the people might attend to things divine. But the people went to the circus and the theater instead of to church. Then the church had laws enacted closing the circuses and the theaters, in order that the people might attend to things divine. But even then the people would not be devoted, nor attend to things divine; for they had no real religion. The next step to be taken, therefore, in the logic of the situation, was to compel them to be devoted—to compel them to attend to things divine. This was the next step logically to be taken, and it was taken. The theocratical bishops were equal to the occasion. They were ready with a theory that exactly met the demands of the case; and the great Catholic Church Father and Catholic saint, Augustine, was the father of this Catholic saintly theory. He wrote:—

It is indeed better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment, or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain to the highest grade of religious development. ¹⁵⁴⁹

Of this theory Neander remarks:—

It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition. ¹⁵⁵¹⁰

The history of the Inquisition is only the history of the carrying out of this infamous theory of Augustine's. But this theory is only the logical sequence of the theory upon which the whole series of Sunday laws was founded.

Then says Neander: "In this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

This statement is correct. Constantine did many things to favor the bishops. He gave them money and political preference. He made their decisions in disputed cases final, as the decision of Jesus Christ. But in nothing that he did for them did he give them *power over those who did not belong to the church*, to compel them to act as though they did, *except in that one thing of the Sunday law*. Their decisions, which he decreed to be final, were binding only on those who voluntarily chose that tribunal, and affected none others.

Before this time, if any who had repaired to the tribunal of the bishops were dissatisfied with the decision, they could appeal to the civil magistrate. This edict cut off that source of appeal, yet affected none but those who voluntarily chose the arbitration of the bishops. But in the Sunday "law" power was given to the church to compel those who did not belong to the church, and who were not subject to the jurisdiction of the church, to obey the commands of the church. In the Sunday "law" there was given to the church control of the civil power, that by it she could compel those who did not belong to the church to act as if they did.

The history of Constantine's time may be searched through and through, and it will be found that in nothing did he give to the church any such power, except in this one thing—the Sunday "law". Neander's statement is literally correct, that it was "in this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends." And it is "in this way" that the "church" is still demanding and receiving help from the State, and getting it only too often.

"Religious Right in the United States" ¹⁵⁶¹ *American Sentinel* 11, 12 , pp. 94, 95.

"ALL men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." The first and greatest of all the rights of men is religious right. Religion and the manner of discharging it is the duty which men owe to their Creator, and the manner of discharging it. The first of all duties is to the Creator, because to him we owe our existence. Therefore the first of all commandments, and the first that there can possibly be, is this: "Hear, O Israel: The Lord thy God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy

heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; this is the first commandment." Mark 12:29, 30.

This commandment existed as soon as there was an intelligent creature in the universe; and it will continue to exist as long as there shall continue one intelligent creature in the universe. Nor can a universe *full* of intelligent creatures modify in any sense the bearing that this commandment has upon any single one, any more than if that single one were the *only* creature in the universe. For as soon as an intelligent creature exists, he owes his existence to the Creator. And in owing to him his existence, he owes to him the first consideration in all the accompaniments and all the possibilities of existence. Such is the origin, such the nature, and such the measure, of religious right.

Did, then, the fathers who laid the foundation of this nation in the rights of the people—did they allow to this right the place and deference among the rights of the people which, according to its inherent importance, is justly its due? That is, Did they leave it sacred and untouched solely between man and his Creator?

The logic of the Declaration demanded that they should; for the Declaration says that governments derive "their just powers *from the consent of the governed*." Governments, then, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, never can of right exercise any power not delegated by the governed. But religion pertains solely to man's relation to God, and to the duty which he owes to him as his Creator, and therefore in the nature of things it can never be delegated.

It is utterly impossible for any person ever, in any degree, to delegate or transfer to another any relationship or duty, or the exercise of any relationship or duty, which he owes to his Creator. To attempt to do so would be only to deny God and renounce religion, and even then the thing would not be done; for, whatever he might do, his relationship and duty to God would still abide as fully and as firmly as ever.

As governments derive their just powers from the governed; as governments can not justly exercise any power not delegated; and as it is impossible for any person in any way to delegate any power in things religious; it follows conclusively that the Declaration of Independence logically excludes religion in every sense and in every way from the jurisdiction and from the notice of every form of government that could result from that Declaration.

This is scriptural, too. For to the definition that religion is "the recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience," the Scripture responds: "It is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Rom. 14:11, 12.

To the statement that religion is "man's

95

personal relation of faith and obedience to God," the Scripture responds, "Hast thou faith? have it to *thyself* before God." Rom 14:22.

And to the word that religion is "the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it," the Scripture still responds, "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5:10.

No government can ever account to God for any individual. No man nor any set of men can ever have faith for another. No government will ever stand before the judgment seat of Christ to answer even for itself, much less for the people or for any individual. Therefore, no government can ever of right assume any responsibility in any way in any matter of religion.

March 26, 1896

"The Christianity of Christ and the Christianity of the Crusades"

***American Sentinel* 11, 13 , pp. 97, 98.**

THE Christianity of the Crusades was the gospel of revenge, of force, of the sword: it was the National Reform movement of that era.

Europe was already "Christian," having been made so largely by the sword; and what was more natural than that men believing in national "Christianity" should regard carnal weapons as the most potent means of establishing even the kingdom of the Prince of Peace?

But the Christianity of the Crusades was not in any sense the Christianity of Christ. When the people sought to take Christ by force to make him King, he hid himself from them. ¹⁵⁷¹

When Peter drew a sword in defense of his Master, Jesus said: "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." ¹⁵⁸²

When arraigned before Pilate as one guilty of speaking against Cesar, Christ said: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight; . . . but now is my kingdom not from hence." ¹⁵⁹³

And finally, the great apostle to the Gentiles wrote: "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imagination, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." ¹⁶⁰⁴

This is the Christianity of Christ. Its fundamental law is: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;" and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." ¹⁶¹⁵ Its one undeviating rule of human conduct is: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." ¹⁶²⁶

Christ himself came not into the world to condemn the world, "but that the world through him might be saved." ¹⁶³⁷ His ministers are ambassadors of peace. Says the apostle: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." ¹⁶⁴⁸

Such is the Christianity of Christ, of the Gospels, of the Acts, of the Epistles; and such the relation that its ministers should sustain toward all men. But such is not the Christianity of the Crusades. The Saviour said: "Love your enemies; do good to them which hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you." ¹⁶⁵⁹ But the Christianity of the Crusades taught the very opposite of all this.

Peter the Hermit, the great apostle of the Crusades, appealed to passion, prejudice, love of conquest, and hope of temporal and eternal reward. He exhorted his hearers to be revenged on the hateful infidels, and assured them that they would at the same time acquire great spiritual "merit"!

Mounted on a mule, the Hermit carried his "gospel" of hate everywhere. In his so-called preaching this man pictured the profanation of the holy places. Pantomime often supplied the lack of words. Depicting the scenes he had witnessed, he displayed a crucifix he had brought with him from Jerusalem, and smiting his

breast with it until the blood flowed, he exhorted his auditors to purge the Holy City of the hated Turk.

"For many years," says Ridpath, "the fanatical religious sentiment of the West had prescribed a pilgrimage to some holy place as the best balm for an inflamed conscience. The morbid soul of the Western Frank saw in the sandal-shoon and scallop-shell of the pilgrim the emblems and passport of a better life. He who had sinned, he who had consumed his youth in lawlessness and passion, he who had in his manhood done some bloody deed for which he was haunted by specters, he who had forgotten the ties of kindred and stopped his ears to the entreaties of the weak, must ere the twilight faded into darkness, find peace and reconciliation by throwing off the insignia of human power and folly and going barefoot to the holy places of the East. And what other spot so sacred, so meritorious, as the scene of the crucifixion and burial of Christ?" ¹⁶⁶10

The Crusades afforded an opportunity to do penance and to get renown and even wealth at one and the same time. "To destroy the hated Turk," says the historian, "and eradicate his stock from the earth, was

98

regarded as the one work worthy of the praise of men and the favor of heaven." ¹⁶⁷11

The Council of Clermont assembled in the autumn of 1095. On the tenth day of the Council, Pope Urban II., who had crossed the Alps to be present, ascending a throne, said: "Christian warriors, rejoice! for you who without ceasing seek vain pretext for war have to-day found true ones; you are not now called to avenge the injuries of men, but injuries offered to God. It is not now a town or castle that will reward your valor, but the wealth of Asia, and a land flowing with milk and honey. If you triumph over your foes, the kingdoms of the East will be your heritage. If you are conquered, you will have the glory of dying where Christ died. . . . Gird your swords to your thighs, ye men of might. It is our part to pray, yours to do battle; ours—with Moses—to hold up unwearied hands, yours to stretch forth the sword against the children of Amalek." ¹⁶⁸12

The response to this appeal was just such as might have been expected. From the lips of that mighty throng burst the cry, *Dieu le Veut! Dieu le Veut!* and answering back, the "successor of St. Peter," the self-styled Vicar of the Son of God, said, "God indeed wills it. Go

forth, brave warriors of the cross, and let 'God wills it,' be your watchword and battle-cry in the holy war."

The Red Cross

"As soon," says Ridpath, "as the loud cry of *Dieu le Veut* was hushed at a gesture from the pope, one of the cardinals arose and pronounced a form of confession for all those who would enlist in the holy enterprise. Thereupon, Adhemar, bishop of Puy, came forward and received from the hands of Urban one of the red crosses which had been consecrated for the occasion. Knights and barons crowded around the seat of his holiness to receive the sacred badge and to take the oath of loyalty to Christ. The cross of red cloth was then stitched upon the right shoulder of the mantle, and the wearer became a soldier of the cross—a Crusader."

"From Scandinavia to the Mediterranean the Crusade was preached with a fiery zeal that kindled a flame in every village. In accordance with a canon of the Council of Clermont the taking of the cross was to be accepted in lieu of all the penances due to the church. The license thus granted was in the nature of a plenary indulgence and became one of the most powerful incitements to the cause. . . . All the warlike lusts of the age were set at liberty under the sanction of religion and retributive justice."

"Those who were in debt gladly threw off the burden by assuming the cross. The creditor might no longer menace or disturb those who had become the soldiers of Christ. Offenders and criminals also found the day auspicious. No prison wall might any longer restrain him who took the sword against the infidel. Over the thief and the murderer on whose right shoulders appeared the sacred emblem of the holy war the church threw the egis of her protection. All manner of crime was to be washed white in the blood of the sacrilegious Turks."

Massacre, Pillage and Burning

Very naturally the movements of large bodies of such men were attended with every sort of excess. The Crusaders "swept through the German territories," says Ridpath, "like an army of devouring locusts, until through sheer waste of resources they were obliged to divide into smaller masses." Pillage marked the track of the Crusading hosts; and if they met opposition, massacre too often followed, and this before they had opportunity to cross swords with the infidel Turks. Semlin, in Austria-Hungary, suffered all the horrors of massacre,

pillage and burning, at the hands of men made "soldiers of the cross," by papal decree, and by adopting and wearing a badge.

"One band numbering about twenty thousand, commanded by Walter the Penniless, of Burgundy, pressed forward through Hungary and Bulgaria in the direction of Constantinople. It is said of this advanced host that there were only eight horsemen in the whole number. The rest of the wretched mob proceeded on foot, generally marching without shoes and hundreds falling by the wayside through exposure, disease, and famine. Nothing but the tolerance and friendly disposition of Carolman, king of the Hungarians, saved the miserable vanguard from entire destruction. In Bulgaria, however, the lieutenant of the Eastern Emperor looked with less favor upon the lawless horde that had been precipitated into his kingdom. The Crusaders were quickly cut off from supplies and were obliged to have recourse to violence, but they now found themselves opposed by a race as savage as themselves.

"The Bulgarians took up arms to defend their country from destruction. The track of Walter and his army was marked with blood and fire. The Crusaders were cut off day by day until at the confines of the country only Walter and a few followers remained to make their way through the forests to Constantinople.

The Sack of Semlin

"Meanwhile the second division of the host, numbering about forty thousand men, women and children, under the command of Peter the Hermit himself, pressed on in the same direction taken by Walter. Their march was promoted through Hungary by the favor of king and people. The wants of the vast multitude were supplied, and friendly relations were maintained, as far as the city of Semlin. Here on the walls were displayed some of the spoils which had been taken two months previously from Walter and his savages. On seeing these tokens of their friends' overthrow the Crusaders broke into ungovernable rage, and fell furiously upon the offending city. The ramparts were scaled, thousands of the people were butchered, and Semlin suffered all the horrors of pillage and burning." ¹⁶⁹13

True, these things were committed by an unorganized mob that never actually reached Palestine. But the regular Crusaders were little better. Having cast away the gospel bands from them to the extent of entering upon war for the furtherance of the gospel, why should they stop short of any excess?

Of the host that besieged and finally captured Antioch, Ridpath says: "One of the chief incentives to the uprising had been the license

freely offered by the Church to all who should be victorious over the infidel. To them restraint should be unknown. The maidens of Greece and the dark-eyed houris of Syria, were openly named as a part of the reward due to them who should hurl the Turk from his seat on the tomb of Christ; and the Crusader in his dreams saw the half-draped figures of Oriental beauties flitting in the far mirage. Before the walls of Antioch the men of the West sat down to enjoy whatever the land afforded. The god of license became the favorite divinity. All restraint was cast aside. Every village in the surrounding country was recklessly pillaged, and the camp of the Crusaders was heaped with spoils. Then the armed warriors gave themselves up to feasting and love-making with the Syrian damsels. Bishops of the Church wandered wantonly through the orchards and lay on the grass playing dice with Cyprians." ¹⁷⁰14

The Slaughter at Jerusalem.

And finally, when Jerusalem was taken by the professed followers of the Prince of Peace, indiscriminate slaughter followed. "Blood," says the historian, "flowed in the gutters, and horrid heaps of the dead lay piled at every corner. None were spared by the frenzied Christians, who saw in the gore of the infidels the white way of redemption. Ten thousand dead, scattered through the city, gave token of the merciless spirit of the men of the West. Another ten thousand were heaped in the reeking courts of the great mosque on Mount Moriah. 'God wills it,' said the pilgrims. The indiscriminate butchery of the Saracens was carried out by the rank and file of the Crusading army. In this blood work they needed no incentive—no commander. Each sword flamed with hatred until it was cooled in the dripping life of the enemies of Christ." ¹⁷¹15

Such were the deeds done and the scenes enacted in the era of the Crusades in the name of Christianity. And what was accomplished? Absolutely nothing for either true religion, or genuine civilization; and worse still, Christianity became with millions of the human race a hissing and a by-word. Henceforth it was to be judged, not by the sublime precepts of its Founder, not by the spiritual truths which he taught, or by the spirit power he had promised, but by the sack of Antioch, by the massacre at Jerusalem, by the rivers of blood that everywhere flowed in the track of the Crusaders.

And who was to blame? Who but the leaders in religious thought? Who but the religious teachers of the day? Suppose that instead of preaching the Crusades, Peter the Hermit had preached the gospel of the Son of God. Suppose that, like the apostle, he had been an ambassador of peace and not of war, how different might have been the history of the eleventh and twelfth centuries; yea, of all subsequent time!

"Protecting' Religious Liberty" *American Sentinel* 11, 13 , pp. 98, 99.

THE *Christian Advocate*, of February 20, commenting upon the provisions of the New York State Sunday law, says: "Section 264 protects religious liberty in the following: 'It is a sufficient defense to prosecution for work and labor on the first day of the week that the defendant *uniformly keeps another day* of the week as *holy time*, and does *not* labor on that day, and that the labor complained of [Sunday labor] was done in such a manner as not to interfere with or disturb any other person in observing the first day of the week as holy time.'"

If religious liberty in the State of New York had no better protection than this, we think it would not long survive.

By the provisions of this section, but two classes of citizens are considered as entitled to religious liberty; namely, those who observe Sunday, and those who uniformly keep another day of the week as holy time. All other classes may whistle for their religious liberty, but never get it so far as the law is

99

concerned. Yet it is a fundamental principle of our system of government that all men have equal rights. The Sunday "law" denies to certain classes of citizens what the Creator has freely given them.

But this is not all that is wrong with this "protective" provision. In order to be entitled to its benefits, the individual must uniformly keep another day as holy time. If he ceases to do this, he falls at once without the provisions of the section, and becomes liable under the law. More than this: he is required to observe the day as *holy time*. This is more than is required of the Sunday observer, he being merely obliged to abstain from Sunday labor.

The law declares that every citizen of the State shall regularly observe some day of the week as a day of rest. If he chooses Sunday, he is obliged to refrain from secular labor; if his choice falls on any other day, he is obliged to observe it as holy time. In any case,

his religious observance of the day is under legal compulsion. And compulsion is not liberty, but the opposite.

This "exemption clause" of the "law" shows conclusively that the statute is religious in character, and not civil. It exempts from the penalty for Sunday labor such persons as uniformly keep another day of the week as *holy time*. That is to say, the law annuls itself, in the case of such individuals, in everything except that which pertains to religion. They may do secular work on Sunday, but they must observe another day of the week as "holy time." They must observe the day religiously; this the "law" demands.

We willingly recognize in the provisions of the section an honest attempt to combine justice with a Sunday "law." But the two will not unite; and hence some very curious features of the "law." It prohibits secular labor on Sunday on the part of any of its citizens, and yet leaves all free to escape from its prohibition by the avenue of regard for some other day. It accepts in lieu of abstinence from secular work on Sunday, a religious regard for another day of the week, which it does not claim will be of any possible utility or value to the State; in other words, it exchanges what it assumes to be of value, for nothing. It exempts the very class who have the strongest objections to obeying it,—namely, those who regard another day of the week as sacred; it makes an act which is the most contrary to its requirements—the observance of *another* day—a valid ground for noncompliance with the same. Such are some of the anomalous features of a Sunday "law" when enacted with, it may be, the best motives and an honest desire to protect religious liberty.

Such a "law" falls very short of constituting a safeguard to religious freedom.

"The Creator's Sunday Law" *American Sentinel* 11, 13 , p. 100.

THE only good law for Sunday that was ever made, was enacted by the Creator. It is the only good law of the kind that can ever be made.

Let it not be thought strange that the Creator enacted a law for the first day of the week. He has created all things, and he has law for everything that he has made; he set nothing adrift after he created it, to float about subject to no rule of guidance, no defined purpose of utility, amidst the rest of his creation. He has a law for the earth, a law for the tree and flower, a law for every operation of nature. "He

sendeth forth his commandment upon earth; his word runneth very swiftly. He giveth snow like wool; he scattereth the hoar frost like ashes. He casteth forth his ice like morsels: who can stand before his cold? He sendeth out his word, and melteth them: he causeth his wind to blow, and the waters flow." Ps. 147:15-18. He has law for the beings he has made, both man and beast. And he has law for the days of the week.

The fourth commandment not only states the law of the Sabbath, but of the other days of the week as well, so far as concerns man's relation to them. That it makes so brief mention of them in comparison with the Sabbath is due to the preëminence of the latter. The commandment says: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Every word of the Creator is law. The sentence, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work," is law, as much as is any other divine pronouncement; not, indeed, in the sense of prohibiting all rest or recreation upon any other day than the seventh, but as distinguishing between man's relation to it and his relation to the Sabbath. It is the law of their character as related to mankind. They are the working days; the Sabbath is the rest day.

The Creator's law for Sunday therefore is, that it is one of the six common days upon which man may labor and perform his work. That is the law as it stands in the divine code to-day.

Man, it is true, has enacted a different "law." He has made a statute which sets forth the first day of the week, instead of the seventh, as the weekly rest day. But can man with his enactments set aside the decree of the Eternal? Can a man-made statute have any force, as opposed to the law of the Almighty?

Shall we observe the Creator's law for Sunday, or man's?

"The Papacy" *American Sentinel* 11, 13 , p. 101.

THE word "papacy" is derived from "papa," and designates that religious system in which the church acknowledges a visible earthly head. This head is called the *papa*, or pope.

It is obvious that this system demands for the church a human source of authority in spiritual affairs; otherwise her visible, earthly head would be such only in name. This demand is met in the pope's

claim to infallibility, when speaking "*ex-cathedra*." Infallibility must, of course, pertain to the church's spiritual head.

Hence it is equally obvious that this system dispenses with the Scriptures; for they claim to be the source of all authority in questions of religious belief and practice. "To the law and to the testimony; if the speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3:16, 17.

If the church should appeal to the law and to the testimony for knowledge upon every religious question, she would acknowledge as her head the Author of that word, who is Christ. There would be in this no recognition of any visible head on earth. The papal system demands that there should be another "word," equal in authority to that given through the prophets and apostles. But two such words cannot stand together in truth; for they deny each other. The Scriptures deny that any spiritual authority exists in any word other than the word of God; and the pope's word, by claiming to be infallible, contradicts scripture; and this contradiction appears in the very fact that by the scriptural doctrine that all question are to be determined by the law and the testimony, the pronouncements of the pope are superfluous.

It is not strange, therefore, that the papal power should look with no great favor upon the Word of God as a guide for the people, and should commit the copies of that Word to the flames whenever she has a favorable opportunity to do so.

The papal antagonism to the Bible is simply a necessary part of the antagonism of the papal system to Christianity, in respect to the church's head. For the Word of God declares that Christ is the head of the church, which is his body. Eph. 5:23; Col. 1:18. The body cannot have two heads; the church of Christ is not a monstrosity. That church which acknowledges a visible earthly head, denies by that very act the invisible, divine head, which is Christ. That system of religion is antichrist.

Another thing demanded by the papal system is the union of the church with the State. The word of God has in it the power of God. By his word all things were created. It has all power itself, so that it needs no other support. But the word of man is powerless in itself; it must have support to make it effectual. That support must be the

power of man; and the highest form of that power is represented in the State.

The thing produced by the union of the papal system of paternalism in religion, with the State, is designated in the Scriptures as "the beast."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 13 , p. 104.

THE gospel of Christ is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1:16. The devil's gospel—for he can transform himself into an angel of light (2 Cor. 11:14)—is, salvation(?) through outward religious forms by the power of compulsion to all who can be subjected thereto, without regard to belief or conscience.

April 2, 1896

"Enforcing the Law" *American Sentinel* 11, 14 , p. 107.

RELIGIOUS intolerance is never slow to shield itself behind "the law." Masked under legal forms, it can do its work with certainty, and with the appearance and air of a conservator of the public welfare. If its work is spoken of as persecution, it can reply that its victims have merely been punished for violating the law of the land.

The papal church claims that she never persecuted, since the millions put to death for conscience' sake during the ages of her supremacy, suffered at the hands of the civil authority. "Heresy" was contrary to the "law" of the land; hence "heretics" were criminals, and were punished accordingly. The church points to the personality of civil government and exclaims, "I didn't do it; the [*sic.*] did it." And on the same grounds a prominent Hebrew recently addressed Christendom asking them to do justice to the Jews and exonerate them from the guilty of murdering Jesus Christ, since the record shows that he was put to death by the Roman, Pontius Pilate!

The Jews did not propose to put Christ to death because his teaching and example were contrary to their traditions,—not at all; but because he was making himself a king in the place of Cesar! This was the argument which prevailed with Pilate. They would not seize him and hurry him off to crucifixion with their own hands because they hated him; that would have been persecution. "We have a law," said they, "and by that law he ought to die." They were simply zealous for "the law"! They could also invoke the Roman law, for which, in this

case, they were likewise zealous. So they brought Jesus before the high priest and he was tried "according to law," and before Pontius Pilate as well, where also he was legally condemned. Surely this ought(?) to exonerate the Jews from the charge of being our Saviour's persecutors in the events which terminated with his crucifixion.

But Peter, on the day of Pentecost, plainly told the Jews that they were Christ's betrayers and murderers. The legal forms under which the Saviour was put to death did not in the least change the complexion of the part played in the drama by the Jews. It was persecution, and that alone. And no more did the sanction of the civil authority, given in accordance with the "law of the land," exculpate the papal persecutors of the Christians in the Dark Ages. "Laws" which sanction injustice and constitute ready weapons for the hands of religious bigots, ought to have no place upon human statute books. God is a God of justice. He "hath prepared his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all." Justice is law; and only justice can properly be affirmed by the decisions of courts, or enforced by those invested with civil authority.

"What 'Christianity'?" *American Sentinel* 11, 14 , p. 108.

IT is often asserted, in defense of Sunday "laws," that in this country Christianity is a part of the common law. What Christianity? let us ask. Is it that Christianity which says that he who hates his brother without a cause is guilty of murder, and that the lustful look is adultery? Matt. 5:21, 22, 27, 28. Are these precepts a part of the common law? Is it that Christianity which commands us to love our enemies and forgive them as often as they injure us? Are these common law precepts? Is it that Christianity which directs us to love God supremely, and our neighbors as ourselves? Can we be haled before the courts of common law for failure to do either of these things? Is this the Christianity that is a "part of the common law"? If not, what Christianity is it? If it be not this Christianity, it is not Christ's Christianity; and if it be not Christ's Christianity, it is not Christianity at all, but a counterfeit and a fraud.

Christianity is *not* a part of the common law of this land, nor of any other land in this fallen earth. Nor is it a part of any human law whatever. It is as far above human law as God is above man. Only a low and altogether earthly conception of Christianity could think of it

as on a level with the "common law." And this is the conception of it from which Sunday "laws" derive their force.

Christianity is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," which sets the sinner free from the "law of sin and death." Rom. 8:2. As well might legislators claim to have at their command all the agencies of divinity by which Christianity operates, as to claim that it is a part of the common law of the land.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 14 , p. 112.

JESUS CHRIST was put to death as a criminal because his teach and example were contrary to the traditions of the Jews; and his followers are confined as criminals by the Pharisees of this day because their teaching and practice are contrary to popular tradition.

CIVIL government means force. The function of the civil power is not to persuade people, but to compel them. And therefore there cannot be on this earth a Christian civil government; for Christianity does not compel men, but persuades them. The State acting as a mere persuader of men would not be a State at all; it must act by compulsion, or cease to be that for which it is ordained. There is no Christian power in this world other than that which operates through the Holy Spirit.

But the statement that a civil government cannot be Christian in its nature, does not imply that it must be antichristian or that it cannot be administered by Christians. Civil government is not ordained to do that which is evil, but to conserve justice in the sphere of men's natural rights. It does not pertain to the sphere of man's relation to God; justice in that sphere cannot be conserved by any human power or wisdom. God will deal with every man according to his works in the day of final judgment, and this takes the matter entirely out of the hands of man. Man's place here is to be a doer of the divine law, and not a judge. All justice is, of course, in harmony with Christianity. Hence civil government, as ordained by God, does not work at cross purposes with Christianity. It is non-Christian simply as being by nature incapable of doing the work that is being done among men by the gospel.

EVERY man has the right, so far as his fellowmen are concerned, to believe as he pleases; and that right he never can and never will surrender so long as he is a Christian, yea, so long as he is a man.

"CIVILIZATION" must not be mistaken for Christianity. A Christian is always civil and always ready to advance in the direction of physical, mental, and social well-being; but the power which uplifts him is the power of God working in his heart through faith in Christ. "Civilization" is largely made up of that which attracts by its glitter and outward show; but "all is not gold that glitters," and a showy exterior is the common means of making attractive that which is evil. A nation may be most highly "civilized" at the very time that it is most wicked.

April 9, 1896

"Christian Citizenship" *American Sentinel* 11, 15 , pp. 115, 116.

"A PRACTICAL and adequate organization," says the *Christian Citizen*, ¹⁷² 1 "has recently been called into existence in Chicago, called the 'National Christian Citizenship League,' which has already abundantly vindicated its reason for being. Its avowed three-fold object is:—

"1. To reveal Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the nation as well as of the individual.

"2. To make Christian principles operative in public affairs.

"3. To unite the followers of Christ in consistent, harmonious and aggressive action, not as church members, but as Christian citizens, for the following purposes, viz.:

"1. To prevent, by personal effort, the nomination and election of corrupt candidates and the enactment of corrupt laws in the city, State, and nation.

"2. To secure fidelity on the part of officers instructed with the execution of the laws.

"3. To exterminate the saloon as the greatest enemy of Christ and humanity.

"4. To preserve the Sabbath.

"5. To purify and elevate the elective franchise.

"6. To promote the study of social wrongs, and the application of effective remedies.

"7. In general, to seek the reign of whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report."

The *Christian Citizen* further says:—

"We do not wish for a union of Church and State. Nor do we seek to govern the State through the Church. But we do propose to identify Christian citizens with public affairs, and thus infuse into industries, policies and administrations, the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

"To this necessary and sacred work we summon all, of whatever creed, party, nationality, or sex, who acknowledge God as supreme over all."

Christ the Saviour of the Individual.

The reader familiar with the principles which should govern the relations of Church and State, need not be told that this so-called "Christian Citizenship" movement is the rankest kind of National Reform.

It seem strange that men do not see the absurdity of such leagues. Of course, if Jesus Christ is ever to be revealed "as the Saviour of the nation," it must be by some human power, as God has never revealed him in any such way. The Scriptures set Christ forth as the Saviour of the individual, and of the individual only. "Whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." ¹⁷³²

It is true that "the kingdoms of this world" are finally to "become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ;" ¹⁷⁴³ but it will not be by political action, nor will it be in the world that now is. That kingdom, as the Apostle Peter plainly tells us, is to be in the "new earth," which is to come forth from the ashes of the present world which is reserved unto destruction against the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men, and in it is to dwell only righteousness. ¹⁷⁵⁴ Moreover the inhabitant of that kingdom "shall not say, I am sick," ¹⁷⁶⁵ "for they which shall be all counted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." ¹⁷⁷⁶

Nor is this kingdom to be given to Christ by political action. He receives the kingdom from his Father, who says: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron: thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." ¹⁷⁸⁷

Christian Principles in Public Affairs.

There is one sense, and one sense only, in which Christian principles can properly be applied in public affairs. The Christian must be honest in all the walks of life; whether in private or public he must and will discharge faithfully every duty devolving upon him. He cannot

be an embezzler nor an extortioner. He must deal justly with his fellowmen, and discharge conscientiously every trust committed to him. The individual and the individual only can "make Christian principles operative in public affairs," for only the individual can possess Christian principles.

But Christianity is not the only system of ethics which enjoins honesty, and it is a sad fact that professed Christians are not as a rule more trustworthy than many who make no profession. A very large number of our unfaithful public servants, political tricksters, corrupt politicians, are men who make a profession of religion, as are likewise a great many embezzlers and defaulting bank officers. The public would gain nothing by making a profession of Christianity a stepping-stone to public office. Indeed to do so would only be to place a premium upon hypocrisy; and this the National Reformers of the various schools have already done.

In the early days of the National Reform movement it was predicted by one of the leaders that when the movement was seen to be a success, the politicians would hasten to secure front seats. As recently as 1892, during the agitation for the Sunday-closing of the World's Fair, a direct premium was put upon political dishonesty by the threatened political boycott, which was likewise an implied promise that those who yielded to the demands of the advocates of Sunday-closing should receive their support at the polls.

Religious Combinations Dangerous.

It was declared by a committee of United States Congress more than sixty years ago that "religious combinations to effect political objects are dangerous." It is equally true to-day, and this effort to unite the "followers of Christ" for "consistent, harmonious, and aggressive [political] action" is a menace to our free institutions. Such combinations never have and never can confine themselves to proper political objects. They always have and always will endeavor to use civil power for the furtherance of religion; and the danger is no less, because instead of being united in one denomination, they act simply as "Christian citizens."

The Papacy was the outgrowth of just such a combination. It was not as Roman Catholics, but as "Christians" that the churches of that day brought their influence to bear upon the civil power. Not Roman Catholicism but "Christianity" was made the religion of the Roman

Empire; what followed was only the logical, and, under the prevailing conditions, the inevitable result.

"To prevent by personal effort the nomination and election of corrupt candidates" through this gigantic religious combination means simply to prevent the election of anybody who will not be subservient to the dictates of these "Christian citizens." And "to secure fidelity on the part of officers entrusted with the execution of the laws," simply means, in this connection, to secure prompt attention to the demands of the church people for the enforcement of such civil laws as they may deem of advantage to them. It means especially the rigid enforcement of Sunday laws, and the closing of saloons—on SUNDAY.

It has been plainly shown by these so-called Reformers that they do not desire so much the "extermination of the saloon" as they do the exaltation of Sunday. "To preserve the 'sabbath'" is the great object in view, and everything else must be made to bend to that.

The explanation: "We do not wish for a union of Church and State" would never be made was there not a consciousness even on the part of these so-called Reformers that their movement must inevitably lead to such a result.

The Very Essence of Church and State.

The very essence of Church and State is the use of civil power to enforce religious dogma, or to advance the interests of the Church. It matters not whether that dogma be peculiar to one sect or many. All the evils of union of Church and State would be just as great and would develop just as speedily with a multitude of sects established by law as with a single sect. In fact they would be greater because a single sect established by law would necessarily be held in check to a great extent by other sects; but let all the sects, or at least the more powerful sects, be clothed with civil power to enforce the dogmas held by them in common, and the small minority left to protest, have practically no redress. This has been repeatedly demonstrated in the case of Sabbatarians who, it is urged, constitute only seven-tenths of one percent. of the population, and are therefore not to be considered as having any rights which the majority is bound to respect.

The "pious" invitation: "To this necessary and sacred work we summon all, of whatever creed, party, nationality, or sex, who

acknowledge God as supreme over all," deserves passing notice. There are very many who acknowledge God as supreme over all, but who deny the right of any number of

116

men, or of any number of churches to dictate to them an interpretation of God's will. And that is just what it means, for "'God' to be supreme over all." If God were indeed supreme no one would have ought to fear; but those having control of legislation and not God would be supreme, ruling professedly in the name of God, but in reality administering not the law of God, but their own interpretation of that law. Thus, like the Papacy, they would sit in the temple of God, showing or professing themselves to be God. It would be nothing less than an image of the Papacy.

"Christianity and Communism" *American Sentinel* 11, 15 , p. 116.

THE world to-day is full of theories. Never was human thought more productive of speculation and alleged discoveries relative to panaceas for social and political, as well as physical ills. The human mind is prone to inventions. "God hath made man upright," writes Solomon, "but he has sought out many inventions." He has been continually trying, ever since the fall, to invent some means of becoming his own saviour. But his efforts in this line are, of course, as useless as those made to discover the long-sought "perpetual motion."

The trouble with these "inventions" and theories is, they are human. Man has turned away from a field of knowledge opened before him by the wisdom of God, to wander in the mazes of his own wisdom and speculation. Man cannot be his own saviour. He cannot uplift himself from the plane of his fallen human nature by the force of his own laws and resolutions. But there is one adequate Saviour—Jesus Christ—and one adequate uplifting power for every fallen condition—the power of the gospel of Christ. There is one sure way of attaining happiness here and hereafter, and that is the way of God's word. "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." Ps. 119:105. There is one way of securing uninterrupted prosperity, of having all things work together for our good; and that is stated in the inspired utterance, "All things work together for good to them that love God." Rom. 8:28.

Men, however, are not willing to let happiness and prosperity be assured to them in this way. They have more confidence in the

methods dictated by their own wisdom, than in those set forth in the God-ordained scheme of redemption, which their finite wisdom cannot grasp. They have more faith in a tower of babel as a means of attaining heaven than in the ladder of Jacob's dream. Though it is recorded that the ancient builders "left off to build" the structure begun in the plains of Shinar (Gen. 11:1-10), their descendants have been busy rearing similar towers in the field of ethics, from that time down to the present.

The foundation stone of all these structures is salvation by works. Upon this we see being reared to-day the babel tower of governmental religion. The power of national law is to be made the means of regenerating and saving the nation. By the works of that law is the nation to be made Christian. The Christianity of the nation is to be the Christianity of the people; and when the Church, directing human legislation, shall fulfill(?) the prophecy, "Out of Zion shall go forth the law," the cap-stone of the mighty structure will have been laid. But the work will end in confusion, as it ever has in the past.

Another monument of the modern Babylon may be seen in "Christian" communism. Communism is asserted by its advocates to be identical with Christianity. In this guise it is proclaimed from the pulpit, and in one Western college it is even made the basis of a professorship, under the name of "Applied Christianity." But the very name "communism" indicates that the doctrine is one which deals with masses rather than individuals. Applied Christianity is the life of Christ in the heart of the individual. Christianity deals with individuals only, since it operates only through faith, which is something each person must possess for himself. Christianity operates through faith in Christ; communism operators [*sic.*] through "faith" in a theory. The one seeks to give, the other seeks to receive. The one means self-denial, the other is self-assertion. Any doctrine which seeks to apply Christianity to the State, or the people *en masse*, or to make it operative through the theories and conceptions, or laws and resolutions, of men, is not Christianity, but a base counterfeit. It is the doctrine of self-salvation.

Communism in the pulpit proclaims that the "revelation of Jesus was a social idea," and that "the career of Jesus was as truly political as was that of Mazzini or Sumner." It asserts "that Jesus was crucified for disturbing the social order of things;" and that "Jesus went *at* Jerusalem more truly than Parkhurst at New York, and far more wisely." ¹⁷⁹1 But Jesus himself said, "My kingdom is not of this

world." He would not allow his servants to use the sword in his behalf. He refused to let the multitude make him a king. ¹⁸⁰2 He refused to be made a judge. ¹⁸¹3 Neither military force nor political office pertain to the kingdom of Christ.

The world does not need more theories and more isms; it has too many of these already. It is not in need of new discoveries in ethics or sociology. It needs more of that which has been known and preached since the world began,—the "faith which worketh by love." More love of humanity by humanity is the world's great need, which no human inventions or theories can supply. More love of humanity means more of God in the heart, for "God is love." And this means more faith in the Word of God, for there is enough of the Spirit of God if only the heart is open to receive him. Thus we come back again to the great truth which men have so persistently slighted, that to the gospel of Jesus Christ, which is "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth," and to that alone, must we look for peace, happiness, satisfaction and true success amidst the vicissitudes and troubles of this life.

"The Fountain of Law" *American Sentinel* 11, 15 , pp. 116, 117.

"THERE is one Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy." ¹⁸²1 That which is in the truest sense entitled to be termed law, can from its very nature have but one Author.

The idea that law, as a rule of just conduct for individuals, can be manufactured by legislatures, is altogether erroneous. Neither law nor rights can be manufactured by any human power. The Declaration of Independence asserts that it is a self-evident truth that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." This being true, as it certainly is, it follows that the law of those rights must lie equally without the sphere of human enactments. The law must be co-existent with the rights. The author of the one must of necessity have been the author of the other.

But, as the immortal Declaration asserts, governments are instituted among men to preserve these rights. They are instituted to see that the law of these rights is enforced, or is observed by individuals. That is the civil law,—the law of civility, or respect for human rights. Of course, it must devolve upon sovereign power in a community or State to define the law for the common guidance of all;

but obviously, this is not creating law. It is but discovering that which was already in existence.

"Our human laws," says Froude, ¹⁸³² "are but the copies, more or less imperfect, of the eternal laws so far as we can read them; and either succeed and promote our welfare, or fail and bring confusion and disaster, according as the legislator's insight has detected the true principles, or has been distorted by ignorance or selfishness."

Law is a science; and of the principles of science man is the discoverer, not the maker. The laws of logic, or of mathematics, are dis-

117

covered and laid down in text-books for our guidance; but no man manufactured them. And so with respect to civil law.

An unjust "law" is therefore no more binding upon any person than is an incorrect "rule" of logic. No person can be rightfully bound by injustice; nor can any person under any circumstances throw off the claims of justice. This is not saying that private opinion is superior to legislative enactments, and that an individual may disregard such enactments on no higher authority than his own. The standard of justice is set up among men by the Author of human rights, and to that standard, more or less clearly visible to every mind, he may appeal. It has to this natural sense of justice implanted in man by the Creator, that our forefathers appealed when they sent forth to the world the Declaration of Independence. It was to this standard that Abraham Lincoln and his co-workers appealed when they publicly dissented from the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court.

But in the case of Sunday "laws," we may appeal not only to the natural sense of justice which men possess, but to the most explicit declaration of God's word. That word commands us to sanctify—set apart—the seventh day. We cannot make the seventh day distinct from other days, and at the same time make the first day also distinct in the same way; the one distinction breaks down the other. We are bound by the law of God, and there can be no real law, civil or otherwise, which conflicts with that. The sphere of the law of natural rights—the civil law—is altogether separate from the sphere of our obligations to God, and from the law by which those obligations are defined.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 15 , p. 120.

THE statement that politics and religion should be kept separate does not mean that in the field of political action a man is free from moral obligation; but it does mean that every man should be left perfectly free from all human restraint in matters of religion. It does mean that religious faith and practice are not proper subjects of political action; that such questions are not cognizable by political bodies, but are beyond the sphere of human authority.

This however does not destroy moral obligation in any degree.

The Christian must be such in all the walks of life. It is as wicked to cheat, or to lie or to steal for political purposes as for anything else. The Christian can do none of these things and excuse himself on the ground that he did it as a politician. Neither can he use political power to thrust his religion down the throats of his fellowmen. To do so would be to violate both the Golden Rule of the Scriptures and the law of justice written by the Creator in the great book of nature.

April 16, 1896

"Worms and the Wartburg" *American Sentinel* 11, 16 , pp. 121, 122.

WORMS and the Wartburg Castle were both scenes of important events in the history of the Reformation.

At Worms assembled the Diet to which the place owes its fame, for it was there that Luther put to confusion the representatives of both Church and State; while, in Wartburg Castle the reformer subsequently found temporary asylum from his enemies.

"A real reformation," says D'Aubigne, "prepared during many ages, is the work of the Spirit of God. Before the appointed hour, the greatest geniuses and even the most faithful of God's servants cannot produce it; but when the reforming time is come, when it is God's pleasure to renovate the affairs of the world, . . . then if men are silent, the very stones will cry out." ¹⁸⁴¹

All was ready when Luther came upon the stage of action. "God who prepares his work through ages, accomplishes it by the weakest instruments when his time is come." The reformer was only a poor monk, but "he came in the fullness of time," writes Professor Harnack, "when the rule of the Roman Church, which had hitherto educated the peoples, had become a tyranny, when States and nations were beginning to throw off an ecclesiastical yoke and

independently to organize themselves in accordance with their own laws."

"He came in the fullness of time—when laymen were no longer satisfied with priest and sacrament, but were seeking God himself, *and were feeling the personal responsibility of their own souls.*"

The Reformation was not the work, however, of Luther and his co-laborers; they were only instruments in God's hands. In the life of the true reformer we see only the reflected glory of the Creator working out his eternal purpose. "Luther was great only in the rediscovered knowledge of God in the gospels." He himself said: "I put forward God's word; . . . this was all I did. And yet while I was asleep . . . the word that I had preached overthrew popery, so that neither prince nor emperor has done it so much harm. And yet I did nothing: the word alone did all." ¹⁸⁵²

"The Reformation was accomplished," says the historian, "in the name of a spiritual principle." It "rejected all worldly elements." And only so long as this was true did it continue to be *reformation*. "Every revolution," says D'Aubigne, "should be accomplished in the mind before it is carried out externally." It was so with Luther; the Reformation began in his own heart. Seeking freedom from the bondage of sin and finding it not in external ordinances, but only in the promise of God: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," Luther began to minister to others the comfort wherewith he himself had been comforted. It was with no ambitious purpose that Luther assailed the doctrines of the Papacy; he desired only to give to his fellowmen the gospel which priestcraft had taken from them. His purpose was not the destruction of the Papacy, but the salvation of souls.

Realizing that individual responsibility to God necessarily meant freedom to obey, Luther denied the right alike of Church and State to trammel his conscience. And this denial was fraught with far-reaching consequences to both civil and ecclesiastical systems.

"An obscure individual, bearing in his hand the word of Life, had stood firm before the mighty ones of the world, and they had shaken before him. He had wielded this arm of the word of God, first against Tetzel and his numerous army; and those greedy merchants, after a brief struggle, had fled away: he next employed it against the Roman legate at Augsburg; and the legate in amazement had allowed the prey to escape him: somewhat later with its aid he contended against the champions of learning in the halls of Leipsic; and the astonished

theologians had beheld their syllogistic weapons shivered in their hands; and, lastly, with this single arm, he had opposed the Pope, when the latter, disturbed in his slumbers, had risen on his throne to blast the unfortunate monk with his thunders; and this same word had paralyzed all the power of this head of Christendom. A final struggle remained to be undergone. The word was destined to triumph over the emperor of the West, over the kings and princes of the earth; and then, victorious over all the powers of the world, to arise in the Church, and reign as the very word of God." ¹⁸⁶³

The ordeal was severe, but the reformer stood, not in the strength of men, but in the power of God. To one who asked him, "How can you hope to succeed?" Luther answered, "I trust in God Almighty, whose word and commandment I have before me." The forces of a mighty empire were arrayed against him, but he faltered not, and when in the presence of the assembled Diet, he was required to give a direct answer to the demand of the Emperor that he retract his writings, the reformer said:—

I cannot submit my faith either to the Pope or to the Councils, because it is as clear as the day that they have frequently erred and contradicted each other. Unless, therefore, I am convinced by the testimony of Scripture, or by the clearest reasoning; unless I am persuaded by means of the passages I have quoted, and unless they thus

122

render my conscience bound by the word of God, I cannot and I will not retract, for it is unsafe for a Christian to speak against his conscience. Here I stand, I can do no other; may God help me. Amen.

Never before had the old city of Worms been stirred by such words. The most important declaration of independence since that of the apostles: "We ought to obey God rather than men," had been given to the world. The Protest of the Princes at Spires five years later was simply the response of German manhood to the reformer's declaration of the individual's duty to God and of his consequent right to pay his highest allegiance to him only.

Rome was baffled! She had demanded unqualified submission only to hear her authority boldly challenged. The power of conscience was declared to be above the civil magistrate, and the word of God above the visible church.

"The sword of the Spirit which is the word of God" had been unsheathed against an apostate church, and though she might take

the life of the warrior who thus wielded it, she could not destroy the weapon which had power in itself to continue the warfare; nor could she again fetter the human mind enlightened with divine wisdom. The word of God once locked in dead languages and chained to convent walls was not to be unfettered that it might accomplish in other minds and hearts the revolution it had wrought in Luther's bosom. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

"He is a freeman, whom the truth makes free,
And all are slaves beside. There's not a chain,
That hellish foes, confederate for his harm,
Can wind around him, but he casts it off
With as much ease as Sampson his green withes." ¹⁸⁷⁴

The Wartburg

From Worms Luther went to the Wartburg, not indeed by his own volition, but nevertheless providentially. May 25, 1521, he was placed under the ban of the empire. But his safe conduct protected him. The next day he left Worms as though to return to Wittenburg. On his journey he was seized by his friends and was carried to the Wartburg, a castle near Eisenach, where he remained until March of the following year.

But the Reformer was not idle in his retirement. "Luther's residence at the Wartburg," remarks, Dr. Schaff, "marks the second period of his reformatory activity." For a time his enemies thought him dead, but they were soon undeceived. It was in the Wartburg that Luther translated the New Testament into German, which more than anything else contributed to make the Reformation permanent. Here too he wrote those tracts which so stirred Germany, and which were like barbed arrows in the sides of the Papacy. It is because of the work done within its walls for soul-liberty that the Wartburg is to-day a household word, while many more pretentious and in their day more noted castles are forgotten.

The eternal years of God belong to truth, and he who would make an everlasting name must identify himself with the incarnate "Word which liveth and abideth for ever," for He is the embodiment of truth.

"With our own strength we naught can do,
Destruction yawns on every side:
He fights for us, our champion true,
Elect of God to be our guide.
What is his name? The anointed One,

The God of armies he; Of earth and heaven the Lord alone—
With him, on field of battle won, Abideth victory." ¹⁸⁸⁵

**"What Is Due to God, and What to Cesar?" *American Sentinel* 11, 16 ,
pp. 124, 125.**

IN the words, "Render unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's," Christ has established a clear distinction between Cesar and God,—between that which is Cesar's and that which is God's; that is, between the civil and the religious power, and between what we owe to the civil power and what we owe to the religious power. That which is Cesar's is to be rendered to Cesar; that which is God's is to be rendered to God alone. With that which is God's, Cesar can have nothing to do. To say that we are to render to Cesar that which is God's, is to pervert the words of Christ, and make them meaningless. Such an interpretation would be but to entangle him in his talk,—the very thing that the Pharisees sought to do.

As the word "Cesar" refers to civil government, it is apparent at once that

The Duties Which We Owe to Cesar Are Civil Duties

while the duties which we owe to God are wholly moral or religious duties. Webster's definition of *religion* is:—

The recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience.

Another definition, equally good, is: "Man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God."

Yet again, the American definition is: "The duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it." ¹⁸⁹¹

It is evident, therefore, that religion and religious duties pertain solely to God; and as that which is God's is to be rendered to him and not to Cesar, it follows inevitably that, according to the words of Christ, civil government can never of right have anything to do with religion,—with a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God.

What Is Morality?

Another definition which may help in making the distinction between that which pertains to God and that which pertains to our fellow-men, is that of *morality*, as follows:—

Morality: The relation of conformity or non-conformity to the true moral standard or rule. . . . The conformity of an act to the divine law.

As morality, therefore, is the conformity of an act to the divine law, it is plain that in this, its true sense, morality also pertains solely to God, and so is outside the legitimate sphere of civil authority. This may appear at first sight to be an extreme position, if not a false one; but it is not. It is the correct position, as we think anyone can see who will give the subject a little careful thought. The first part of the definition already given, says that morality is "the relation of conformity or nonconformity to the true moral standard or rule," and the latter part of the definition shows that this true moral standard is the divine law. Again, moral law is defined as:—

The will of God, as the supreme moral ruler, concerning the character and conduct of all responsible beings; the rule of action as obligatory on the conscience or moral nature. The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue, written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai.

These definitions are according to Scripture. The Scriptures show that the ten commandments are the law of God; that they express the will of God; that they pertain to the conscience, and take cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart; and that obedience to these commandments is the duty that man owes to God. Says the Scripture: "Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. And the Saviour says:—

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca ["vain fellow," margin], shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire. Matt. 5:21, 22.

The apostle John, referring to the same thing, says: "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." 1 John 3:15. Again, the Saviour says:—

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a

woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. Matt. 5:27, 28.

To hate, is murder; to covet, is idolatry; to think impurely of a woman, is adultery;—these are all violations of the moral law, but no civil government seeks to punish for them. A man may hate his neighbor all his life; he may covet every thing on earth; he may think impurely of every woman he sees,—

125

he may keep it up all his days; but so long as these things are confined to his thought, the civil power cannot touch him. It would be difficult to conceive of a more immoral person than such a man would be; yet the State cannot punish him. It does not attempt to punish him. This demonstrates again that with morality or immorality the State can have nothing to do.

The State Punishes Incivility

But let us carry this further. Only let that man's hatred lead him, either by word or sign, to attempt an injury to his neighbor, and the State will punish him; only let his covetousness lead him to lay hands on what is not his own, in an attempt to steal, and the State will punish him; only let his impure thought lead him to attempt violence to any woman, and the State will punish him. Yet bear in mind that even then the State does not punish him for his immorality, but for his incivility. The immorality lies in the heart, and can be measured by God only. The State punishes no man because he is immoral. If it did, it would have to punish as a murderer the man who hates another, because, according to the true standard of morality, hatred is murder. Therefore it is clear that in fact the State punishes no man because he is immoral, but because he is uncivil. It cannot punish immorality; it must punish incivility.

This distinction is shown in the very term by which is designated State or national government; it is called *civil* government. No person ever thinks of calling it moral government. The government of God is the only moral government.

God Is the Only Moral Governor

The law of God is the only moral law. To God alone pertains the punishment of immorality, which is the transgression of the moral law. Governors of men are civil governors, not moral. The laws of States

and nations are civil laws, not moral. To the authorities of civil government pertains the punishment of incivility, that is, the transgression of civil law. It is not theirs to punish immorality. That pertains solely to the Author of the moral law and of the moral sense, who is the sole judge of man's moral relation. All this must be manifest to every one who will think fairly upon the subject, and it is confirmed by the definition of the word "civil," which is as follows:—

Civil: Pertaining to a city or State, or to a citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens, or to the State.

By all these things it is made clear that we owe to Cesar (civil government) only that which is civil, and that we owe to God that which is moral or religious. Other definitions show the same thing. For instance, sin as defined by Webster is "any violation of God's will;" and as defined by the Scriptures, "is the transgression of the law." That the law here referred to is the moral law—the ten commandments—is shown by Rom. 7:7:—

I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

Thus the Scriptures show that sin is the transgression of the law which says, "Thou shalt not covet," and that is the moral law.

But crime is an offense against the laws of the State. The definition is as follows:—

Crime is strictly a violation of law either human or divine; but in present usage the term is commonly applied to actions contrary to the laws of the State.

Thus civil statutes define crime, and deal with crime, but not with sin; while the divine statutes define sin, and deal with sin, but not with crime.

As God is the only moral governor, as his is the only moral government, as his law is the only moral law, and as it pertains to him to punish immorality, so likewise *the promotion of morality* pertains to him alone. Morality is conformity to the law of God; it is obedience to God.

But Obedience to God Must Spring from The Heart In Sincerity and Truth

This it must do, or it is not obedience; for, for, as we have proved by the Word of God, the law of God takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. But "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." By transgression, all men have made themselves immoral. "Therefore by the deeds of the law [by obedience] there

shall no flesh be justified [accounted righteous, or made moral] in his sight." Rom. 3:20. As all men have, by transgression of the law of God, made themselves immoral, therefore no man can, by obedience to the law, become moral, because it is that very law which declares him to be immoral.

If ever men shall be made moral, it must be by the Author of all morality. And this is just the provision which God has made. For, "now the righteousness [the morality] of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness [the morality] of God which is *by faith of Jesus Christ* unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned [made themselves immoral], and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:21-23. It is by the morality of Christ alone that men can be made moral. And this morality of Christ is the morality of God, which is imputed to us for Christ's sake; and we receive it by faith in him who is both the author and finisher of faith. Then by the Spirit of God the moral law is written anew in the heart and in the mind, sanctifying the soul unto obedience—unto morality. Thus, and thus alone, can men ever attain to morality; and that morality is the morality of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ.

To God Alone Pertains the Promotion of Morality

God, then, being the sole promoter of morality, through what instrumentality does he work to promote morality in the world? What body has he made the teacher of morality in the world? the Church, or the civil power; which?—The Church, and the Church alone. It is "the Church of the living God." It is "the pillar and ground of the truth." It was to the Church that he said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" "and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." It is by the church, through the preaching of Jesus Christ, that the gospel is "made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." There is no obedience but the obedience of faith; there is no morality but the morality of faith. Therefore it is proved that to the Church, and *not* to the State, is committed the conservation of morality in the world. This at once settles the question as to whether the State shall teach morality, or religion. The State *cannot* teach morality or religion. It has not the credentials for it. The Spirit of God and the gospel of Christ are both

essential to the teaching of morality, and neither of these is committed to the State, but both to the Church.

But though this work be committed to the church, even then there is not committed to the church the prerogative either to reward morality or to punish immorality. She beseeches, she entreats, she persuades men to be reconciled to God; she trains them in the principles and the practice of morality. It is hers by moral suasion or spiritual censures to preserve the purity and *discipline* of her membership. But to reward morality or to punish immorality pertains to God alone, because whether it be morality or immorality, it springs from the secret counsels of the heart; and as God alone knows the heart, he alone can measure either the merit or the guilt involved in any question of morals.

The Inquisition Is In It

By this it is demonstrated that to no man, to no assembly or organization of men, does there belong any right whatever to punish immorality. Whoever attempts it, usurps the prerogative of God. The Inquisition is the inevitable logic of any claim of any assembly of men to punish immorality, because to punish immorality, it is necessary in some way to get at the thoughts and intents of the heart. The Papacy, asserting the right to compel men to be moral, and to punish them for immorality, had the cruel courage to carry the evil principle to its logical consequence. In carrying out the principle, it was found to be essential to get at the secrets of men's hearts; and it was found that the diligent application of torture would wring from men, in many cases, a full confession of the most secret counsels of their hearts. Hence the was established as the means best adapted to secure the desired end. So long as men grant the proposition that it is within the province of civil government to enforce morality, it is to very little purpose that they condemn the Inquisition; for that tribunal is only the logical result of the proposition.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 16 , p. 128.

AMS sophistical a National Reform argument (though not so designed), as we have seen recently, runs thus:—

When we speak of "the State" without qualification expressed or implied, we do not refer to any particular State or form of government, but to earthly government, as distinct from the

government of God. Neither do we mean law-makers and rulers alone, since they would be nothing without people under them. And since all the world is under some form or other of human government, the term, "the State," is really synonymous with "the world."

The conclusion reached is that the relation of Christ and his Church to the State is identical with Christ's relation to the world, namely, "one of salvation;" and then follow such texts as John 6:51; 2 Cor. 5:19; etc. The absurdity of the "argument" becomes apparent at once upon reading these texts, merely substituting the word "State" for "world," which is perfectly proper if they mean the same thing. Thus John 6:51 would read: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the State"! The new rendering of 2 Cor. 5:19 makes it equally absurd; thus: "God was in Christ, reconciling the State unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them [States, of course]; and hath committed unto us the ministry of reconciliation." In like manner John 3:17 would read: "For God sent not his Son into the State to condemn the State; but that the State through him might be saved."

It is thus that consistent "National Reform" would distort the Scriptures in the interests of its Church and State propaganda, and thus would it justify its efforts to save the State by constitutional amendments, religious statutes, Christian citizenship leagues, etc.

"CAN a government be so framed and administered as not to infringe on somebody's rights of conscience?" asks the *Christian Statesman*, of February 22, last. The implication is that it cannot; and this idea seems to be held by quite a large number of religious people in this country. If these people would remember that both civil government and the rights of conscience are ordained of God, it might help them to arrive at a correct conclusion. God never instituted two things which were out of harmony with each other. He never instituted anything out of harmony with himself. Therefore he never ordained any form of civil government which conflicts with the rights of conscience.

April 23, 1896

"Paul Before Agrippa" *American Sentinel* 11, 17 , pp. 129, 130.

IN Paul's day Rome ruled the world, paganism was entrenched in the laws and customs of the people, and new religions were proscribed.

All gods were then regarded as national deities, and while the gods of Rome were held to be superior to all others, even to Jehovah, Rome permitted conquered nations to maintain their accustomed worship; hence Judaism was tolerated.

But Rome forbade innovations in religion. The law was:—

"No man shall have for himself particular gods of his own; no man shall worship by himself any new or foreign gods, unless they are recognized by the public laws." ¹⁹⁰¹

"Whoever introduces new religions, the tendency and character of which are unknown, whereby the minds of men may be disturbed, shall, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death." ¹⁹¹²

Christianity, while only the perfect development of the religion of the Hebrews, was regarded by both Jews and Gentiles as a new faith, and therefore prohibited; but the apostle argued that Christianity was simply the faith of the fathers, and consequently within the "law," that is, not prohibited by "law."

Paul a Roman Citizen.

Paul, though a Jew, was a Roman citizen; and this fact imparts a peculiar interest to the record of his life, because his relation to the State corresponded more nearly to that of most men of to-day than did that of any other of the apostles.

Not every Roman subject was a citizen. There is a wide difference even to-day between residence and citizenship; and there was very much more difference then. "The early law of Rome," says the "Encyclopedia Britannica," "was essentially personal, not territorial. A man enjoyed the benefit of its institutions and of its protection, not because he happened to be within Roman territory, but because he was a citizen,—one of those by whom and for whom its law was established."

Paul, on three recorded occasions, availed himself of the privileges that were his by virtue of his Roman citizenship. And once did he plead that he was "a citizen of no mean city," Tarsus. This, however, was not tantamount to Roman citizenship, for we

subsequently find the chief captain, to whom this statement was made, apparently ignorant of the fact that the apostle was a Roman.

Paul's first appeal to his Roman citizenship is recorded in the 16th chapter of Acts. "And it came to pass," writes Luke, "as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying: the same followed Paul and us, and cried, saying, These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation. And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour. And when her masters saw that the hope of their gains was gone, they caught Paul and Silas, and drew them into the marketplace unto the rulers, and brought them to the magistrates, saying, These men, being Jews, do exceedingly trouble our city, and teach customs, which are not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe, being Romans. And the multitude rose up together against them: and the magistrates rent off their clothes, and commanded to beat them. And when they had laid many stripes upon them, they cast them into prison, charging the jailor to keep them safely: who, having received such a charge, thrust them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks." ¹⁹²³

Proper Dignity Maintained.

"When it was day, the magistrates sent the sergeants, saying, Let these men go." "And the keeper of the prison told this saying to Paul." "But Paul said unto them, They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out. And the sergeants told these words unto the magistrates: and they feared, when they heard that they were Romans. And they came and besought them, and brought them out." ¹⁹³⁴

Roman law guaranteed to the citizen a trial

130

before condemnation or punishment; and in taking the course the apostle did he only insisted that the proceedings should be according to the law which the magistrates professed to respect and enforce.

We are not warranted in attributing to Paul any improper motive in thus demanding his rights under the law. He must have had in view the glory of God and the spread of the truth; and doubtless the

influence upon all concerned was salutary. "Paul and Silas felt that to maintain the dignity of Christ's Church, they must not submit to the illegal course proposed by the Roman magistrates. . . . They had been publicly thrust into prison, and now refused to be privately released, without proper acknowledgments on the part of the magistrates." ¹⁹⁴ 5 It was seen that the apostle and his companion were not unreasoning fanatics, but rational, thinking men, who knew their rights and were neither afraid nor ashamed to maintain them by proper means. It was also demonstrated that they were not revengeful, for while demanding at the hands of the magistrates such acknowledgment as would vindicate them from the unjust charges made against them, they sought no revenge for the indignities they had suffered.

We cannot doubt that in all this the apostle acted wisely. It is not only the Christian's privilege but his duty to take such a course under all circumstances as will place him in a favorable light before the bar of public opinion. Silence and abject submission are sometimes mistaken for confession of the truth of unjust changes; while a calm, dignified defense and assertion of civil rights commands respect and secures attention to the principles involved. To the manly stand taken by the apostle upon this occasion is largely due under God the freedom enjoyed in the world to-day in matters of conscience.

"They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin."

Unlawful to Scourge a Roman Uncondemned

The second recorded instance in which the apostle availed himself of his rights as a Roman citizen was when on the occasion of the uproar at Jerusalem, "the chief captain commanded him to be brought into the castle, and bade that he should be examined by scourging; that he might know wherefore they cried so against him. And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying, Take heed what thou doest; for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea. And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was freeborn. Then straightway they departed from him which should have examined him: and the chief captain also was afraid, after he knew

that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him." ¹⁹⁵6 But in this instance, as upon the former occasion, Paul sought no revenge. He was a Roman, but was also a Christian.

The Apostle Exercises the Citizen's Right of Appeal

The third, and so far as we know, the last occasion upon which Paul asserted his rights as a Roman, was when "Festus, willing to do the Jews a pleasure, answered Paul, and said, Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me? Then said Paul, I stand at Cesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest. For if I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Cesar. ¹⁹⁶7

The appeal of a Roman citizen to the emperor could not be disregarded, and Festus answered, "Hast thou appealed unto Cesar? Unto Cesar shalt thou go."

Festus really had no option in the matter; but there being no clearly-defined charge against the apostle, he was in doubt as to the account of the case which he ought to send to the emperor. Festus therefore kept Paul in prison until Agrippa and Bernice came unto Cesarea. He then brought the apostle before them, and briefly recited the facts in the case, concluding thus:—

When I found that he had committed nothing worthy of death, and that he himself hath appealed to Augustus, I have determined to send him. Of whom I have no certain thing to write unto my lord. Wherefore I have brought him forth before you, and specially before thee, O king Agrippa, that, after examination had, I might have somewhat to write. For it seemeth to me unreasonable to send a prisoner, and not withal to signify the crimes laid against him. ¹⁹⁷8

"Then Agrippa said unto Paul," continues the record, "Thou art permitted to speak for thyself. Then Paul stretched forth the hand, and answered for himself."

Paul's defense is recorded in the twenty-sixth chapter of Acts, and being of easy access, we shall only call attention briefly to it.

Christianity Not a New Religion

Paul established by a circumstantial statement the fact that he was not only a Jew but a Pharisee; and then anticipating the only charge that could lie against him on religious grounds under Roman law, namely, that he had introduced a new religion or worshiped a God not recognized by Roman law, he declared: "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews."

As before remarked, Christianity was not a new religion; it was simply a new phase of that religion given to our first parents at the fall, cherished by the patriarchs, and restored to Israel through Moses; and as such it was not a violation of Roman law to teach it, not was it an offense under the law to worship the God it revealed. But as previously stated, neither Jew nor Gentile recognized this fact. In the eyes of both, Christianity had its origin in the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, and was no part of any previously-existing system of religion; and, as they viewed it, was consequently prohibited by the law of the empire.

Recounting before the king his trip to Damascus, his experience in being stricken to the earth by a light from heaven, the voice speaking to him, his conversion, etc., the apostle declared that he witnessed none other things than the prophets and Moses did say should come—in short, that he was not a setter-forth of strange doctrines.

The Apostle Labored to Save Men

Paul's words on this occasion were not however, merely, nor even chiefly, a defense of his own rights; nor was it his chief object to convince Agrippa that he had violated no law. His defense of himself was rather a means to an end. It was the apostle's life work to preach the gospel; and his motto was: "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." His heart burned within him for the salvation of his royal auditors.

Most graphically did he depict the scenes attending his conversion on the ways to Damascus, and most eloquently did he present the claims of the gospel and unhesitatingly declare his relation to it.

"Having therefore obtained help of God," concluded the apostles, "I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say

should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people, and to the Gentiles." "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest. Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian. And Paul said, I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am, except these bonds." ¹⁹⁸⁹

Forgetful as he ever was of himself, willing to endure all things that he might save some, the apostle was nevertheless conscious of the value of that physical liberty which was his by divine right; and in the words, "except these bonds," we discover something of the yearning after freedom which God has implanted in the human breast that he might gratify it by giving the glorious liberty of the children of God; for without such aspirations the message which proclaims "liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound" would fall upon ears dead alike to calls to human progress or to spiritual growth; and Christ would have died in vain.

"The Sabbath and Rest" *American Sentinel* 11, 17 , pp. 133, 134.

THE word "sabbath" means rest. After employing six days in creating the heavens and the earth, God rested on the seventh day, and was refreshed. Ex. 31:17. The rest and refreshment which pertain to the Sabbath do not arise from cessation from wearisome toil, for "the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary" (Isa. 40:28); and as the Sabbath was when it afforded Him rest and refreshment, so he has given it to man. Moreover it was instituted for man in Eden before the fall, before man was obliged to earn bread by the sweat of his brow; and it will be observed in the new earth, where toil and weariness will not be known. While it affords a welcome relief from toil in this life, it has also a rest and refreshment of a difficult and higher sort. It has a rest and a delight which are spiritual. Isa. 58:13, 14.

Yet this institution, given to mankind in order that they might enjoy complete and perfect rest, is being made the occasion of great unrest among men at the present time. It is being made the basis of an agitation which affects all classes of people; which disturbs political parties, causes trouble and labor to legislators and judges, and in various ways disturbs the public peace. All this is plainly a gross perversion of the God-ordained purpose of the Sabbath day.

The trouble is that men are not taking the Sabbath as God has given it to them; but they have made a sabbath of their own—the first day of the week—the purpose and "law" of which are also of their own manufacture; and they are endeavoring to make this sabbath take the place of the Sabbath of the Lord. But their sabbath does not promote peace among men, but rather confusion and strife. The whole religious world is in confusion concerning its basis and proper observance. It is the center of a ceaseless agitation, which gives no satisfaction to either the Church or the State.

The remedy is to turn from the man-made institution based upon tradition and popular custom, to the Sabbath of the Lord, based upon his divine word. Whoever will observe

134

this divine Sabbath, will find rest and refreshment which the world knows not of. The Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day, blessed and this divine Sabbath, will find rest and refreshment which the world knows not of. The Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day, blessed and hallowed by the Creator—gives perfect rest, as it was designed to do by its Author. The confusion, unrest, and strife, which pertain to the question of Sabbath observance in the world to-day, would cease at once if men would but observe the Sabbath God has given. But nothing else can come from the effort to establish the man-made sabbath in the place of that which is divine.

April 30, 1896

**"Civil Grounds of Religious Intolerance" *American Sentinel* 11, 18 ,
pp. 137, 138.**

IN all ages and in every country religious intolerance has been defended on the ground of public policy.

Dissenters have ever been stigmatized as enemies of the State, subverters of social order, and disturbers of the public peace.

Ahab's wicked accusation, contained in the question to Elijah: "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" has been repeated in various forms in every country and in every age from that time until the present.

When Daniel was accused to the king because he prayed three times a day contrary to the royal mandate, the accusation was in these words: "Daniel, which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast

signed." His violation of the king's decree was held to be subversive of social order, and his example to be pernicious in the extreme.

The Son of God was accused "as one that perverteth the people," and the prevailing argument with Pilate for his condemnation was, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cesar." Religious bigotry simply invoked against Christ the penalties of the civil law; he suffered ostensibly, not as a defamer of religion, but as an enemy of the State.

The apostles were also accused of being disturbers of the peace. At Thessalonica the cry was, "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received; and these all do contrary to the decrees of Cesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus." And at Ephesus,

138

the silversmiths raised a tumult because their craft was endangered by the preaching of the apostles. Nor were their fears groundless. The danger which they saw threatening their business really existed; so close was the relation between the prevailing faith and the social and commercial customs of the people. Thus they plausibly argued that there existed a substantial civil basis for the legal prohibition of the preaching of the doctrine of Christ.

Human Nature Intolerant.

It is said that "times change and men change with them;" but there is really little truth in the supposed maxim. The grace of God is the only thing that really changes anybody. Men are naturally intolerant, and we still find them invoking the power of the State to enforce religious dogmas, and to bolster up religious creeds; and at the same time justifying their action on "civil" grounds.

In our own country the attempt has been made to justify various measures of religious legislation on the ground that the stability of our institutions and even of the Government itself depends upon the maintenance of our religion. This is especially true of Sunday laws. In a tract, "The American Sabbath," published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Rev. Robert Patterson, D.D., says:—

It is the right of the State to protect by law such a fundamental support of government. This attack on the sabbath is treason against the very foundation of government. As such, let it be resisted by every American citizen. The American sabbath is essential to American liberty, to our Republic, and to God's religion.

In his book, "The Sabbath for Man," Mr. Crafts says:—

It is the conviction of the majority that the nation can not be preserved without religion, nor religion without the sabbath, nor the sabbath without laws; therefore sabbath laws are enacted by the right of self-preservation, not in violation of liberty, but for its protection.—*Page 248.*

The "argument" may seem plausible to many, but it is unsound. It would justify all the persecutions of the past, and revive the bloody scenes of the Dark Ages.

A Case in Point.

In harmony with this theory honest American citizens have within a year toiled in the chain-gang for no offense against their fellowmen, but only for refusing to honor a statute-intrenched religious institution; and to-day J. W. Lewis, a Seventh-day Adventist, swelters in a Tennessee jail like a common criminal for the same reason.

An exact parallel to it is found in Russia. There the faith of the Orthodox Church is the established religion; and the theory of the government is, as stated by Lady Herbert, in the *Dublin Review*, January, 1893, that "that which makes the body and strength of the Russian Government is its national religion." It follows, according to Mr. Crafts' and Dr. Patterson's logic, that the Russian Government is perfectly justifiable in maintaining that religion at any cost.

The statement quoted from Lady Herbert was made upon the authority of Father Vanutelli, a Dominican monk, who was invited by the Russian Government to visit the principal religious establishments in that country. "He was everywhere cordially received," remarked the *Review of Reviews*, "and had an interview with Pobidonotezeff," the famous procurator of the Holy Snod. Pobiedonotezeff, it appears, expressed his views very freely to his guest, saying, as Lady Herbert put it, "that society in the West was going to ruin, and that its decay was owing to the want of religion and the revolutionary and social principles which were being so widely enunciated." "In Russia," he said, "we have preserved the principle of authority and the deepest respect for the Christian religion. The people are attached to the government and thoroughly good at the bottom, and they enjoy a state of prosperity which in other countries does not exist. Here there are no political parties, no parliaments or rival authorities, and we wish to avoid any contact with what might disturb the tranquility of the masses."

Nowhere Does Christ Reign as in Russia

Father Vanutelli himself said:—

I cannot understand how it is that so many persons who visit Russia write about it afterwards without alluding to the main characteristic of the people. Without an appreciation of their religious aspect any description of Russia must be incomplete. The Christian idea is predominant everywhere, and nowhere does Christ reign to such an extent as in Russia.

The following quotation from an article in the *Century*, for February, 1893, by Pierre Botkine, at that time secretary of the Russian Legation at Washington, will serve to throw some additional light upon this subject and show what Vanutelli meant by saying that "nowhere does Christ reign as in Russia." Botkine said:—

The strength of Russia lies precisely in the unity of power, in the firm faith of the people in their church, and in their reliance upon and devotion to the high personality called to occupy the throne.

The Russian idea is that the Czar reigns by divine right. He is the acknowledged head of the church as well as of the civil government, and the fealty of the people to him is not simply that of subjects to a civil ruler, but to a spiritual lord as well, who has the power to close heaven against them or to admit them to all its enjoyments. Their patriotism and their religious veneration center in a single individual, namely, the Czar; hence his power over them, and the consequent strength of the government which is thus supported by the strongest sentiments of the human soul.

Religious Institutions and Political Stability

In view of what has already been said it is scarcely necessary to say that the union of Church and State in Russia is perfect. Nor is it strange that the government regards any effort to weaken the established church, or to draw away converts from it, much as it would an attempt to undermine the empire itself, or to destroy in the breasts of the people, that feeling of patriotism that is the strength of every stable government. All religious restrictions in Russia are in the interests of political stability. Mr. Botkine said:—

The Orthodox Church is the State Church in Russia; and, as I have explained, the strength and might of the empire are considered by us to depend to a great degree upon the firm faith of the people in its doctrines and discipline. Our history abounds in proofs of this. It is therefore natural that our government cherishes

and supports the orthodox religion, and tries to prevent the members of that church or their children from heedlessly going off into other communions.

This is but putting in other phrase the sentiment already quoted from Mr. Crafts and Dr. Patterson, in justification of Sunday laws. In Russia it is the conviction, if not of the majority, at least of the rulers, that the nation can not be preserved without religion, nor religion without the Orthodox Church, nor the Orthodox Church without laws; that to dissent from the established religion is treason against the empire; therefore such laws are enacted by the right of self-preservation.

The Motive of Religious Intolerance.

It is the purpose of the Russian Government to crush out all religious dissent throughout the length and breadth of the empire in the interests of the ideal of Czar Nicholas, "One empire, one tongue, one church;" or in other words, perfect unity, and consequently, matchless strength; and it matters not how many conscientious men and women travel the weary road to Siberia as a result of this theory. The motive is not avowedly religious, but political. The Czar seeks to control the religion of his subjects, we are told, only that he may the more firmly cement and bind together the various parts and elements in the empire. The logic is just as good in the one case as in the other. The principle is the same in America as in Europe.

Mr. Botkine even denied that there was any restriction of religious liberty in Russia except where certain obnoxious sects propagated doctrines which the authorities considered subversive of morals or of good order in society. Of the Jews he said: "We did not expel the Jews from the empire, as is often mistakenly charged, though we did restrict their rights as to certain localities of domicile and as to kinds of occupations—police regulations." This being the case, Mr. Botkine regarded the remonstrances sent to the Czar from other countries as most impertinent. "The principle we contend for," said he, "is home rule."

The "Justification" the Same in All Ages.

It will be observed that the arguments urged in justification of restrictions of religious liberty are the same in every country and in every age. Elijah was persecuted because he "troubled" Israel; Daniel

was persecuted because he regarded not the king's command; Christ was put to death as an enemy of the State; the apostles were denounced and persecuted as disturbers of the peace; Jews and Protestants in Russia are banished to Siberia because they propagate doctrines which the authorities consider subversive of morals and of good order, and tending to weaken the government; and in this country it is urged that the same thing should be done for the very same reasons: indeed, the same principle does prevail to a greater or less extent, especially in our Sunday legislation. In Tennessee and some other States, as before remarked, "otherwise good citizens" are fined, imprisoned, and worked in the chain-gang for daring to dissent, practically, from the prevailing religion—and this on the plea that their example is prejudicial to good morals! and their acts against the peace and dignity of the State!! Surely we are not so very far ahead of our neighbors or even of the ancients after all! If times do change, men do not change with them to the extent of abandoning the supposed right of the majority or of the rulers to cram their religion, or at least, a portion of it, down the throats of the minority, or of their subjects. No considerable part of the race has yet developed sufficient moral power to yield complete obedience to the acme of all social law: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 18 , p. 144.

A FORCED religious observance is a sacrifice which God abhors.

ANY power which undertakes to deal by law with an act on the basis of its immorality, assumes the wisdom to measure and the power to adequately punish *sin*; and thus doing, it assumes to stand in the place of God. Earthly powers can by their laws deal with acts only on the basis of their character as violative or not violative of human rights.

SECTARIAN appropriations of public money should be stopped not because some one sect is getting more than its share, thereby making the other sects jealous; but because it is not just to tax people to support that in which they do not believe, and in which they are prevented by conscience from having any representation.

THE doctrine that Christianity is in this country a part of the common law, is certainly very flattering to the common law, but not so flattering to Christianity. Great indeed must be the common law if

Christianity is only a part of it. Christianity—the manifestation of supreme love to God and to our fellowmen—covers the whole individual life. It includes not only justice in dealing, but mercy as well; while the civil law can at most only aim at justice. Christianity is infinitely broader and higher than human law, and is administered by an infinitely higher power and authority. The doctrine that Christianity is a "part of the common law," is one of the devil's schemes to degrade Christianity.

WE are told by the advocates of Sunday laws that Sunday rest, being merely the observance of a "civil sabbath," can be enforced without any interference with the rights of conscience. But those who have most to say on this line are always those who are most zealous for Sunday as a religious institution. Have these persons a clearer insight than others into the nature of things purely civil? or does their religious zeal eclipse their discernment of truth and justice? Why does disregard of the "civil sabbath" "disturb" only those who are zealous for the religious sabbath? Why does honest labor, not objectionable to any upon six days of the week, become a "nuisance" to certain ones upon one particular day of each week, if not upon religious grounds?

May 7, 1896

"Papal Policy" *American Sentinel* 11, 19 , pp. 145-147.

The Appeal of the Cardinals

TWO weeks ago we printed in these columns the appeal of Cardinals Gibbons, Vaughan, and Logue, for the establishment of an international court of arbitration. For a number of reasons this subject is worthy of more notice than it has yet received either from us or at the hands of the press generally.

The three cardinals named did not go so far as to say in so many words that the Papacy ought to be made the supreme arbiter of the world, but nobody can doubt that such was the purpose of their appeal. "Such a court existed for centuries," say they, "when the nations of Christendom were united in one faith. And have we not seen nations appeal to that same court for its judgment in our own day?"

Only One of Many Similar Suggestions

This covert suggestion of Cardinals Gibbons, Vaughan, and Logue, is only one of many similar ones made within the last ten years. To avoid a way in 1885, which Germany dared not undertake because of France, Bismarck turned to the Pope as arbitrator; and Rome, seizing the fact, has ever since, in season and out of season, urged that "his holiness" be made the arbiter of the world. In its issue of Feb. 17, 1894, in an article on

"The Pope as International Arbitrator"

the *Catholic Mirror* said: "International arbitration is gaining ground more and more, and it promises to hasten the day when the sword shall be sheathed forever. . . .

"During the century from 1793 to 1893 there have been fifty-eight international arbitrations. . . . From 1793 to 1848, a period of fifty-five years, there were nine arbitrations; there were fifteen from 1848 to 1870, a period of twenty-two years; there were fourteen from 1870 to 1880, and twenty from 1880 to 1893.

"The most interesting arbitration of the century was that in which the highest representative of moral force in the world was accepted in 1885 by the apologist of material force to mediate between Germany and Spain. Leo XIII. revived the roll of the popes in the Middle Ages.

"The obstacles to an international code are not insurmountable. . . .

"An interesting quotation from the *Spectator and English Review* says: 'Humanity is in search of an arbitrator whose impartiality is indisputable. In many respects the Pope is, by position, designed for this office. He occupies a rank which permits monarchs as well as republics to have recourse to him without sacrifice of dignity. As a consequence of his mission the Pope is not only impartial between all nations, but he is at such a degree of elevation that their differences are imperceptible to him. The difficulty about religion is becoming weaker every day. . . . The fact that the most haughty statesman of Europe [Prince Bismarck] recognizes in the face of the world that he can, without loss of dignity, submit his conduct in an international affair to the judgment of the Pope, is an extraordinary proof that the Pope still occupies an exceptional position in our skeptical modern world.'

"Why should not the exceptional position of the Pope be utilized by the nations of the world? He is the highest representative of moral force on earth; over 200,000,000 of Christians scattered

throughout all nations stand at his back, with a moral power which no other human being can command."

The Ambition of the Papacy

No one familiar with the situation and with the utterances upon this subject emanating from high sources in the Roman Catholic Church, can doubt that the ambition of the Papacy is to once more dominate the nations something as she dominated them when in 1076, Henry IV. of Germany, "the highest of secular potentates, stood for three days in the courtyard of the castle [of Canossa], clad in

146

the shirt of a penitent, and entreating to be admitted to the Pope's presence." 1991

Complaisant minds may think there is not danger, but what are the facts? There exists at the present time a world-wide condition of affairs exceedingly favorable to the

Pretensions of the Roman Hierarchy

For years modern civilization has apparently been about to crumble, like the Roman Empire, under the weight of its own magnificence. Those conditions essential to stability have not been preserved, and the recognition of impending ruin has become well-nigh universal. Very naturally men are casting about to find some remedy; but so far the search has been in vain.

World-wide Perplexity

And abnormal state of affairs exists everywhere. The jealousy of nations has imposed upon them burdens too great to be borne indefinitely. Immense standing armies have depleted national treasuries to the verge of bankruptcy. Indeed, some of the nations have been unable to meet their obligations already; but the armies must be maintained at any cost, for ability to repel an invader is the price of national autonomy.

Upon the unnatural condition created by exorbitant taxation and the withdrawal of so many thousands of men from industrial pursuits, has been superinduced unparalleled commercial depression. Nations are perplexed, the people are restless and dissatisfied to a degree that threatens the very existence of civil society.

Rome Sees All This

and seeing it she is preparing to take every advantage afforded both by existing and by impending conditions. Rome has never been modest in her claims, but within the last decade she has become more bold than even her wont in asserting her powers and in pressing her claims as the saviour of society, the possessor of a panacea for all ills that afflict or threaten the body politic of the world.

Will the world be warned of the designs of the Papacy before it is too late? Of this system the Nun of Kenmare says:—

It has the power in many countries to trample on the courage of the weak, because it flatters and bribes the strong to act as its allies until the strong also become weak; and then they, too, learn what are the tender mercies of this professedly Christian church. ²⁰⁰²

Rome Never Changes

In her spirit, in her disposition, in her essential nature and characteristics, Rome is the same to-day that she was two hundred or five hundred years *before Christ*.

Between Rome's beginning and our day, between 753 B.C. and 1894 A.D., she has appeared in different outward forms, she has taken on different phases, such as the kingly, the republican, the imperial and the papal; but it has been Rome all the time—Rome in spirit, in nature, and in essential characteristics.

There is no world-power that occupies so large a place in the Bible as does Rome. Rome, from its rise in ancient time and in its pagan form, through all its career, its merging into the papal form, and down to our own day, is traced in all its workings, and is marked in its every essential feature, by the pen of inspiration. And it is Rome all the time and always the same—cunning, crafty, insinuating, arrogant, violent, persecuting and bloody—always actuated by the same spirit and pursuing steadily the same policy. So constant, so persistent, and so characteristic is this policy, that it is singled out in the Scripture and distinctly defined as "*his* policy."

In the eighth chapter of Daniel there is a prophecy of the career of Media and Persia, of Grecia under Alexander, and then under Alexander's successors, and of the power that should succeed these which by every evidence of Scripture and history, is demonstrated to be

None Other Than Rome

And in that place this power is thus described:—

And in the latter time of their [Alexander's successors'] kingdom when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.

Observe that it is distinctly declared that "through *his policy* also, he shall *cause craft to prosper* in his hand," "and by *peace* shall *destroy* many." To know what this "policy" is, is to know the character of Rome from beginning to end. To understand this "policy," is to understand papal craft even to-day, for "Rome never changes."

Roman Policy Described

Rollin, the historian, describes this Romish policy so fully and gives such a perfect analysis of it that we cannot do better than to quote his words:—

"The reader may perceive from the events above related, one of the principal characteristics of the Romans, which will soon determine the fate of all the States of Greece, and produce an almost general change in the universe; I mean a spirit of sovereignty and dominion. This characteristic does not display itself at first in its full extent; it reveals itself by degrees; and it is only by an insensible progress which at the same time is sufficiently rapid, that we see it carried at last to its greatest height.

"It must be confessed that this people, on some occasions, show a moderation and disinterestedness, which, from a superficial view, seems to exceed everything we meet with in history, and which we feel it incumbent on us to praise.

"Was there ever a more glorious day than that in which the Romans after crossing seas and exhausting their treasures, caused a herald to proclaim, in a general assembly, that the Roman people restored all the cities to their liberty, and desired to reap no other fruit by their victory than the noble pleasure of doing good to nations, the bare remembrance of whose ancient glories sufficed to endear them to the Romans? The description of that immortal day

can hardly be read without tears and without being affected with a degree of enthusiasm, of esteem, and admiration.

Only Imaginary Freedom

"Had this deliverance of the Grecian States proceeded merely from a principle of generosity, void of all interested motives; had the whole tenor of the conduct of the Romans been of the same nature with such exalted sentiments, nothing could possibly have been more august, or more capable of doing honor to the nation. But if we penetrate ever so little beyond this glaring outside, we soon perceive that this specious moderation of the Romans was entirely founded on a profound policy; wise, indeed, and prudent, according to the ordinary rules of government, but at the same time very remote from that noble disinterestedness so highly extolled on the present occasion. It may be affirmed that the Grecians then abandoned themselves to a stupid joy fondly imagining that they were really free, because the Romans declared them so.

"Greece, in the times I am now speaking of, was divided between two powers; I mean the Grecian Republics and Macedonia; and they were always engaged in war; the former, to preserve the remains of their ancient liberty, and the latter, to complete their subjection. The Romans, perfectly well acquainted with this state of Greece, were sensible that there was no necessity of apprehending any difficulty from those little republics, which were growing weak through length of years, by intestine feuds, mutual jealousies, and the wars they had been forced to support against foreign powers. But Macedonia, which was possessed of well-disciplined troops, inured to all the toils of war, which had continually in view the glory of her former monarchs, which had formerly extended her conquests to the extremities of the globe, which still harbored an ardent, though chimerical desire, of attaining universal empire, which had a kind of natural alliance with the kings of Egypt and Syria, sprung from the same origin and united by the common interests of monarchy; Macedonia, I say, gave just alarm to the Romans, who, from the ruin of Carthage, had no obstacles left with regard to their ambitious designs but those powerful kingdoms that shared the rest of the world between them, and especially Macedonia, as it lay nearest to Italy.

A Specious Bait

"To balance, therefore, the power of Macedon, and to dispossess Philip of the aid he flattered himself he should receive from the Greeks, which, indeed, had they united all their forces with his, in order to oppose his common enemy, would perhaps have

made him invincible with regard to the Romans, they declared loudly in favor of those republics, made it their glory to take them under their protection, and that with no other design, in outward appearance, than to defend them against their oppressors; and farther, to attach them by still stronger ties, they hung out to them the specious bait, as a reward for their fidelity. I mean liberty, of which all the republics in question were inexpressibly jealous, and which the Macedonian monarchs had perpetually disputed with them.

"The bait was artfully prepared and as eagerly swallowed by the generality of the Greeks, whose views penetrated no farther. But the most judicious and most clear-sighted among them discovered the danger that lay concealed beneath this charming bait, and accordingly, they exhorted the people from time to time, in their public assemblies, to beware of this cloud that was gathering in the West; and which, changing on a sudden into a dreadful tempest, would break like thunder over their heads, to their utter destruction.

A Tribunal From Which There Was No Appeal

"Nothing could be more gentle and equitable than the conduct of the Romans in the beginning. They acted with the utmost moderation towards such States and nations as

147

addressed them for protection; they succored them against their enemies, took the utmost pains in terminating their differences, and in suppressing all troubles which arose among them, and did not demand the least recompense for all these services done for their allies. By these means their authority gained strength daily and prepared the nations for entire subjection.

"Under the pretense of manifesting their good will, of entering into their interests and of reconciling them, they rendered themselves sovereign arbiters of those whom they had restored to liberty, and whom they now considered, in some measure, as their freedmen. They used to depute commissioners to them to inquire into their complaints, to weigh and examine the reasons on both sides, and to decide their quarrels; but when the articles were of such a nature that there was no possibility of reconciling them on the spot, they invited them to send their deputies to Rome. But afterwards they used to summon those who refused to be reconciled, obliged them to plead their cause before the Senate and even to appear in person there. From arbiters and mediators having become supreme judges, they soon assumed a magisterial tone, looked upon their decrees as irrevocable decisions; were greatly offended when the most implicit obedience was not paid to

them, and gave the name of rebellion to a second resistance. Thus there arose, in the Roman Senate, a tribunal, which

Judged all Nations and Kings,

and from which there was no appeal. This tribunal, at the end of every war, determined the rewards and punishments due to all parties. They dispossessed the vanquished nations of part of their territories, to bestow them on their allies, from which they reaped a double advantage; for they thereby engaged in the interest of Rome such kings as were in no way formidable to them, and weakened others whose friendship the Romans could not expect, and whose arms they had reason to dread.

"We shall hear one of the chief magistrates in the republic of the Achaeans inveigh strongly in a public assembly against this unjust usurpation, and ask by what title the Romans were empowered to assume so haughty an ascendant over them; whether their republic was not as free and independent as that of Rome; by what right the latter pretended to force the Achaeans to account for their conduct, whether they would be pleased should the Achaeans, in their turn, offically [*sic.*] pretend to inquire into their affairs, and whether there ought not to be an equality between them. All these reflections were very reasonable, just and unanswerable, and the Romans had no advantage in the question but force.

How the Romans Treated Kings

"They acted in the same manner, and their politics were the same with regard to their treatment of kings. They first won over to their interests such among them as were the weakest, and consequently, the less formidable; they gave them the titles of allies, whereby their persons were rendered, in some measure, sacred and inviolable, and to a degree safeguarded against other kings more powerful than themselves; they increased their revenues and enlarged their territories, to let them see what they might expect from their protection which had raised the kingdom of Pergamos to such a pitch of grandeur.

"After this the Romans invaded, upon different pretenses, those great potentates who divided Europe and Asia. And how haughtily did they treat them even before they had conquered. A powerful king, confined within a narrow circle by a private man of Rome, was obliged to make his answer before he quitted it; how imperious was this! But how did they treat vanquished kings? They commanded them to deliver up their children, and the heirs of their crowns, as hostages and pledges of their fidelity and good behavior; obliged

them to lay down their arms; forbade them to declare war, or to conclude any alliance without first obtaining their leave; banished them to the other side of the mountains, and left them, in strictness of speech, only an empty title and a vain shadow of royalty, divested of its rights and advantages.

Enemies to Liberty Everywhere

"We have no room to doubt that providence had decreed to the Romans the sovereignty of the world, and the Scriptures had prophecied their future grandeur; but they were strangers to those divine oracles; and besides, the bare prediction of their conquests was no justification with regard to them. Although it be difficult to affirm, and still more so to prove, that this people had from their first rise, formed a plan, in order to conquer and subject all nations; it cannot be denied, if we examine their whole conduct attentively, that it will appear that they acted as if they had a foreknowledge of this, and that a kind of instinct determined them to conform to it in all things.

"But, be this as it may, we see, by the event, to what this so much boasted lenity and moderation of the Romans was confined. Enemies to the liberty for kings and monarchies, looking upon the whole universe as their prey, they grasped with insatiable ambition, the conquest of the whole world; they seized indiscriminately all provinces and kingdoms, and extended their empire over all nations; in a word, they prescribed no other limits to their vast projects than those which deserts and seas made it impossible to pass." ²⁰¹³

This Statement True of the Papacy To-day

This statement of Rome's policy and its workings is as true and as appropriate in the case of the Roman Church and the American Republic to-day, as it is in the case of the Roman State and the Grecian Republics in all time. It describes the policy of Leo XIII. and the ultimate purpose of the Papacy toward the Government and people of the United States; toward the workingmen; as the self-appointed intermediary between capital and labor; and the would-be arbiter of the world, to-day, as truly as it describes the policy of the Roman Senate and its ultimate purpose towards the governments and peoples of Grecia and the other nations of antiquity. Nor is

The Identity of This Policy

in Rome to-day, and in Rome of old, denied by the Papacy. In fact, it is asserted by the Papacy, and the continuance of this policy from ancient Rome is the acknowledged inspiration of modern Rome.

When Imperial Rome was falling to ruins under the violent inroads of the barbarians of the North, the spirit and policy of Rome not only survived but was deepened and perfected in papal Rome. And this spirit and policy were consciously and intentionally continued by the popes of the time and was consciously received and diligently cultivated by each succeeding pope.

It has been said of Leo II. that "all that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable customs, might seem concentrated in him alone." At the very moment of his election he was absent in Gaul on a mission as mediator to reconcile a dispute between two of the principal men of the empire. He succeeded in his mission and was hailed as "The Angel of Peace," and the "Deliverer of the Empire." In a sermon, he showed what his ambition embraced. He portrayed the powers and glories of the former Rome as they were reproduced in Catholic Rome. The conquests and universal sway of heathen Rome were but the promise of the conquests and universal sway of Catholic Rome. Romulus and Remus were but the precursors of Peter and Paul. Rome of former days had by her armies conquered the earth and sea: now again, by the see of the holy blessed Peter as head of the world, Rome, through her divine religion, would dominate the earth.

2024

Truly "Rome never changes." This is "his policy," craft and hypocrisy, hypocrisy and craft, always employed to feed an insatiable ambition for universal dominion. "Rome never changes." In "policy," in spirit, in working, in essential nature, Rome never has changed and never can change. And it is high time that the people of this country and of the world understood the full significance of this boast of the Roman Catholic Church.

May 14, 1896

**"Civil' Reasons for Religious Intolerance in Rome" *American Sentinel*
11, 20 , pp. 153, 154.**

THE contest between Christianity and the Roman Empire, which began with the proclamation of the gospel and ended only when Rome acknowledged the inalienable right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, affords one of the most impressive object lessons that the world has ever seen.

The measure of religious liberty which we enjoy to-day is largely due under God to the self-sacrifice and heroic endurance of those men and women, yea, and even children, who fearlessly offered themselves upon the altar of principle, scorning to save their lives by a denial of Him who has said: "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you."

A Contest Between Principles.

The controversy between the Christians and the Romans was not a dispute between individuals, or a contention between sects or parties. It was a contest between antagonistic *principles*—between *Christianity* and *Rome*, rather than between Christians and Romans.

On the part of Christianity this contest was the assertion of the principles of the rights of conscience and of the individual; on the part of Rome it was the assertion of the principle of the absolute absorption of the individual, and his total enslavement to the State in all things, divine as well as human, religious as well as civic.

Jesus Christ came into the world to set men free, and to plant in their souls the genuine principle of liberty—liberty actuated by love,—liberty too honorable to allow itself to be used as an occasion to the flesh, or for a cloak of maliciousness,—liberty led by a conscience enlightened by the Spirit of God,—liberty in which man may be free from all men, yet made so gentle by love that he would willingly become the servant of all, in order to bring them to the enjoyment of this same freedom.

What Rome Claimed.

The Roman Empire then filled the world,—"the sublimest incarnation of power, and a monument the mightiest of greatness built by human hands, which has upon this planet been suffered to

appear." That empire, proud of its conquests, and exceedingly jealous of its claims, asserted its right to rule in all things, human and divine.

Man with all that he had was subordinated to the State; he must have no higher good than that which the State could bestow. Thus every Roman citizen was a subject, and every Roman subject was a slave. "The more distinguished a Roman became," says Mommsen, "the less was he a free man. The omnipotence of the law, the despotism of the rule, drove him into a narrow circle of thought and action, and his credit and influence depended on the sad austerity of his life. The whole duty of man, with the humblest and greatest of the Romans, was to keep his house in order, and be the obedient servant of the State."

To Acknowledge Christ Was to Deny Rome

It will be seen at once that for any man to profess the principles and the name of Christ, was virtually to set himself against the Roman Empire; for him to recognize God as revealed in Jesus Christ as the highest good, was but treason against the Roman State. It would not be looked upon by Rome as anything else than high treason, because as the Roman State represented to the Roman the highest idea of good, for any man to assert that there was a higher good, and thus make Rome itself subordinate. And this would not be regarded in any other light by Roman pride than as a direct blow at the dignity of Rome, and subversive of the Roman State. Consequently the Christians were not only called "atheists," because they denied the gods, but the charge against them before the tribunals was for the crime of "high treason," because they denied the right of the State to interfere with men's relations to God. It was held that in this they were "irreverent to the Cesars, and enemies of the Cesars and of the Roman people."

The Roman idea of the State was not merely the State as a civil institution, but as divinity

153

itself. Rome was the supreme deity. Thus the idea of the State as the highest good was the religious idea; consequently religion was inseparable from the State.

The Roman State being the chief deity, the gods of Rome derived their dignity from the State rather than the State deriving any honor from them. And though Rome allowed conquered nations to maintain the worship of their national gods, these as well as the conquered

people were considered only as servants of the Roman State. Every religion was held subordinate to the religion of Roman, and though "all forms of religion might come to Rome and take their places in its pantheon, they must come as the servants of the State."

A fundamental maxim of Roman legislation was,—

No man shall have for himself particular gods of his own; no man shall worship by himself any new or foreign gods, unless they are recognized by the public laws.

"What the Law Says is Right"

The Roman State being the supreme deity, the Senate and people were but the organs through which its ideas were expressed; hence the maxim, *Vox Populi, vox Dei*,—the voice of the people is the voice of God. As this voice gave expression to the will of the supreme deity, and consequently of the highest good; and as this will was expressed in the form of laws; hence again the Roman maxim, "What the law says is right."

It is very evident that in such a system there was no place for individuality. The State was everything, and the majority was in fact the State. What the majority said should be, that was the voice of the State, that was the voice of God, that was the expression of the highest good, that was the expression of the highest conception of right;—and everybody must assent to that or be considered a traitor to the State. The individual was but a part of the State. There was therefore no such thing as the rights of the people; the right of the State only was to be considered, and that was to be considered absolute.

Christianity was diametrically opposed to this. It proclaimed the *right* of the individual to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, while Rome asserted the *duty* of every man to worship according to the dictates of the State. Christianity asserted the supremacy of God; Rome asserted the supremacy of the State. This was the contest, and these were the reasons of it, between Christianity and the Roman Empire.

Christianity Not Anarchistic.

Yet in all this Christianity did not deny to Cesar a place; it did not propose to undo the State. It only taught the State its proper place; and proposed to have the State take that place and keep it.

Christianity did not dispute the right of the Roman State to be; but it did deny the right of that State *to be in the place of God*.

In the emperor was merged the State. He alone represented the divinity of the Roman Empire. The Christians' refusal to recognize in him that divinity or to pay respect to it in any way, was held to be open disrespect to the State. The Christians' denial of the right of the State to make or enforce any laws touching religion or men's relationship to God, was counted as an undermining of the authority of government. As it was held that religion was essential to the very existence of the State, and that the State for its own sake, for its own self-preservation, must maintain proper respect for religion; when Christianity denied the right of the State to exercise any authority or jurisdiction whatever in religious things, it was held to be but a denial of the right of the State to preserve itself.

They Sought to Preserve the State.

Therefore when Christianity had become quite generally spread throughout the empire, it seemed to such emperors as Marcus Aurelius, Decius, Valerian, and Diocletian—emperors who most respected Roman institutions—that the very existence of the empire was at stake. Consequently their opposition to Christianity was but an effort to save the State, and was considered by them as the most reasonable and laudable thing in the world. And it was only as a matter of State policy that they issued edicts or emphasized those already issued for the suppression of Christianity. In making or enforcing laws against the Christians it was invariably the purpose of these emperors to restore and to preserve the ancient dignity and glory of the Rome.

"The immortal gods," said Diocletian, "have, by their providence, arranged and established what is right. Many wise and good men are agreed that this should be maintained unaltered. They ought not to be opposed. . . . It is the greatest of crimes to overturn what has been once established by our ancestors, and what has supremacy in the State."

The Conscience above the Magistrate.

As before remarked, Christianity and the Roman theory of the nature and sphere of the State were antagonistic. The State assumed

to be supreme in all things; Christianity set the Creator above the State, and the individual conscience above the civil magistrate.

Every means known to the Romans for the punishment of crime was invoked against the Christians. The emperors, governors, and magistrates felt it to be their duty to maintain the dignity of the empire by enforcing the "law" because it was "law." They felt that the very existence of civil society was at stake, and unflinchingly did they discharge their "sworn duty."

They Gave Their Lives for a Principle.

Imprisonment, banishment, torture and death were invoked against the Christians, but without avail. Whole families were condemned and executed, or given to the wild beasts in the arena; but the followers of Christ faltered not. The hoary-headed grandsire, the middle-aged father, the loving wife and mother, the affectionate daughter just merging into womanhood, and even the innocent children, strengthened by that mysterious power given by God in answer to humble faith, alike unflinchingly awaited the onslaught of the fierce Numidian lions about to be let loose upon them, and which they knew would presently feast upon their flesh and drink their life blood.

Two hundred and fifty years this contest continued, and then as the outcome of the longest, the most wide-spread, and the most terrible persecution that ever was inflicted by the Roman State, that empire was forced officially to recognize the right of every man to worship as he pleased. Thus was Christianity acknowledged to be victorious over all the power of Rome. The rights of conscience were established, and the separation of religion and the State was virtually complete.

But how brief was the triumph. No sooner had the cloud of intolerance lifted than it again settled upon the world, and even to-day in our own "free" land men suffer fines, imprisonment and chain-gangs for daring to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and for denying the right of the State to exact from them a service due only to God and to be rendered only to him.

What shall the end be?

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 20 , p. 160.

MINISTERS of the gospel are ordained to be ambassadors for God—agencies through which the Holy Spirit may appeal to sinful hearts to accept God's offer of free grace and become reconciled to him. But according to the conceptions which many ministers seem to have in these days, the divine plan of which they are the exponents, is an arrangement in which grace and the Holy Spirit connect through themselves with city politics and the policeman's club. Such an incongruous combination is utterly foreign to the purposes of heaven. Civil government is ordained of God; but civil government and the gospel of Christ are two very different things. The power of the civil arm is one thing; the power of the gospel of salvation through faith is another thing altogether.

May 21, 1896

"John Bunyan" *American Sentinel* 11, 21 , pp. 161, 162.

JOHN BUNYAN was born near Bedford, Eng., in 1628, the very year in which Charles I. yielded to the Petition of Right which declared the "illegality of forced loans, of martial law in time of peace, and of the billeting of soldiers on private houses." ²⁰³1

But it was to a deep religious experience, to a sense of duty to his fellowmen and above all, to his God, and to a practical knowledge of the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, that Bunyan owed the inspiration of his life rather than to the demand of the times for redress of political grievances.

In 1653, at the age of twenty-five years, Bunyan was converted and became a member of the Baptist Church at Bedford. Two years later he began to preach the gospel. To the latter fact was due his long imprisonment in Bedford jail.

Rights Not Guarded.

Charles II. was placed upon the throne by the English people without giving proper guarantees that their liberties would be respected. True, he had given his word of honor to protect the religious liberty of his subjects, but political reasons and his lust for power soon led him to disregard this sacred pledge.

"Hardly was he seated on the throne," says Dr. Armitage, ²⁰⁴ 2 "when Venner's petty insurrection furnish a pretext for vengeance

upon all his opponents, and especially those of the dissenting sects, no matter how much they proved their loyalty.

"Amongst the first victims of his tyranny we find Bunyan, charged with 'devilishly' and 'perniciously' abstaining from going to church, 'as a common upholder of meetings contrary to the laws of the king,' and with 'teaching men to worship contrary to law.'"

Offended Repeatedly.

Bunyan was first sentenced to Bedford jail for three months, at the end of which time he was to be banished if he refused to conform to the established worship. He was, however, kept in prison for six years; when released he immediately resumed preaching. He was again imprisoned for another six years. Upon being released the second time, Bunyan began again to preach and was arrested the third time, but was detained only a few months.

"His judges were harsh with him," says Dr. Armitage, "but his real oppressors for these twelve weary years were the king and Parliament, who made it a crime for anyone to preach but a priest of the Church of England."

It was while in Bedford jail that Bunyan wrote his "Holy War" and "Pilgrim's Progress."

From all he loves on earth though sundered far,
And kept by bolted door, and iron bar;
His genius rises on devotion's wings,
And, soaring, with unwonted grandeur sings.²⁰⁵³

Of "Pilgrim's Progress," Dr. Armitage says: "While we are obliged to reprehend the base injustice which kept this grand preacher pining in prison, however leniently treated, the fact is forced upon us, that the wrath of man was made to praise God; for had not his zealous servant been compelled to this solitude we should not have had that masterpiece of literature." Another, bringing "incense kindled at the muse's flame," sings:—

Lo! Sundered from the converse of mankind,
For twelve long years in Bedford jail confined,
A lowly child of genius and of grace
A trophy rears, which time shall ne'er deface.

Pathetic Incidents.

There were some most pathetic incidents in connection with the long imprisonment of Bunyan. Says Dr. Armitage: "His wife was

gentle to a proverb. When he was in prison she went to London to pray for his release, and induced a peer of the realm to present a petition to the House of Lords in his behalf; so the judges were directed to look into the matter afresh. She therefore appeared before Sir Matthew Hale, Chester, and Twisden.

"With all the simplicity of a woman's love she told her artless story. She said her husband was 'a peaceable person,' and wished to support his family. They had four helpless children, one of them blind, and while he was in prison they must live on charity.

"Hale treated her kindly, Twisden harshly, and demanded whether he would leave off

162

preaching if released. In child-like honesty she replied that he dare not leave off preaching so long as he could speak.

"Her request was denied, and she left the court-room in tears, not so much she said, 'because they were so hard-hearted against me and my husband, but to think what a sad account such poor creatures would have to give at the coming of the Lord Jesus.'

"Jesus wept because Jerusalem stoned the prophets, and Bunyan's wife was much like him. But, this giant in genius was just as tender-hearted as his wife. Where do we find such pathos in any passage as this, which he wrote in prison:—

"The parting with my wife and poor children hath often been to me in this place as the pulling off my flesh from my bones; and that not only because I am too fond of those great mercies, but also because I should have often brought to my mind the hardships, miseries and wants my poor family was like to meet with should I be taken from them; especially my poor blind child, who lay nearer my heart than all I had besides. Poor child, thought I, what sorrow art thou like to have for thy portion in this world! Thou must be beaten, suffer hunger, cold, nakedness, and a thousand calamities, though I cannot now endure the wind should blow on thee. But yet, thought I, I must venture all with God, though it goeth to the quick to leave you. I was as a man who was pulling down his house upon the head of his wife and children. Yet, thought I, I must do it, I must do it."

Kindness Cannot Compensate for Injustice.

Bunyan's jailer was very kind to him. His blind daughter was permitted to visit him at will, and latterly even Bunyan himself was permitted to visit his church unattended and even to preach. But these facts do not abate from the iniquity of his imprisonment. No

amount of favor at the hands of an individual can compensate for injustice on the part of the law and the courts.

The chapter of wrong and oppression for Christ's sake is a long one, and yet the world has only partially learned the lesson. We talk of religious liberty, and yet practice only toleration.

The imprisonment of J. W. Lewis, in Tiptonville, Tenn., and of Wm. Simpson, in Chatham, Ont., for ordinary quiet Sunday labor that interfered with nobody and required nobody else to work, is just as indefensible from the standpoint of religious liberty and of equal rights as was Bunyan's imprisonment for holding meetings and preaching contrary to "the statutes made and provided."

His Case Before Sir Matthew Hale.

Bunyan's imprisonment was according to "due process of law." As already stated, his case came before Sir Matthew Hale, that eminent justice whose name is revered by all. This only proves the inspired declaration that "great men are not always wise." Bunyan was not an enemy of civil order, nor did he needlessly defy the authorities. He believed that God had called him to preach the gospel, and he felt that he had no right to forbear. "His persecutors," says the "Encyclopedia Britannica," ²⁰⁶⁴ "tried to extort from him a promise that he would abstain from preaching; but he was convinced that he was divinely set apart and commissioned to be a teacher of righteousness, and he was fully determined to obey God rather than men. He was brought before several tribunals, laughed at, caressed, reviled, menaced, but in vain. He was facetiously told that he was quite right in thinking that he ought not to hide his gift; but that his real gift was skill in repairing old kettles. He was compared to Alexander the coppersmith. He was told that if he would give up preaching he should be instantly liberated. He was warned that if he persisted in disobeying the law he would be liable to banishment; and that if he were found in England after a certain time his neck would be stretched. His answer was, 'If you let me out to-day, I will preach again to-morrow.' Year after year he lay patiently in a dungeon, compared with which the worst prison now to be found in the island is a palace."

Did He Court Persecution?

Some might reason that Bunyan might as well have given the required pledge not to preach as he was not able to preach while in prison, and that therefore he courted persecution. This is a shortsighted view of the matter.

The living preacher's voice is hushed, but not
The voice of noble and unfettered thought;
In that lone dungeon Bunyan breathes the air
Of a celestial clime, for God is there. ²⁰⁷5

Bunyan preached more loudly and effectively in prison than he could possibly have done any place else; and his patience and endurance under persecution did much to secure a greater degree of religious toleration in England.

Count me o'er earth's chosen heroes,—they were souls that
stood alone,

While the men they agonized for hurled the contumelious stone,
Stood serene, and down the future saw the golden beam incline
To the side of perfect justice, mastered by their faith divine,
By one man's plain truth to manhood and to God's supreme design.

By the light of burning heretics Christ's bleeding feet I track,
Toiling up new Calvaries ever with the cross that turns not back,
And these mounts of anguish number how each generation learned
One new word of that grand *Credo* which in prophethearts hath
burned

Since the first man stood God conquered with his face to heaven
upturned.

For Humanity sweeps onward: where to-day the martyr stands,
On the morrow crouches Judas with the silver in his hands;
Far in front the cross stands ready and the crackling fagots burn,
While the hooting mob of yesterday in silent awe return
To glean up the scattered ashes into History's golden urn. ²⁰⁸6

Motive of His Release.

Even Bunyan's release was not the result of the desire on the part of the authorities to do justice. "He owed his complete liberation," says the "Britannica," "to one of the worst acts of one of the worst governments that England has ever seen. In 1671 the Cabal was in power. Charles II. had concluded the treaty by which he bound himself to set up the Roman Catholic religion in England. The first step which he took towards that end was to annul, by an unconstitutional exercise of his prerogative, all the penal statutes against the Roman Catholics; and in order to disguise his real design, he annulled at the same time the penal statutes against Protestant

Nonconformists. Bunyan was consequently set at large. In the first warmth of his gratitude he published a tract, in which he compared Charles to that humane and generous Persian king, who, though not himself blessed with the light of the true religion, favored the chosen people, and permitted them, after years of captivity, to rebuild their beloved temple. To candid men, who consider how much Bunyan had suffered, and how little he could guess the secret designs of the court, the unsuspicious thankfulness with which he accepted the precious boon of freedom will not appear to require any apology."

Nevertheless the sacrifice which he made was not lost. More than two centuries have passed since Bunyan's suffering for the truth ceased. But the result of his heroic life survives to-day, and in this year of grace 1896, men are nerved and encouraged to endure as he endured for the love of the same truth and the same Saviour for which he counted it a privilege to suffer.

"The Cure for Immorality" *American Sentinel* 11, 21 , pp. 162, 163.

THE Willimantic (Conn.) Christian Endeavor Union, at a recent meeting adopted unanimously the following resolution:—

Resolved, that we earnestly entreat all good people in this part of the State, and more especially do we urge it upon the parents and young people connected with our churches and Christian Endeavor societies, to refrain from giving, attending, abetting, or participating in card parties and dances, for the reason that the fruits of these things, when there are any fruits at all, are always evil, and the Master whom we serve has said that "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit."

As a method of combating immorality this is infinitely better than invoking the power of the civil authority to compel an outward show of regard for righteousness which is not felt in the heart, although, as the *Outlook* of May 9 remarks, mere "prohibitory and restrictive measures are of very little avail in promoting a pure life. Christ said," it adds, "that when an unclean spirit is cast out of a man, and returning to him, finds the soul swept and garnished, he takes seven other spirits worse than himself and enters into him, and that the last state of that man is worse than the first." What is necessary is a new tenant in the soul from which the devil has been cast out; and that new tenant must be the Lord Jesus Christ. But if mere resolutions to abstain from exercises tending to immorality cannot fortify the soul against evil, much less can the heart be purified by legal compulsion

which has not even the consent of the individual to its operations. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh;" and out of an evil heart will flow an evil life, in spite of all that human power can do to prevent it.

No one, however, can well question the propriety of endeavoring, by precept and example, to induce people to forsake the ways of evil and walk in the path of righteousness; and when the appeal can be made upon the basis of God's word, it will often take effect in the heart, since "the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." The word of God strikes conviction to the soul, repentance follows, and the heart is purified by faith.

And here is the difficulty with the efforts made to reform people so as to secure the better observance of Sunday; the appeal cannot be based upon Scripture, since Scripture does not sanction the claims of Sunday as a day of rest. Moral suasion in the matter is robbed of all its potency by this fact; and it only remains to secure Sunday observance by that method which knows nothing of faith or of the convicting power of God's word,—namely, the force of the civil "law." But the word of God does support the seventh-day

163

Sabbath; and this imposes an obligation upon all men which the civil "law" can neither strengthen nor counteract.

Let the churches and religious societies agitate as much as they will by precept and moral suasion, for such reforms as they may think the condition of society demands; no one can properly object to that. But it is proper to draw the line at those "reforms" which cannot be based upon the divine text-book of morality, and can only be realized through the operation of a force which has no power either to convict the soul or to purify the life.

"Where God Is" *American Sentinel* 11, 21 , p. 163.

IT is a tendency of human nature to put faith in visible signs and symbols. The presence of the sign is taken as evidence of the presence of the thing symbolized. This is conspicuously true in religion, where superstition so often plays a prominent part, and where in real spiritual understanding so many have not grown beyond the stature of babes. A name, a picture, a statue, a cross, or other religious symbol, is made the evidence of the reality of that for which

it stands in the spiritual realm. By a mere profession of Christianity, or by the practice of outward ceremonies and forms, men are easily deluded into the belief that they possess genuine piety. It is this sort of "faith" precisely that leads some men in our country to-day to view the National Constitution as a godless document, because it does not contain the name of God or make a formal recognition of his authority.

The great trouble with men in this world is their failure to recognize God in the multitude of places and events where his presence and power are manifested. God is invisible; and being not seen, his presence and working must be recognized by faith; for "faith"—not some external sign or token—is "the evidence of things not seen." Heb. 11:1. It is God's right to be recognized by his creatures everywhere and in all things, and it is the work of Christianity to point men to him as the Creator and Upholder of all things, and to his goodness and mercy and love in all the circumstances that surround them. "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign," said Christ. They were evil and adulterous because they had not faith, and they sought after a sign for the same reason.

God is in nature: in its bright hues, and graceful forms, which delight the eye, or its stupendous and stern aspects, which fill the heart with awe and a sense of human littleness. God is in the hearts of men, even though they may not recognize his presence or acknowledge any of his claims. If they have a love of justice, if they pity the unfortunate, if they have a desire to do good to their fellow-beings, if they have any love of humanity around them, they manifest that God is in them; for "God is love," and there is no source of love and of good but him. God is in every deed that is done for the uplifting of humanity; he is in every word that breathes justice and mercy and liberty to the afflicted and the oppressed. He is in all that recognizes men as possessing equal rights and entitled naturally to the uninterrupted enjoyment of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and he is therefore already in the Constitution of the United States.

Would it not be better to teach men that God is everywhere in all his works, and that we are to recognize him in every privilege and blessing that we enjoy, beholding him by faith, than to lead men to put confidence in mere names, and signs and outward professions, by which true faith is virtually denied, and by which numberless souls have been deluded to their ruin?

May 28, 1896

"Decoration Day and Its Lesson" *American Sentinel* 11, 22 , p. 170.

THE tragedy of war casts a long shadow. More than thirty years removed from the last echo of our nation's fratricidal strife, we stand again upon the verge, as it were, of that dark drama, and sorrow for the dead.

He that lacks time to mourn lacks time to mend.
Eternity mourns that. 'Tis an ill cure
For life's worst ills to have no time to feel them.
Where sorrow's held intrusive and turned out,
There wisdom will not enter, nor true power,
Nor aught that dignifies humanity. ²⁰⁹1

Again we pause to pay our tribute of respect to the thousands who yielded up their lives in the great struggle, and to contemplate with sadness and awe, the scenes which memory unveils or voice and pen depict, characteristic of the great crisis in which our national existence hung trembling in the balance.

Why the War Was Necessary.

That our country was involved in a great civil war which spread death and ruin far and wide and brought bereavement into almost every home, is a familiar fact to all within our national borders. But what was the meaning of the fearful sacrifice which is commemorated in the scenes and exercises of this day? Why was it necessary that our nation should experience the terrible convulsion of civil war? The answer cannot be better given than in the words of the man who, during that terrible period, stood at the nation's head, and which were spoken by him upon that battle field where the climax of the struggle had been reached. We refer to President Lincoln's speech at the dedication of the Gettysburg national cemetery, Nov. 19, 1863. Mr. Lincoln said:—

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forward on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting-place for

those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Recognition of Human Rights, the Issue.

The might issue had been raised whether "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," should continue or should "perish from the earth;" and the fearful sacrifice of life, the waste of blood and treasure, the suffering and misery and ruin, came *in order that this Government might be preserved*. And what is "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," that it should be preserved at such cost? Ah, it is that form of government, and the only form, which recognizes the rights of the people. It is government built upon the divine principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence,—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; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Such was this Government in theory; and if it had been such in reality, the terrible scenes of the civil war would never have been enacted.

"Or war! begot in pride and luxury,
The child of malice and revengeful hate;
Thou impious good, and good impiety!
Thou art the foul refiner of a State,
Unjust scourge of men's iniquity,
Sharp easier of corruptions desperate!"

Governmental Sanction of Human Slavery.

Our Government sanctioned, even in its fundamental law, a most glaring denial of that principle of equal individual rights upon which it professed to be based. The system of negro slavery had been planted in our land and had flourished until it had become too firmly fixed to be voluntarily given up. And when at length the Supreme Court of the United States, in the famous, or rather infamous, Dred Scott decision, gave its sanction to this iniquitous system by which man in the image of God was deprived of his God-given rights and treated as if he were a beast, the woe upon this nation was sealed. God could not longer tolerate such injustice to his creatures made in his own image; and the prophetic words of Thomas Jefferson, who foresaw that the time would come when our rights would revive or expire in a convulsion, ²¹⁰2 were fulfilled. The convulsion came, and the rights of the negro were revived. And with them, in a sense, our own rights revived; for the rights of one race of men are but the common rights of all mankind.

A New Effort to Overthrow Our Government.

But attempts to overthrow this Government have not been abandoned. What could not be directly accomplished by force of arms, is now sought by a more peaceful, but more subtle and dangerous means. A party has arisen in our nation, hostile to that conception of government set forth in the memorable address of President Lincoln, and which aims at nothing less than the overthrow of that ideal and the establishment of a theocratic government in its stead. A new slavery now threatens not one portion of the people merely, but all classes,—a slavery which would take away freedom of conscience, and bind about the soul the chains of religious despotism. This party have laid siege to our National Congress, and intend to prosecute the siege until Congress capitulates, and enacts for them such legislation as will place all "Christian" institutions and usages "upon an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." And they have succeeded in drawing to their aid almost the entire religious forces of the land. They demand that the National Constitution shall be so amended as to recognize Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations, and his will as being of supreme authority in civil affairs. Under such a constitution American citizens of every class would inevitably become the victims of legislation which seeks to bind the conscience, regulating it by congressional action. "The individual

conscience," it is said, "must yield to the conscience of the whole people, which is over him, and should be over him." ²¹¹³

Danger That the Effort Will Succeed.

Such is the doctrine of the party which is seeking to enslave the individual conscience; and its zeal and persistence, and the number and influences of those whom they have drawn to their support, combined with the general apathy of the people toward the issue involved, make the danger of their success exceedingly great. And when they do succeed, this "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," will have perished as certainly as though it had gone down in the shock of civil war. For their theocratic government and our popular government are utterly at variance with each other, the former demanding that our civil codes shall include the "revealed will of Jesus Christ," and denying that human governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Our Present Duty.

But to preserve this Government upon those principles of justice which have made it the world-wide champion of human rights, this nation drained the cup of woe and humiliation, and unnumbered thousands of her chosen sons poured out their blood upon the field of battle; and that blood now cries to us from the ground, that we who live to-day should dedicate ourselves to the great cause of human freedom; that we should guard with ceaseless vigilance the liberties secured to us by the wisdom and privations of the noble founders of our Republic; and that as we with gratitude remember our nation's dead, we each for himself "highly resolve" that our life service shall be freely given to the end that men may enjoy genuine religious liberty, and that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

June 4, 1896

"Sun Worship" *American Sentinel* 11, 23 , p. 177, 178.

SUN worship was doubtless the earliest form of idolatry, as it was also the most debasing.

In all probability the orb of day was first adored, not as God, but as his most fitting representative. That it soon came to be regarded as God was not only the logical but even the necessary result.

To the sun was early ascribed life-giving power. His rays shining on the earth caused her to bring forth her fruits in their seasons. All nature responded to his genial warmth. What was more natural than that man, forgetting the Source of all light and life, into whose presence he no longer permitted to come, should change "the truth of God into a lie," and worship and serve "the creature more than the Creator"?

"A dark cloud stole over man's original consciousness of the Divinity," says D`llinger, ²¹²1 "and, in consequence of his own guilt, an estrangement of the creature from the one living God took place; man, as under the overpowering sway of sense and sensual lust, proportionally weakened, therefore, in his moral freedom, was unable any longer to conceive of the Divinity as a pure, spiritual, supernatural, and infinite Being, distinct from the world, and exalted above it. And thus it followed inevitably, that, with his intellectual horizon bounded and confined within the limits of nature, he should seek to satisfy the inborn necessity of an acknowledgment and reverence of the Divinity by the deification of material nature; for even in its obscurity, the idea of the Deity, no longer recognized, indeed, but still felt and perceived, continued powerful; and in conjunction with it, the truth struck home, that the Divinity manifested itself in nature as ever present and in operation." But how terribly has the truth of God's presence in nature been perverted!

The phenomena of nature differ but little in various countries, and the human heart is everywhere the same. Whether in the valley of the Nile, on the banks of the Euphrates, on the shores of the Mediterranean, or in the valleys of Mexico or the mountains of Peru, the sun appeared as the great benefactor of the race, and was worship under various forms and titles.

More properly speaking, certain functions or power supposed to reside in the sun were worshiped,—indeed, sun worship was simply the worship of the power of reproduction in nature, including man.

"The influence of the sun on nature," says the Encyclopedia Britannica, "either brightening the fields and cheering mankind, or scorching and destroying with pestilence, or again dispelling the miasma collected from marshes by night, was . . . taken to be under the control of a divine being, to whom men ascribed, on human

analogy, a form and character in which were reflected their own sensations." ²¹³2

All ancient religions except Judaism and Christianity (and they are really one), were

178

almost wholly sun worship, or nature worship, which is the same thing, as the sun plays so important a part in all the processes of nature. ²¹⁴ 3 All pagans were polytheists, but the chief deity everywhere was the sun, or, as we have already explained, some real or fancied power of that great luminary, and all others were honored because of their fancied relation to him.

Ammon-Ra.

One of the gods of Egypt was Ammon, which name "is said to have meant, etymologically, 'the concealed god;' and the idea of Ammon," says Rawlinson, ²¹⁵ 4 "was that of a recondite, incomprehensible divinity, remote from man, hidden, mysterious, the proper object of the profoundest reverence. Practically this idea was too abstract, too high-flown, too metaphysical, for ordinary minds to conceive of it; and so Ammon was at an early date conjoined with Ra, the sun, and worshiped as Ammon-Ra, a very intelligible god, neither more nor less than the physical sun, the source of light and life, 'the lord of existences, and support of all things.'"

The Greeks worshiped the sun under various names, among which was Adonis. The same name was also applied to the sun by the Babylonians by whom it was associated with Tammuz. ²¹⁶ 5 But both were sun gods, the former being the father of the latter. Tammuz was the "sun when obscured by night or in winter." That is to say, Adonis was the sun shining in his strength; Tammuz, the same luminary, wholly or partly obscured. Hence the custom of weeping for Tammuz and rejoicing at his "resurrection." A similar relation was by the Egyptians supposed to exist between Ra and Osiris, namely, that of father and son.

The Feast of Tammuz.

The annual festival of Tammuz, "which celebrated his supposed death and resurrection, was a time of mourning followed by one of joy." ²¹⁷ 6 It was one of the most abominable of festivals, being a season of prostitution as a religious rite. It was upon the occasion of

the celebration of this festival that Babylon was taken by the Medes and Persians, as recorded in the 5th chapter of Daniel. Reference is also made to this most abominable of religious customs in Ezek. 8:14.

Sun worship always involved a multitude of gods. Probably no people ever exceeded the Egyptians in the number of their objects of worship, but they were all more or less remotely connected with sun worship.

Like other nations of antiquity the Egyptians attributed to the sun life-giving, or reproductive power, and like the Babylonians, some of their religious rites were too vile for description. They worshipped both the male and female principle in nature, the former residing in the sun and derived from him; the latter belonging to the earth, moon, etc.

The most sacred symbol of divinity was the bull-god Apis. This beast was kept at Memphis and was attended by nude women. But Ra or Ammon-Ra was preëminently the sun-god of the Egyptians "and was," says Rawlinson, "especially worshipped at Heliopolis. Obelisks, according to some, represented his rays, and were always, or usually, erected in his honor." ²¹⁸⁷

Osiris was a form of Ra, and corresponded in some respects to the Babylonian Tammuz, the Roman Hercules and the Greek Adonis. "He was the light of the lower world," says Rawlinson, "from the time he sinks below the horizon in the west to the hour he reappears above the eastern horizon in the morning. This physical idea was however, at a later date modified, and Osiris was generally recognized as the perpetually presiding lord of the lower world, the king or judge of Hades or Amenti," hence was specially worshiped by penitents.

A Roman at the Altar of Osiris

Our illustration is a scene in the temple of Osiris at Abydos. The visitor from the city of Romulus, finds in the Egyptian Osiris simply another phase of Hercules, and having offered his petition to this god of Kem, he receives with all the humility at the command of a Roman, the blessing of the Egyptian priest ministering at the altar of "the lord of the lower world."

Sun-worship has left its indelible mark upon the civilization of the race. Even modern Christianity is largely influenced by some of its

customs. At a very remote period the days of the week were dedicated to the principal heavenly bodies. The sun being regarded as the source of all things was honored with the first place; and his day, identical with the modern Sunday, was esteemed the most sacred of festivals. It was not however, a period of rest but one of festivity; nor was it until the early centuries of the Christians era that it came to have any sabbatic character whatever, which was first attached to it by Gentile "Christians" in opposition to the Sabbath observed by the Jews.

The Sabbath of the Hebrews was the seventh day, and was given to them by the Jehovah as a memorial of the finished creation. Sunday was the sign, rather of the continual activity of the sun, and was by the pagans *contrasted with* the Sabbath rather than *likened to* it. The Sabbath testified that "the works were finished from the foundation of the world"; the Sunday, that the creation was still in progress under the divine energy of the Sun. The two days were the signs of rival systems.

Reason for Sunday Observance

When the early Christians, from reasons of expediency, adopted the Sunday of paganism in lieu of the Sabbath of the Lord, they adopted likewise the pagan reason for its observance, conjoining it, however, to some extent, with reasons for the true Sabbath, and of course ascribing the work which it was supposed to commemorate to Jehovah instead of to the sun, as did the pagans. For instance, Justin Martyr, in his apology for the Christians, addressed to the Emperor of Rome, said: "Upon Sunday we all assemble, that being the first day in which God set himself to work upon the dark void, in order to make the world." Of course, to the pagan the sun was God, and the reason assigned by Justin Martyr was the pagan reason for honoring the sun's day.

It will be seen that Sunday in its every phase is opposed to the Sabbath of the Lord, and it is for this reason that Sabbatarians uniformly refuse to pay it any regard. Instead of being the Christian Sabbath, it is, and always has been, the symbol of a false god and a false and debasing worship—a worship the most hateful to God of any form of idolatry. (See 8th chapter of Ezekiel.)

"Spiritualism in Baltimore" *American Sentinel* 11, 23 , pp. 178, 179.

THE *Catholic Mirror*, of May 23, devotes a column of editorial comment to the prevalence of Spiritualism in Baltimore. "Every morning," says the *Mirror*, "in the [Baltimore] *Sun* we find half a column of announcements of where wonderful mediums are to be seen and sÈances are to be held, and all over town one hears of signs and wonders. Last week Spiritualism even figured in a murder trial, and at least one juryman was governed in his contribution to the verdict by his belief in the reality of certain incidents that were sworn to as having occurred at a sitting where spirits were called up. . .

"Everybody, it is said, attends these sÈances, and many do beyond doubt; otherwise the mediums, who, while dealing in unsubstantial things otherwise, handle only hard cash, would not flock here in such numbers. Some of them are declared to be coining money, and in their waiting rooms, as described to us, are gathered, morning after morning, crowds of visitors of all classes, the scene not unlike that at some fashionable physician's."

What seems to have called forth this comment from the *Mirror*, is the fact that Roman Catholics are included among these visitors to the haunts of professed intercourse between the living and the dead; and at this the Catholic organ professes some surprise. "Catholics among the rest," it says, "are said to go to these places; but one naturally wonders what sort of Catholics. By the church, dabbling in Spiritualism is distinctly forbidden, and Father Clarke, S.J., of England, in an interesting pamphlet, has pointed out why. Any one who consults mediums positively imperils his or her spiritual welfare. The sincere Spiritualists frankly admit that at least nine-tenths of the operators are frauds and their exhibitions the dreariest sort of humbuggery. . . But if any part of the exhibitions given belongs to the other world, what world is it? Father Clarke plainly tells us that such manifestations can only come from a diabolic source, with which any God-fearing and sensible person wishes as little to do as possible."

This view given by "Father" Clarke and indorsed by the *Mirror* is undoubtedly true; but what consistent ground has either of these Catholic authorities for advocating it? Do they not both believe in communication between the living and the dead? Is not the Roman Catholic religion based upon the doctrine of prayers to the dead, which bring aid from the latter to the living? Does that religion not hold that prayers to the Virgin Mary and a large number of "saints" who have been many years dead, are of vital importance to our welfare? Does it not also countenance many tales of the miraculous appearances of the Virgin and these dead "saints" to the living?

There can be no denial upon these points. How then can Roman Catholics consistently oppose the idea that the dead appear and communicate with the living in the manner which Spiritualism sets forth?

We think it not at all strange that the city which is the seat of the highest papal authority in this country, should also be distinguished as a center of the manifestations of Spiritualism. The two religions are founded upon the same idea, and naturally belong together.

The time will come,—has indeed all but come,—when false religions and religious bodies which have fallen away from God and retain merely the forms of godliness, will join hands with Spiritualism for mutual support and advancement. The testimony of the dead, who are supposed to know so much

179

more than do even the wisest of the living, and especially of men noted for their high moral standing in this life, is a source of power which the politico-religious "reformers" of our time cannot much evidence(?) of this nature may have come to the surface as yet, it is as certain as that Scripture is true that there will be plenty of it forthcoming when these "reform" movements shall have progressed a little further. It is in such communications that Sunday "laws" and other oppressive enactments against such as adhere to God's moral code, will yet find one of their chief sources of support.

"Superstition and the Papacy" *American Sentinel* 11, 23 , p. 179.

"THAT was certainly a most remarkable procession," says the *Christian Work*, of May 14, "which marched through the streets of Madrid one day last week." Spain had been suffering from a protracted drouth. Added to this misfortune was the drain upon Spain's military and financial resources caused by the Cuban war, with the dark prospect of the loss of this last of her American possessions. In such an emergency, papal superstition suggested, as usual, an appeal to some dead "saint." This procession, we are told, "constituted an appeal to the patron saint of the city, St. Isidore, to put an end to the drouth from which Spain has been suffering, and at the same time to put an end to the Cuban rebellion. It was a magnificent affair. Both civic and military organizations participated, and there were nearly a thousand priests in line, all carrying lighted tapers. The route was lined with enthusiastic spectators, who threw so many flowers that the very streets were filled with them. At the head of the

procession were carried the remains of the saint, who died six hundred years ago."

The scene is one thoroughly characteristic of the papal religion. That religion is built upon the idea that we are to look to the dead for that aid which it is beyond human power to give. The idea is essentially pagan, as an examination of any pagan religion will show. The Lord's testimony concerning it may be seen from the language of Isa. 8:19: "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living, to the dead?"

The Scriptures nowhere sanction the idea of seeking to the dead for aid. The Almighty declares himself to be the source of our strength and wisdom and righteousness, and directs us to seek unto him. From many texts in his Word we learn that it is utterly useless to seek unto the dead for anything; since they "know not anything" (Eccl. 9:5), have no "more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun" (verse 6), their thoughts have perished (Ps. 146:3, 4), etc. Any such demonstration, therefore, as this religious procession to invoke the aid of some dead man whose bones are carried at its head, is simply nothing else than exhibition of superstition.

The idea that when people die they are still alive, knowing more and having more power than they ever did before, is well calculated to foster superstition of the grossest kind. Worship of the dead was one of the earliest marks of apostasy from the true God. The civil power, through the common belief in the consciousness and superhuman power and wisdom of departed spirits of men, which imagination and superstition had transformed into gods, very early came to look to these "gods" for aid in times of emergency, and to connect their worship with the affairs of the State. Probably nothing has contributed more powerfully than this superstition to the union of Church and State.

"Present-day Protestantism" *American Sentinel* 11, 23 , p. 181.

THE spokesmen of the Papacy have much to say at the present time, and with much apparent reason, concerning the decay of Protestantism. We say "apparent" reason, since in reality Rome has no reason whatever to congratulate herself upon the prospect of her victory over Protestantism.

It is true that vast numbers of people, nominally Protestants, are indifferent to the distinctive principles of Protestant belief. It is true that the number of such persons is increasing, and that Rome is rapidly gaining adherents from all classes of the people. It is true also that the Protestant churches as such are fast placing themselves upon papal ground by their advocacy of religious legislation, and that by this course and their adherence to the papal dogma of Sunday sanctity they give Rome all the advantage in the contest for supremacy, so far as they themselves are concerned. But Protestantism has a strength entirely above that which these human elements can supply; and that strength, despite all contrary appearances, will give Protestantism the victory.

Protestantism cannot be represented by an army of men, or by a creed evolved from the conceptions and deductions of original minds. Protestantism is religious truth, and as such is represented by the word of God. Over that word the Papacy will never triumph; but that word will triumph completely over the Papacy. And when the Papacy and all the powers of earth which it will have drawn to its support, and even the very earth itself, shall have passed away, the word of the eternal God will still remain, a sure foundation for all who shall have made that word their trust.

The truth is that Protestantism is not declining in the earth, but rising, and the present generation is to see such a manifestation of its power as no generation ever yet beheld. For truth—the eternal truth of God which is given to set men free from every yoke—is to shine forth with a brightness that will lighten all the earth. It is to be proclaimed with a voice so loud that every ear shall hear. It will be the word of God—"the Scripture and the Scripture only," and will go with all the power of that word, which is the power that created all things. It will proclaim God's eternal law—that law which the Papacy has thought to change. The conflict with papal error will be short, sharp, and decisive, and God's own voice will give it a fearful and glorious termination.

The God of truth will not keep silence for ever. The same voice which spoke against sin from the flaming summit of Mount Sinai, is to be heard once more. "Whose voice then shook the earth; but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain." Heb. 12:26, 27.

Let it be ours to stand with Protestantism upon the foundation which cannot be shaken.

June 11, 1896

"Religious Persecution in Armenia" *American Sentinel* 11, 24 , pp. 185, 186.

Origin and Religion of the People.

THE present disturbed state of Armenia, which has been attended with so much bloodshed, and characterized by atrocities worthy of the Dark Ages, lends a peculiar interest to the history of that unhappy country.

The origin of the Armenians is lost in the mists of antiquity. According to tradition they are descended from Togarmah, a grandson of Japheth, one of the three sons of Noah, who settled in Armenia, after the ark rested upon Mount Ararat.

Tradition also relates that the gospel was preached in Armenia early in the first century by the apostles Thaddeus and Bartholemew; and certain it is that in A.D. 276, both the king and the great mass of his people became at least nominally Christian.

"As a Christian nation whose lot has been cast beyond the frontiers, of Christendom," says Alice Stone Blackwell, "the Armenians have had to suffer constant persecution,—in early times from the Persian fire worshipers, in later centuries from the Mohammedans." ²¹⁹¹

The Armenians received aid and sympathy from the Crusaders, and in return gave them active support. This is doubtless one reason for the hatred with which they are regarded by the Mohammedans everywhere. After the failure of the Crusades they were subjected to fierce persecutions and great barbarities at the hands of Tartars, Persians and Ottoman Turks. But through it all the Armenians have held tenaciously to their faith.

Demand of the Persian King.

It was about the middle of the 5th century that the Armenians first lost their independence. They remained a nation, however, until in 1604, Shah Abbas laid the whole country waste, and forcibly transplanted about 40,000 of the inhabitants into Persia. "Since then,"

says the "Encyclopedia Britannica," "the Armenians have had no political position as a nation, though they continue to form an important and valuable portion of the population in Russia, Turkey, and Persia." ²²⁰²

In A.D. 450, the Persians king sent a letter to the Armenian princes in which he highly extolled fire worship, contrasting it with Christianity, much to the disadvantage of the latter, as he painted it, and demanding that the Armenians should embrace the religion of Persia.

Upon receipt of the king's letter a council was called, and after due deliberation, an answer was returned to the imperious letter of the Persian monarch.

The Reply of the Armenians

After replying at considerable length to the argument of the king against the Christian

186

faith, the Armenian princes and bishops concluded:—

From this faith no one can move us,—neither angels nor men; neither sword, nor fire, nor water, nor any deadly punishment. If you leave us our faith, we will accept no other lord in place of you; but we will accept no god in place of Jesus Christ; there is no other god beside him. If, after this great confession, you ask anything more of us, lo, we are before you, and our lives are in your power. From you, torments; from us, submission; your sword, our necks. We are not better than those who have gone before us, who gave up their goods and their lives for this testimony.

This noble reply filled the Persian king with rage. His rejoinder was an army of 200,000 men, which invaded Armenia, carrying death and destruction everywhere. A battle was fought at the foot of Mount Ararat, in which the Armenians were defeated; but the obstinate resistance to his will offered by rich and poor, men, women and children, soon convinced the king that he could never make fire worshipers of the descendants of Togarmah. An old historian thus quaintly expresses it: "The swords of the slayers grew dull, but the necks of the Armenians were not weary."

The Armenians' Love of Country.

After ages of injustice and oppression the spirit of the Armenians is unbroken and their love of liberty is perhaps unsurpassed by any

people; while their affection for their country is something touching. One of their poets ²²¹3 has thus expressed this latter sentiment:—

Had a lifetime of ages been granted to me
I had given it gladly and freely to thee,
O my life, my Armenia!
Were I offered the love of a maid lily-fair,
I would choose thee alone for my joy and my care,
My one love, my Armenia!
Were I given a crown of rich pearls, I should prize,
Far more than their beauty, one tear from thine eyes,
O my weeping Armenia!
If freedom unbounded were proffered to me,
I would choose still to share thy sublime slavery,
O my mother, Armenia!

The Armenian's Love of Liberty

As is to be inferred from the last stanza of the foregoing quotation, the Armenian's love of freedom is only second to their love of country, and it may well be doubted if it is not equal to it. Centuries of wrong and oppression seem only to have intensified in the Armenian bosom the God-given passion for liberty, as is witnessed by the following from another of the poets ²²²4 of that oppressed land:—

When first my faltering tongue was freed,
And when my parents' hearts were stirred
With thrilling joy, to hear their son
Pronounce his first clear-spoken word,
"Papa, Mamma," as children use,
Were not the names first said by me;
The first word on my childish lips
Was thy great name, O Liberty!
"Liberty!" answered from on high
The sovereign voice of Destiny:
"Wilt thou enroll thyself henceforth
A soldier true of Liberty?
The path is thorny all the way,
And many trials wait for thee;
Too strait and narrow is this world
For him who loveth Liberty."
"Freedom!" I answered, "on my head
Let fire descend and thunder burst;
Let foes against my life conspire,
Let all who hate thee do their worst:
I will be true to thee till death;
Yea, even upon the gallows tree

The last breath of a death of shame
Shall shout thy name, O Liberty!"

Political Insurrection and Religious Hate.

This intestine strife in Armenia in which 50,000 men, women and children lost their lives, was not primarily religious but political. Political insurrection gave opportunity, however, for religious hate to manifest itself, and thousands of non-combatants fell victims to the fanatical hate of Moslem soldiers. The *Independent*, of March 19, published a list of twenty-one preachers and pastors who laid down their lives directly for their faith, during November and December, 1895. "Each one of them," says the *Independent*, "was offered his life if he would renounce Christ and accept Islam; but they counted not their lives dear unto them."

Of these twenty-one martyrs, the *Independent* says: "They were the best men, the most highly educated men among their people, their natural leaders. Every one was put to death for refusing to become a Mohammedan. In every case the offer of life on these terms was made; in several cases time was allowed to consideration of the proposal; and in each case faith in Jesus Christ was the sole crime charged against the victim."

Not only are the names of these men given, but the names of the places where they suffered death and the dates are also given.

"Christians" Persecuting Christians.

But the saddest feature of religious persecution in Armenia and among Armenians in other part of Turkey, is that "Christians" have in many instances persecuted Christians. The bulk of the Armenian people belong to the Armenian Church, which is almost identical in faith with the Greek or Russian Church. The head of the church is called "Patriarch" or "Catholicos," and the Armenian Church never accepted the decision of the Council of Chalcedon.

Of course the breach between the Armenian Church and the Roman Church is much wider than between the Greek and the Armenian Churches, and much of the persecution of the Armenians has been at the instigation of Roman Catholics. Our illustration, which we are permitted to use by the courtesy of the *Missionary Herald*, shows the scene of the severe persecution of this character which

took place in 1892. Rev. Lyman Bartlett, of Smyrna, in an article in the *Missionary Herald*, for May, says of Afion Kara Hissar:—

During the summer of 1892 I visited this place with my daughter at a time when the persecution was at its height, and during our stay of three weeks the house we occupied, which was the home of the preacher, was stoned every night but one. The front windows, being protected by wire netting, were uninjured; but the back rooms, whose windows were exposed, could not be used for a time, and the windows were taken out to save them from destruction. The brethren were almost daily stoned by the boys in the streets, and one Sunday during our stay a crowd gathered about the door, railing at those who dared to enter, and stoning the door after we had assembled for worship, till finally we were obliged to call on the Turkish police to protect us from the violence of the mob. For a long time most active measures were employed to prevent people coming to the worship, both slander and threats being freely used, and the preacher was most shamefully maligned.

At one time a document was presented to the governor accusing him of having, in a public place, shamefully slandered the Virgin Mary, and this document was emphasized by 200 signatures, mostly Armenians. The governor informed me of this soul accusation, but declared that he should not submit it to the court, as it could be nothing but slander. Yet, after we had gone, it was served in due form, and the good man was summoned before the Turkish court for trial. He had no one to plead his cause, and his accusers were many, but being allowed to speak in his own defense, he easily convinced the court and all who heard him, of his entire innocence and of the perfidy of his accusers. The case was dropped without further trial. In this affair he rejoiced in the fulfillment of our Lord's promise: "It shall be given you in that hour, what ye ought to speak."

Persecution by Mohammedans.

The *Missionary Herald*, for June, has also the following paragraph, which is of interest in this connection:—

In the town of severek, in Central Turkey, there were recently three of the original members of the Protestant community formed forty years ago. Two of these became martyrs, one while praying on his housetop. The third denied his faith in order to save his life. It is said that every minister and priest in the place sealed his faith with his blood, excepting one Catholic priest, who saved his life by flight.

Miss Grace E. Kimball, M.D., writing to the *Missionary Herald*, under date of March 1, says:—

The villagers from the districts of Khizan, Nordus, and Moks show the most distress. In Khizan, a district partly in the Bitlis, partly in the Van vilayet, there is a large Koordish population—fanatical Moslems, headed by a sheikh, the son of the famous Sheikh Jeladin. Last fall the sheikh instituted a regular campaign against the Christian population, with a view to rooting out that religion from his borders. This outburst of fanaticism was avowedly brought to a climax by the visit of a British vice-consul to the region. All the Armenians who entertained him, or in any way had to do with him were either killed or barely escaped by flight and hiding. As a result of this crusade of last fall, practically the whole Christian population has nominally accepted Islam, the churches are turned into mosques, and even the gravestones bearing the sign of the cross, have been pulled down and defiled by serving as lavatories for the Koords. Very many—it is impossible to know how many—were killed out of special spite, and as an argument to facilitate the "conversion" of the rest. The priests in particular were victims either of slaughter or of forcible conversion.

Many other details might be given, but enough has been said. The fact is established that to the horrors of war have been added in the last decade of the nineteenth century the additional horrors of religious persecution; and that thousands have been slaughtered, not alone because they were "rebels," but because they bore the hated name of "Christian." How many of them were such indeed, only the Judge of all the earth knows, and he alone will make it manifest in his own good time.

June 18, 1896

"Civil Grounds of Religious Intolerance" *American Sentinel* 11, 25 , pp. 195, 196.

IN No. 18 of the current volume of this paper was published an article under this title in which it was shown that "in all ages and in every country religious intolerance has been defended on the ground of public policy," and that "dissenters have ever been stigmatized as enemies of the State, subverters of social order, and disturbers of the public peace." ²²³ 1 The proof of these propositions was conclusive, but by no means as full as it might have been. Indeed, to exhaust the subject would be to review the entire history of the world, for substantially the same arguments have been urged in justification of restrictions of freedom of conscience in every country and in every period.

Speaking of the causes of pagan persecutions, Lecky says that "they were partly political and partly religious." The same writer explains this statement in this way:—

In the earlier days of Rome religion was looked upon as a function of the State; its chief object was *to make the gods auspicious to the national policy*, and its principal ceremonies were performed at the direct command of the Senate. ²²⁴2

Of certain repressive measures directed by the Romans against other religions than their own, Lecky says:—

They grew out of that intense national spirit which sacrificed every other interest to the State, and resisted every form of innovation, whether secular or religious, that could impair the unity of the national type, and dissolve the discipline [*sic.*] which the predominance of the military spirit and the stern government of the Republic had formed. ²²⁵3

It thus appears that the real motive that led the pagans to persecute the Christians was a desire *to preserve intact their civil institutions*; the very motive which to-day actuates the Czar in the persecution of Jews and Stundists, and that is urged in our own country in justification of certain measures of religious legislation. In justification of Sunday laws, Mr. Crafts says, as quoted in our former article:—

It is the conviction of the majority that the nation cannot be preserved without religion, nor religion without the Sabbath, nor the Sabbath without laws, therefore Sabbath laws are enacted by the right of self-preservation, not in violation of liberty, but for its protection.

This is but a revamping of the old pagan theory firmly believed by the multitude. Lecky says, "that the prosperity and adversity of the empire depended chiefly upon the zeal or indifference that was shown in conciliating the national divinities." That the Christian religion is true while the religion of the Romans was false does not affect the principle; civil government was as much a divine ordinance in Rome as it is in the United States, and if the preservation of social order justifies religious laws now, it justified them as fully then. Nor is this all; if the preservation of either this or any other nation justifies religious restrictions at all, it justifies such restriction to any extent which in the judgment of those in authority may be necessary for the preservation of that nation. But to maintain such a position would be to justify all the persecution that has ever cursed any land, or disgraced any system of religion.

Another point of semblance between ancient and modern intolerance, between pagan and so-called Christian bigotry, is found in the fact that when Rome reached the point of tolerating professors of all religions in Rome, this liberty did not free the Roman "from the obligation of performing also the sacrifices or other religious rites in his own land." The parallel to this is found in Tennessee and some other of our American States in which perfect religious liberty is supposed to be guaranteed, notwithstanding the fact that a certain amount of deference must always be paid to the religion of the majority, in the observance of Sunday.

American colonial history is exceedingly fruitful in illustrations of how religious intolerance has sought to shield itself behind civil considerations, and justify persecution on the ground of protecting public morals and preserving the peace and dignity of the State. In "The Emancipation of Massachusetts," Brooks Adams relates how the clergy of that colony "used the cry of heresy to excite odium, just as they called their opponents Antinomians, or dangerous fanatics." To stir up the people against them. "Though the scheme was unprincipled," says Mr. Adams, "it met with complete success, and the Antinomians have come down to posterity branded as deadly enemies of Christ *and the commonwealth*; yet nothing is more certain than that they were not only good citizens, but substantially orthodox." Of course the motive of the clergy was wholly religious, yet they made it appear that while they were concerned for what they regarded as the true faith they were equally interested in the welfare of the colony. Henry Dunster, the first president of Harvard College, did not believe in infant baptism, and for this he was indicted and convicted on the charge of *disturbing church ordinances*. The disturbance was as real as is the disturbance charged in Tennessee against Seventh-day Adventists—it was all in the minds of those, who, having control of legislation, were determined that the civil power should be used in support, to some extent at least, of their tenets. Dunster was driven out *as an enemy of the commonwealth*, and died in poverty and neglect.

In 1651, John Cotton denounced certain Baptists as "foul murderers" because they denied infant baptism. And in "The Emancipation of Massachusetts" page 116, we are told that under the Puritan Commonwealth, the moment a man "refused implicit obedience, or above all, if he withdrew from his congregation he was shown no mercy, *because such acts tended to shake the temporal*

power." "Therefore," says the same writer, page 118, "though Winslow solemnly protested before the commissioners at London that Baptists who lived peaceably would be left unmolested, yet such of them as listened to 'foul murderers' were denounced as dangerous fanatics *who threatened to overthrow the government*, and were hunted through the country like wolves."

Regarding the facility with which civil offenses were for religious reasons charged in Massachusetts against dissenters, Charles Francis Adams says:—

A species of sweep-net was now needed which should bring the followers no less than the leaders under the ban of law. The successful prosecution of Wheelwright afforded the necessary hint. Wheelwright had been brought within the clutches of the civil authorities by a species of *ex post facto* legal chicanery. Even his most bitter opponents did not pretend to allege that he had preached his Fast day sermon with the intent to bring about any disturbance of the peace. They only claimed that his utterances tended to make such a result probable, and that his own observation ought to have convinced him of the fact. Therefore, they argued, although it was true that no breach of the peace had actually taken place and although the preacher had no intent to excite to a breach of the peace, yet he was none the less guilty of constructive sedition. Constructive sedition was now made to do the same work in New England which constructive treason, both before and after, was made to do elsewhere. ²²⁶⁴

But it mattered not that Wheelwright could be accused only by legal fiction, and that an extremely attenuated one. Mr. Adams thus relates the sequel:—

The court being now purged of all his friends Coddington only excepted, Wheelwright's case was taken up. He appeared in answer to the summons; but, when asked if he was yet prepared to confess his errors, he stubbornly refused to do so, protesting his entire innocence of what was charged against him. He could not be induced to admit that he had been guilty either of sedition or of contempt, and he asserted that the doctrine preached by him in his Fast-day discourse was sound; while, as to any individual application which had been made of it, he was not accountable. Then followed a long wrangle, reaching far into the night and continued the next day, during which the natural obstinacy of Wheelwright's temper must have been sorely tried. At his door was laid all the responsibility for all the internal dissensions of the province. He was the fruitful source of those village and parish ills; and every ground of complaint was gone over, from the lax response of Boston to the call for men for the Pequot war, to the

slight put by his church upon Wilson, and halberdiers upon Winthrop. To such an indictment defense was impossible; and so, in due time, the court proceeded to its sentence. It was disfranchisement and exile. . . . His sentence stands recorded as follows: "Mr. John Wheelwright, being formally convicted of contempt and sedition, and now justifying himself and his former practice, being to the disturbance of the civil peace, he is by the court disfranchised and banished, having fourteen days to settle his affairs; and if within that time he depart not the patent, he promiseth to render himself to Mr. Stoughton, at his house to be kept till he be disposed of; and Mr. Hough undertook to satisfy any charge that he, Mr. Stoughton, or the country should be at." ²²⁷⁵

Similar facts might be given at almost any length both in the history of Massachusetts and in that of England and other countries, but the reader can pursue the study for himself. Enough has been said to fully sustain the proposition that religious intolerance ever

196

seeks to hide its hideous face behind some civil law, and to justify its crimes against humanity on the ground of public necessity; but nobody is deceived except the poor bigots themselves. Everybody else knows full well the real motive.

"A Significant Decision" *American Sentinel* 11, 25 , pp. 197, 198.

OUR readers are familiar with the fact that a decision was handed down May 18 by the Supreme Court of the United States affirming the constitutionality of Section 4,578 of the Code of Georgia prohibiting the running of freight trains in that State on Sunday, except under certain conditions and circumstances.

The "law" was assailed on the ground that it was in violation of the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have power to regulate commerce between the States; but the majority of the court held that the said act was only "an ordinary police regulation designed to secure the well-being and promote the general welfare of the people within the State by which it was established, and, therefore, not invalid by force alone of the Constitution of the United States."

Like the Christian Nation Decision.

Like the "Christian Nation" decision of February 29, 1892, this decision is more broad and far-reaching than was really required by

the question before the Court, Mr. Justice Harlan who delivered the opinion of the court, seems to have gone out of his way to lay broad and deep the foundation of Sunday "laws."

Judging from this opinion, the power of the several States to enact and enforce Sunday "laws" is not regarded as open to question. Immediately after stating the facts in the case the learned Justice says:—

If the statute in question forbidding the running in Georgia of railroad freight trains, on the sabbath day, had been expressly limited to trains laden with domestic freight, it could not be regarded otherwise than as an ordinary police regulation established by the State under its general power to protect *the health and morals, and to promote the welfare, of its people.* ²²⁸¹

Policy of the State to Protect "the Sabbath"

"From the earliest period in the history of Georgia," continues the opinion, "it has been the policy of that State, as it was the policy of many of the original States, to prohibit all persons, under penalties, from using the *sabbath as a day* for labor and for pursuing their ordinary callings. By an act of the colonial legislature of Georgia, approved March 4th, 1762, it was provided: 'No tradesman, artificer, workman, laborer or other person whatsoever shall do or exercise any worldly labor, business or work of their ordinary callings, upon *the Lord's day*, or any part thereof (works of necessity or charity only excepted), and that every person being of the age of fifteen years or upwards, offending in the premises, shall for every such offense, forfeit the sum of ten shillings. And that no person or persons whatsoever shall publicly cry, show forth, or expose to sale, any wares, merchandise, fruit, herbs, goods, or chattels whatsoever upon *the Lord's day*, or any part thereof, upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit the same goods so cried or showed forth, or exposed to sale, or pay ten shillings.'"

The "Law" Cited

The court then cites the act against the running of freight trains on Sunday, described in the act as "the sabbath day," and then continues:—

In what light is the statute of Georgia to be regarded? The well-settled rule is, that if a statute purporting to have been enacted to

protect the public health, *the public morals* or the public safety has no real or substantial relation to those objects, or is a palpable invasion of rights secured by the fundamental law, it is the duty of the courts to so adjudge and thereby give effect to the constitution. *Mugler v. Kansas*, 123 U.S. 623, 661; *Minnesota v. Barber*, 136 U.S. 313, 320.

In our opinion there is nothing in the legislation in question which suggests that it was enacted with the purpose to regulate interstate commerce, or with any other purpose than to *prescribe a rule of civil duty for all who, on the sabbath day, are within the territorial jurisdiction of the States. It is none the less a civil regulation because the day on which the running of freight trains is prohibited is kept by many under a sense of religious duty.* The legislature having, *as will not be disputed*, power to enact laws to promote the order and to secure the comfort, happiness and health of the people, *it was within its discretion to fix the day when all labor, within the limits of the State, works of necessity and charity excepted, should cease.* . . . The legislature of Georgia no doubt acted upon the view that *the keeping of one day in seven for rest and relaxation was "of admirable service to a State considered merely as a civil institution."* 4 Bl. Com. 63. The same view was expressed by Mr. Justice Field in *Ex parte Newman*, 9 Cal. 502, 520, 529, when, referring to a statute of California relating to the sabbath day, he said: "Its requirement is a cessation of labor. In its enactment, the legislature has given the sanction of law to a rule of conduct, which the entire civilized world recognizes as essential to the physical and moral well-being of society. Upon no subject is there such a concurrence of opinion, among philosophers, moralists and statesmen of all nations, as on the necessity of periodical cessation of labor. One day in seven is the rule, founded in experience and sustained by science. . . . The prohibition of secular business on Sunday is advocated on the ground that by it the general welfare is advanced, labor protected, and the moral and physical well-being of society is promoted."

So, in *Bloom v. Richards*, 2 Ohio St. 387, 392, Judge Thurman, delivering the unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court of Ohio, said: "We are, then, to regard the statute under consideration as a mere municipal or police regulation, whose validity is neither strengthened nor weakened by the fact that *the day of rest it enjoins is the sabbath day.* Wisdom requires that men should refrain from labor at least one day in seven, and the advantages of having the day of rest fixed, and so fixed as to happen at regularly recurring intervals, are too obvious to be overlooked. *It was within the constitutional competency of the general assembly to required the cessation of labor, and to name the day of rest.*"

"Essential" to the Well-Being of Man

The same principles were announced by the Supreme Court of Georgia in the present case. . . . That court, speaking by Chief-Justice Bleckley, said: "There can be no well-founded doubt of its being a police regulation, considering it merely as ordaining the cessation of ordinary labor and business during one day in every week; for the frequent and total suspension of the toils, care and strain of mind or muscle incident to pursuing an occupation or common employment, is beneficial to every individual, and incidentally to the community at large, the general public. Leisure is no less essential than labor to the well-being of man. . . ."

That court further said: "With respect to the selection of the particular day in each week which has been set apart by our statute as the rest day of the people, *religious views and feelings may have had a controlling influence. We doubt not that they did have*; and it is probable that the same views and feelings had a very powerful influence in dictating the policy of setting apart any day whatever as a day of enforced rest. But neither of these considerations is destructive of the police nature and character of the statute. . . . Courts are not concerned with the mere beliefs, and sentiments of legislators, or with the motives which influence them in enacting laws which are within legislative competency. *That which is properly made a civil duty by statute is none the less so because it is also a real or supposed religious obligation; nor is the statute vitiated, or in anywise weakened, by the chance, or even the certainty, that in passing it the legislative mind was swayed by the religious rather than by the civil aspect of the measure.* Doubtless it is a religious duty to pay debts, but no one supposes that this is any obstacle to its being exacted as a civil duty. With few exceptions, the same may be said of the whole catalogue of duties specified in the ten commandments. *Thos os them which are purely and exclusively religious in their nature cannot be made civil duties, but all of them may be, in so far as they involve conduct as distinguished from mere operations of mind or states of the affections. Opinions may differ, and they really do differ, as to whether abstaining from labor on Sunday is a religious duty; but whether it is or is not, it is certain that the legislature of Georgia has prescribed it as a civil duty.* The statute can fairly and rationally be treated as a legitimate police regulation, and thus treated it is a valid law. There is a wide difference between keeping a day holy as a religious observance and merely forbearing to labor on that day in one's ordinary vocation or business pursuit." *Hennington v. The State*, 90 Ga. 396, 397, 399.

In quoting and adopting this language of the Supreme Court of Georgia, as he does, Justice Harlan shows a most astonishing lack of

appreciation of the essential difference between paying debts and observing a religious ordinance. The payment of debts is not made a civil duty because it is a religious duty; while it is admitted that abstinence from labor on Sunday is made a "civil duty" because it is supposed to be first of all a religious duty. On the other hand, the payment of debts is a religious duty because it is first of all a natural civil duty. Peoples knowing nothing of the ten commandments recognize the obligation to pay debts, and enforce it by civil law; but we find the so-called civil Sabbath only where its observance has first been enjoined as a religious duty. But so well satisfied is the Supreme Court with the reasoning of the Georgia Court on this point, that the learned justice continues:—

Assuming, then, that both upon principle and authority the statute of Georgia is, in every substantial sense, a police regulation established under the general authority possessed by the legislature to provide, by laws, for the well being of the people, we proceed to consider whether it is in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

The Contention of the Defense

The defendant contends that the running *on the sabbath day* of railroad cars, laden with interstate freight, is committed exclusively to the control and supervision of the National Government; and that, although Congress has not taken any affirmative action upon the subject, State legislation interrupting, even for a limited time only, interstate commerce, whatever may be its object and however essential such legislation may be for the comfort, peace and safety of the people of the State, is a regulation of interstate commerce forbidden by the Constitution of the United States. Is this view of the Constitution and of the relations between the States and the General Government sustained by the former decisions of this court? . . . If the people of a State deem it necessary to their peace, comfort and happiness, to say nothing of the public health and the public morals, that one day in each week be set apart by law as a day when business of all kinds carried on within the limits of that State shall cease, whereby all persons of every race

198

and condition in life may have an opportunity to enjoy absolute rest and quiet, is that result, so far as interstate freight traffic is concerned, attainable only through an affirmative act of Congress giving its assent to such legislation?

The court holds that such is not the case, and concludes the opinion thus:—

Local laws of the character mentioned have their source in the powers which the States reserved and never surrendered to Congress, of providing for the public health, the public morals and the public safety, and are not, within the meaning of the Constitution, and considered in their own nature, regulations of interstate commerce simply because, for a limited time or to a limited extent, they cover the field occupied by those engaged in such commerce. The statute of Georgia is not directed against interstate commerce. . . . It simply declares that, on an during the day fixed by law as a day of rest for all the people within the limits of the State from toil and labor incident to their callings, the transportation of freight shall be suspended.

We are of opinion that such a law, although in a limited degree affecting interstate commerce, is not for that reason a needless intrusion upon the domain of Federal jurisdiction, nor strictly a regulation of interstate commerce, but, considered in its own nature, is an ordinary police regulation designed to secure the well-being and to promote the general welfare of the people within the State by which it was established and therefore, not invalid by force alone of the Constitution of the United States.

The judgment is

Affirmed.

No Recognition of Individual Rights.

It will be observed that in all this, while there is a careful guarding of "the powers which the States reserved and never surrendered," there is not so much as a suggestion of any rights for the individual. The State is supreme over the time, health, and morals of the people. *They have no reserved rights.*

A noticeable feature in this decision is the matter-of-fact tone employed in referring to Sunday "laws." Their propriety is beyond question! "From the earliest period in the history of Georgia it has been the policy of that State, as it was the policy of many of the original States, to prohibit all persons, under penalties, from using the *sabbath as a day* of labor and from pursuing their ordinary callings." The argument amounts to no more than this: it has long been so, therefore it must be right. And this "policy" and the "laws" enacted in preservice of it are purely "civil," the court asserts, notwithstanding the admitted fact that "religious views and feelings" "had a controlling influence" in the framing of "laws" requiring Sunday observance!

It is assumed that Sunday "laws" are necessary for the preservation of "health and morals." We have not time now to discuss the question of health; but submit that Sunday labor or business

cannot be shown to be immoral, and it will not ever be claimed that it is immoral, on any other ground than that it is irreligious. It inevitably follows that the Supreme Court has upheld a "law" prohibiting Sunday work because it is irreligious, for if it were not irreligious it could not be immoral, and if it were not immoral it could not be prohibited by law.

Sunday Receives the Seal of Judicial Approval

In our opinion this decision from which only two Justices (Justices Fuller and White) dissented, dashes to the ground all hope of a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States adverse to Sunday "laws." The fiction of Sunday sacredness has now received the seal of approval from the Supreme Court, for only on the supposition that it is a sacred day can Sunday labor or business be regarded as immoral; but it is on this very ground that the Supreme Court sustains not only the Georgia statute prohibiting the running of freight trains but the whole Georgia Sunday "law" as well as the Sunday "laws" of all the States.

The learned Justice delivering the opinion of the Court talks of the power of the State to fix a day of rest for all the people, and intimates that the choice of Sunday was only incidental; but does anybody suppose that the Supreme Court would sustain a statute enacted by any State which would undertake to stop interstate commerce upon any other day of the week than Sunday? Suppose that Utah instead of being settled by Mormons had been colonized by Mohammedans, and that they had passed a "law" prohibiting the running of freight trains on Friday, does anyone suppose for a moment that seven out of nine of our learned Supreme Court Justices would have sustained the "law"? Does anyone suppose that a single justice could have been found to champion such a statute? Certainly not.

We Have a Recognized Religion.

The truth is that while it was the purpose of the founders of this Government to establish on this continent a State without a Church, yea, even without any officially recognized religion, we have to-day and have long had a recognized religion, namely, Christianity, according to the general acceptance of that term. President Washington declared that the Government of the United States was not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion, but a Supreme

Court has arisen that knows not Washington. In 1892 it declared that this is "a Christian Nation," and found evidence of this in Colonial Charters and State Constitutions from the very beginning of our history to that very moment; and now in 1896 it is assumed that labor or business upon the "Christian sabbath" is immoral and therefore properly prohibited by the police power of the States!

**Leaves no Room to Doubt the Attitude of the Supreme Court on the Whole
Question of Sunday Laws**

It is true that no question was raised before the court upon the right of the individual to have and exercise his own individual conscience, being answerable only to God for the abuse of that privilege so long as in so doing the individual does not intrench upon the equal rights of others; but the opinion delivered by Justice Harlan leaves no room to doubt what the decision would have been had the question been upon the right of a State to forbid private Sunday labor by the individual. The court has held that the guardianship of morals is within the legitimate police power of the State, and on this ground the court sustains the Sunday "law" of Georgia; it follows that in the opinion of the learned justices Sunday labor and business are immoral; and as before shown that is the same thing as to hold that Sunday work is irreligious; for on no other possible grounds can it be held to be immoral.

Every department of the Government is now fully committed to the support of the Sunday institution; but the Judiciary has gone further than either the Legislative or the Executive. Until now there has been a question whether Sunday legislation would be sustained by the Supreme Court; whether that tribunal would not hold it to be in violation of the First Amendment; but that question is now settled. The Supreme Court has said that even though it be a religious institution, and even though religious convictions are the potent influence in securing the legislation, it is within the legitimate power of legislatures and must be sustained as a civil institution. Processes of the mind are alone free from governmental regulation; and religious liberty in the United States is only a name.

July 9, 1896

"Is Sunday a Civil Institution?" *American Sentinel* 11, 27 , pp. 209, 210.

THAT Sunday is primarily a religious institution nobody will deny. In the case of *Hennington vs. the State of Georgia*,²²⁹ 1 the Supreme Court of that State said:—

With respect to the selection of the particular day in each week which has been set apart by our statute as the rest day of the people, *religious views and feelings may have had a controlling influence. We doubt not that they did have;* and it is probable that the same views and feelings had a very powerful influence in dictating the policy of setting apart any day whatever as a day of enforced rest.

But notwithstanding this admission, the Georgia court, as our readers know, sustained the statute on the ground that it could "fairly and rationally be treated as a legitimate police regulation." In reviewing the case the Supreme Court of the United States, as our readers are also aware, adopted both the reasoning and the conclusions of the State court, thus sustaining a *confessedly* religious statute, Justices Fuller and White only dissenting.

Let us analyze this confession of the religious origin and character of Sunday laws, and see just what is admitted by the high tribunals making it. (1) *"Religious views and feelings" had "a controlling influence" in selecting the day of rest.* (2) *The same views and feelings "had a very powerful influence in dictating the policy of setting apart any day whatever as a day of enforced rest."*

It is difficult to see how, in the face of such admissions, any court could hold, as did the Supreme Courts of Georgia and of the United States, that a Sunday statute is "a legitimate police regulation."

Enforced Sunday rest can have no justification except on the hypothesis that Sunday labor is immoral; and such labor can be held to be immoral only on the ground that it is irreligious. But it ought not to require any argument to show that no such question can become "a legitimate" subject of "police regulation." It is to be feared that the same "religious views and feelings" which confessedly "had a controlling influence" in the making of the Georgia Sunday statute had a like influence in sustaining it in the State and Federal courts.

The police power is "hard to define," but it will be admitted that it has its limitations. A law writer of some note has well said of this power that it is *"unquestionably limited to the prevention of interference by one man with another."*²³⁰ 2 "The fact," continues the

same author, "that a man's conduct, his behavior, or his manner of living, may be unwise, in view of his own position, or his health, and may result in injury to himself alone, physically or morally, affords no ground whatever for the interference of the 'police power' with his proceedings. It is settled that the State may compel an unwilling citizen to be vaccinated. But on what ground? Now because if he remains unvaccinated, he would be liable to catch the smallpox; nor yet because if he did catch it, he would probably die; but solely because his unvaccinated condition renders him specially liable to become a source of contagion to others. This is an extreme case. But beyond this the police power certainly could not go in this country. It could not, for example, compel a man with a weak back to wear a porous plaster, a man with *caries* to submit to amputation, a man with dyspepsia to take exercise, *or a tired man to rest*, because the suggested proceeding may be an advisable one in each case for the individual's own interest."

These observations are so apt and the truth stated so evident and the application of the principle to Sunday legislation so easy, that but for the exceedingly potent "religious views and feelings" to which Sunday statutes owe both their existence and maintenance, they must certainly ere this have been relegated to that period of the world's history when "the church" was supreme over the State and the Pope set up and deposed kings at his will.

The opinions of both the courts to which we have referred ²³¹ 3 make mention of the "health" of the people as guarded by compulsory Sunday rest, but the idea is absurd. Even if it were demonstrated that a regular weekly period of rest was essential to health, it certainly could not be shown that that rest could not be had just as well on some other day as on Sunday. It is a fact that about one million persons in the United States do not take this rest in the United States do not take this rest upon Sunday, but upon the seventh day of the week; and they are not only not more unhealthful than those who rest on Sunday, but they are on an average actually even more healthful, but, it must be admitted, from causes quite aside from their weekly rest.

As we have seen in the very outset of this article, the Supreme Courts of the State of Georgia and of the United States of America, both confess the religious character of Sunday laws; but it may be of interest to add some additional testimony to the same effect. Says Mr. Tiedeman: "The most common form of

legal interference *in matters of religion* is that which requires the observance of Sunday as a *holy day*. In these days the legal requirements do not usually extend beyond the compulsory cessation of labor, the maintenance of quiet upon the streets and the closing of all places of amusements; *but the public spirit which calls for the compulsory observance of these regulations is the same which in the colonial days of New England imposed a fine for an unexcused absence from divine worship*. Although other reasons have been assigned for the State regulation of the observance of Sunday in order to escape the constitutional objections that can be raised against it if it takes the form of a religious institution, those who are most active in securing the enforcement of the Sunday laws *do so because of the religious character of the day*, and not for any economical reason. . . . The effectiveness of the laws is measured by the influence *of the Christian idea of Sunday as a religious institution*." ²³²⁴

In like manner Judge Cooley remarks that "it is clear that these laws are supportable on authority *notwithstanding the inconvenience which they occasion to those whose religious sentiments do not recognize the sacred character of the first day of the week*." ²³³⁵

Scores of authorities and of cases might be cited to prove that which is so patent in the Georgia case that it would be readily seen, even had the State and Federal courts not both admitted it, namely, that Sunday laws originate in, and are sustained by, "religious views and feelings," and that they are therefore "civil" only in the sense that they are made a part of the legislation of the State. A State "law" requiring the subject to be baptized or to partake of the Lord's supper, or to do any other religious act, would be "civil" in just the same sense.

The idea that "religious views and feelings," where strong enough and held by a sufficiently large number of the people, can be crystallized into civil statutes and be enforced upon all the people by the civil power, is utterly subversive of the principles of both civil and religious liberty. It ignores and even practically denies the existence of natural rights, and casts to the winds constitutional guarantees of freedom of conscience, which, to be of any value, must carry with it freedom to act in accordance with the dictates of conscience. To say that a man is free to believe as he will, means nothing unless he is

also free to act upon his faith, limited not by the faith of the majority, but by the equal rights of his fellowmen, be they many or be they few.

But mischievous as is this idea which subordinates the individual conscience to the will of the majority, or to the will of those having control of legislation and of the courts, it has in this Georgia case been fully adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States as it was adopted and declared by a United State Circuit Court, in the King case, in Western Tennessee, August 1, 1891.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 27 , p. 217.

CIVIL power is force; all the force that is necessary to secure compliance, even to the taking of life; but the gospel cannot be furthered by force. "All that take the sword shall perish with the sword," says the Saviour. It is clear, therefore, that the Christian citizen cannot use force for the promotion of the gospel.

GOD is the author of liberty; and being its author, he has established man's natural right to liberty upon an immovable foundation, which could not be evolved from human customs, traditions, or creeds. The framers of the Declaration of Independence discovered this foundation when they published to the world that "all men are *created* equal," and "*are endowed by their Creator* with certain unalienable rights." Upon this foundation, they could (and did) successfully appeal to mankind. Were there no standard or source of authority to which man could appeal save man himself,—or in other words, outside of that which is human,—the opinion of the majority would have to prevail. Were it not that man's right to liberty rests upon the eternal and immovable fact of his creation, by an infinitely higher Being than himself, the Declaration of Independence could never have been written.

WE say that religion should be kept separate from the affairs of the State. Our opponents strongly disclaim any intention of uniting Church and State, but say that a union of religion and the State is proper and desirable. In favoring this they endeavor to confound religion with morality and justice. But to say that religion should be kept separate from the State does not in the least imply that the State must act wrongfully in anything. "Religion" may be right and it maybe wrong. As a matter of fact most religions in the world are wrong; indeed, all are save one, and that is the Christian religion. In joining religion with the State, therefore, the chances are altogether in favor

of joining the State to error, and producing a union of which, if it amounts to anything, must result in wrong doing on the part of the State.

And here an important truth ought to be stated, which is that even the Christian religion itself is true only as defined and applied by the Holy Spirit. Left to the operation of this Spirit,—a source of wisdom and power infinitely beyond any that is human,—the Christian religion comes to the individual as the perfect, saving truth; but otherwise, as when applied by the State, it becomes error in its most dangerous form. In other words, the mixture of divine truth with conceptions that are human and finite produces the most deceptive and dangerous error, since it is divine in appearance, yet because of its mixture with the human, cannot lead the soul to God. The Christian religion is God's truth, conceived by himself and his son Jesus Christ in the counsels of eternity between them, and altogether beyond even the comprehension of angels as applied in the saving of men's souls. Man may hold forth the word of life as God gives it to him; but to enforce or apply any doctrine of that religion to the life of any individual is a matter which only the Spirit of God can rightly do. Therefore we do not want religion—even the Christian religion—brought into the operation of the affairs of the State.

But we do want justice to be there always. We want respect for the natural rights of all men to control the civil power in all its actions. We want the State to do rightly all that it has rightfully the power to do; and what that is is defined in the Declaration of Independence. And if it does this it will not be a Godless State, for God cannot be separated from right and justice.

July 16, 1896

"Divine and Human Government" *American Sentinel* 11, 28 , pp. 218, 219.

THE theory of legislation upon religious duties and questions is radically opposed to the teaching of the Scriptures of divine truth, which plainly declare that "every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

This text plainly asserts our accountability to God. From other scriptures we learn the scope of this accountability; that it has reference, first, to our duty toward God; second, to our duty toward

our fellowman. The first and great commandment of the law is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;" "and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And our Lord adds, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

All Sin Is Against God.

But while we have duty toward our fellowman, failure to perform that duty is not, as we sometimes loosely say, sin against man, but is sin against God. It is God's law that defines our duty toward our fellows, and the violation of that law is sin. "Whosoever committeth sin," says the apostle, "transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law;" the divine law, of course; and so, in the fifty-first Psalm, we find David confessing to God the wrong done to Uriah, in these words: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned." The wrong was done to a man; the sin was against God; and to God the transgressor was accountable. "So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God," both for our sins against God and our wrongs to our fellowmen. *All sin* is, without qualification, against God. And he it is who "shall bring every work into judgment with every secret thing whether it be good or evil."

God the Only Moral Governor.

God is the great and only moral governor. To him; and to him alone, every soul is morally responsible. In the very nature of things this could not be otherwise; because to permit any power whatever to come between the soul and God would be to destroy individual responsibility to God.

Man the Conservator of His Own Rights.

But man is a social as well as a moral being; and as such he is endowed with "certain unalienable rights;" to him God has committed the preservation of these rights by means of civil government. This truth is thus expressed in the American Declaration of Independence:—

We hold these truths to be self-evident, 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. That to secure these rights, governments are

instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

To disregard these rights or to trample upon them is to *wrong* our fellowmen and so to sin against God. The *sin*, if not repented of and forgiven, God will punish in his own time; the *wrong* may be dealt with by our fellows in their organized capacity as a State. And it is this fact that restrains from deeds of violence and injustice, many who have not the fear of God before them. This safeguard to liberty and natural rights, the God who sends his rain upon the just and upon the unjust, has given to men. Its benefits accrue alike to the righteous and to the wicked. The powers of civil government are exercised alike by and for Jew and Gentile, pagan and Christian. Hence civil government is not in any sense Christian, but is humanitarian, that is, it is given, like marriage, for the good of the race.

It must be at once apparent that there is nothing necessarily evil either in civil government or in its administration and use. God feeds and clothes us by ordaining means whereby we may secure food and clothing. Our natural wants are seldom supplied by miraculous interposition. "It is only in cases of great emergency that the Lord interposes for us." ²³⁴1

We glorify God in the proper use of the means which he has given us. Marriage, one of the Creator's best gifts to man, is often perverted and abused; but this fact does not vitiate the marriage institution. In like manner civil government, ordained of God to be a blessing, and specially to the people of God, that they "may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honest," is often abused and made the engine of oppression. But it still remains true that "the powers that be are ordained of God." The power to do justice and judgment, to protect the weak and punish the evil-doer, is as truly divine in its origin and as God-honoring in its proper exercise as is the power to cultivate the soil or to reap the fruits of the earth.

Why Man Is Made the Guardian of His Own Rights

Man has been made the guardian of his own civil rights, not by an arbitrary arrangement on the part of the Creator, but for wise and beneficent reasons which we can readily discern and comprehend. God committed to men, not the administration of his law, nor any part of it, but the maintenance of those rights which reason teaches that all intelligent moral beings should enjoy in common; those self-evident rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence. Had

God made civil government Christian, and commissioned men to administer his law, and to require of their fellows the discharge of duties due to the Divine Being, or even to administer the divine law as regards the duties which as social beings we owe to one another, it would necessarily have destroyed moral responsibility to God. On the other hand, had God not committed to men the power to regulate to some extent their social relation in order that their natural rights might be preserved, but had himself administered civil justice, one of two things would have followed; either vengeance would have been so swift and certain as to defeat the very design of God in making man a free moral agent, or else punishment would have been so long delayed as to afford no protection to those in need of it. It was absolutely necessary that man should be the guardian of his own rights in this world, and for the temporary concerns of this world, but that this should in no way affect his individual moral responsibility to the Creator. Nor should men make it a pretext for assuming to exercise authority which belongs alone to God.

That the principle here stated is the correct and spiritual one, is clear from the words of Christ when the Pharisees sought to entangle him in his talk. They asked him the question: "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cesar, or not?" But he, understanding their purpose, said: "Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he said unto them, "Whose is this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Cesar's. Then said he unto them, Render therefore unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." In this, Christ plainly separated between civil and moral duties. The paying of tribute was simply a civil matter. They were living under Cesar's government and it was right that they should contribute to the support of the government; and yet this was not an absolute moral duty, but rather one growing out of the surroundings, and in some cases even something to be done merely to avoid offense. It was for this reason that Christ himself paid tribute, as we learn from Matt. 17:24-27.

Civil Government Not Anti-Christian.

As before remarked, civil government is not Christian neither is it anti-Christian; it simply has no religious character; and like other men, the Christian must live under it and is privileged to enjoy its protection, and may even take part in it.

Aside from the Godly men who exercised authority under the Theocracy, there are notable instances of other good men who took part in the affairs of government. Abraham was a nomadic chief, and when necessity arose, marshaled his forces and conducted a vigorous and successful campaign against the freebooters who had robbed Lot and had carried him away captive.²³⁵ 2 And in this Abraham was actuated by no unworthy motive. Of this victory it has been well said by another, "To Abraham, under God, was the triumph due. The worshipper of Jehovah had not only rendered a great service to the country, but had proved himself a man of valor. It was seen that righteousness is not cowardice, and that Abraham's religion made him courageous in maintaining the right and defending the oppressed."²³⁶ 3

The history of this event in Abraham's life also brings to view the fact that Melchizedec,

219

a "priest of the most high God," was king of Salem, and that he came out to welcome Abraham on his return from the slaughter of the kings, and "as 'priest to the most high God' he pronounced a blessing upon Abraham, and gave thanks to the Lord, who had wrought so great a deliverance by his servant. And Abraham 'gave him tithes of all.'"²³⁷ 4

Subsequently we have the history of Joseph, who, in the providence of God, became governor over all the land of Egypt with authority second only to the king. Then, too, Daniel and his three companions, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, held high official positions in the kingdom of Babylon. Nor is this strange since we are plainly told that "the powers that be are ordained of God," that magistrates "are his ministers" "to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil;" and we are exhorted by the apostles to pray "for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty."

Quietness and peace are essential to the enjoyment of life and liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness, which the Declaration of Independence enumerates as among those unalienable rights which governments are instituted to preserve. Thus the Christian's true attitude toward civil government is quiet submission in all things civil; rendering to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's. But to do this, that is, to render to God that which belongs to God, he who would render it, must, in the things rendered to God, be absolutely independent of any human authority. In those

things, his allegiance must be paid to God. And as a matter of history, we find that this has always been the attitude of the servants of God. This was the case with Shadrach, Meshac, and Abed-nego, who, for refusing to bow before the great image in the plain of Dura, were cast into the fiery furnace. It was also the case with Daniel, who, though prime minister of the empire, disobeyed a "law" of the king. It was also the case with Peter and John, who, when commanded by the magistrates contrary to the word of the Lord, answered, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

Christ's Answer to the Pharisees.

In all these cases the civil rulers sought to usurp authority which belonged along to God, and the servants of God refused obedience and quietly submitted to the punishment inflicted, protesting, however, against the injustice and maintaining their innocence while declaring boldly their purpose not to yield to Cesar the things that belong to God.

The same course was pursued by Christians until apostasy began to corrupt the primitive simplicity of the gospel. The followers of Christ ever yielded cheerful obedience to all in authority in all civil matters, but they went to the block and the stake rather than yield an iota of their soul-liberty. So persistent were they in maintaining this individual responsibility directly to God, that their teaching upon this subject so permeated the Roman Empire that by the year A.D. 319, the most perfect religious freedom that ever existed under any government, except our own, was granted in Rome, and was enjoyed by all, both Pagans and Christians, until apostate Christians themselves sought to established [*sic.*] in Rome a man-made theocracy and denied to others the very rights which only a few years before they had claimed for themselves. And in so doing they violated not only the principles for which the had formerly contended but they set at nought the fundamental law of Christianity itself, as laid down by its Author: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

July 23, 1896

**"Render to God the Things that Are God's" *American Sentinel* 11, 29 ,
pp. 226, 227.**

FREQUENT appeal is made to the 13th chapter of Romans to sustain the assumption that unquestioning obedience to civil rulers is a moral duty; but that Scripture teaches us no such doctrine. We sometimes hear about harmonizing texts of sacred Scripture, but the expression should never be used. Where there is an apparent conflict man's duty is, not to harmonize passages in God's Word, but to discover the harmony which already exists.

The principle so plainly stated in Acts 5:29: "We ought to obey God rather than men," is nowhere contradicted in the divine Word. On the contrary we find it to be the rule of action of the servants of God in all ages. It was fidelity to this principle that brought the three Hebrew worthies face to face with death in the burning fiery furnace, but which also on the same occasion brought them face to face with their Lord, whose form was "like the Son of God," and who gloriously delivered them. It was likewise obedience to the same unwritten law, that caused Daniel to be cast alive into the den of lions, from which he also came forth alive, and gloriously vindicated, though he had violated a law of the realm and defied the authority of his earthly sovereign.

The key to the 13th of Romans is found in the words of our Lord recorded in Matt. 22:21: "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." The Jews were living under Cesar's government and were therefore in duty bound to render to Cesar his due; but this did not release them from their obligation to render to God his due, even if to do so would bring them in conflict with Cesar, for it has ever been true that man's first and highest allegiance is due to his Creator, hence

227

he is to love God with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his mind, *more* than he loves himself even; while he is to love his neighbor *as* himself. Matt. 22:37-39.

It should never be forgotten that God's moral government and proper, legitimate, God-ordained civil government, occupy entirely different spheres, and in their respective spheres a man can be loyal to both. No man is better qualified to render honest, efficient service to his country than he who does it for conscience' sake.

The whole subject under discussion in the 13th chapter of Romans is man's duty to his fellows. This is evident from verses 8-10: "Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law."

This the divine law requires and it is more than the civil law can possibly exact. The Christian must not—yea he cannot, do wrong, but he can suffer and will suffer wrong, and that patiently. Said the Saviour: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain." And again the apostle says: "What glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps." 1 Peter 2:20, 21. Even should the civil law strip the Christian of his earthly possessions, it would still be his duty to quietly submit, trusting his cause to God who judgeth righteously, and remembering that "all things work together for good to them that love God." Non-resistance is the rule of the Christian's life.

But while the Christian is to yield to man everything, yea and much more than the civil law requires, and this for conscience' sake, he must not render to Cesar that which is God's. The divine mandate is, "*Render to God the things that are God's*. And neither the 13th chapter of Romans, nor any other Scripture, contradicts this in any degree. The whole subject matter of that chapter is concerning the Christian's duty to render to Cesar (the civil authorities) the things that are due to civil authority, and nothing else.

"Facts vs. Ridicule" *American Sentinel* 11, 29 , p. 228.

A GOOD deal of ridicule has, by the advocates of Sunday laws, been heaped upon all constitutional arguments against Sunday

legislation; but why not answer the constitutional objections rather than ridicule them, if they can be answered?

It has been said that the various Supreme Court decisions touching this question are a sufficient answer. But are they? Of course such decisions show clearly the strength of religious sentiment and its influence even upon Supreme Courts; but they by no means prove that such legislation is constitutional in the sense of being in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Federal Constitution or of the State constitutions containing similar guarantees of freedom of conscience.

To understand the real purpose and intent of any constitution, we must, as Chief-Justice Waite remarked in 1878, go, not to recent decisions, but to the history of the times in which it was adopted, and give to the language of such constitution the meaning that it had at that time. By this rule we shall find that the First Amendment to the Federal Constitution was designed not only to make impossible the setting up of a State Church, but to forbid religious legislation, *i. e.*, legislation upon religious questions.

The term "religion" is not defined in the Constitution, but the Virginia Declaration of Rights, adopted in 1776, furnishes us a definition as follows: "Religion, *or the duty we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it*, can be directed only by reason and conviction," etc. This, then, is what the men who were largely instrumental in securing the adoption of the First Amendment to the National Constitution meant by "religion," and in the light of this definition that amendment would mean just what it was intended to mean, if it read, "Congress shall make no law regarding the duty which we owe to our Creator, or the manner of discharging it."

That this is the meaning of the First Amendment is evident also from the fact that the exact language of the Virginia Bill of Rights was used in the form of the amendment proposed by three of the six States which proposed an amendment on this subject, namely, Virginia, North Carolina, and Rhode Island; while New Hampshire used equally unmistakable language, namely, "Congress shall make no law touching religion, or to infringe the rights of conscience." It was evidently that the purpose of the several States to utterly prohibit to Congress all legislation upon religious questions, and no number of decisions, even by the Supreme Court, can make it otherwise. This is not so much a question of law as of fact, to be tried by the jury of the people rather than by the Justices of our Supreme Courts.

That the First Amendment to the Constitution was designed not only to keep Church and State separate in the sense of preventing an ecclesiastical establishment, but in the sense also of separating religion from the State—making the Government absolutely secular, is evident not only from the facts cited, but also from other considerations. In fact, this seems to have been the universal opinion until in recent years degenerate sons of noble fathers have sought to subvert the grand charter which those sires gave to their posterity.

In 1797, Washington and his cabinet and the United States Senate declared in the Treaty with Tripoli: "The Government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion." It is, perhaps, not saying too much to assert that President Washington and his advisers were in a position, at least as to the point of time, to understand the intent of the Constitution very much better than the Supreme Court of to-day. They knew what it meant, for they helped to make it, and were familiar with the reasons for its adoption and for the adoption of the First Amendment; and it is perfectly evident that they did not see in it much that the Supreme Court has professed to find there.

October 15, 1896

"The Rights of the People" *American Sentinel* 11, 41 , pp. 325, 326.

WHEN the servants of the people who have been selected and sworn for the sole purpose of maintaining the constitutional provisions which the people have established for the security of their rights, fail so completely to do what they have been appointed to do, and really subvert the Constitution instead of supporting it, then the right to do this themselves, in their own proper persons, rests by a double tenure *with the people*.

First, it is always the right and just prerogative of the people to set the actions of these servants alongside of the Constitution and judge whether they have indeed supported it or failed to support it. Remember the words of Dickinson, that "the people must restore things to that order from which their functionaries have departed;" and of Wilson, that "the supreme power resides in the people, *and they never part with it*;" the words of Bryce, that "the people censure any interpretation which palpably departs from the old lines;" and the words of Lincoln, that "the people of these United States are the

rightful masters of both Congresses and courts; not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution."

This right rests always with the people, for them freely to exercise. But when the agents which they have appointed for the very purpose of detecting unconstitutional laws and protecting the people from their injustice—when these agents themselves not only fail to do this, but actually aid in fastening unconstitutional statutes upon the people, then the right of the people to test the statutes by the Constitution, being "incapable of annihilation," returns to the people, and rests with them, by additional tenure, and it then *of right* devolves upon the people, themselves and for themselves, and each one for himself, to decide the case, declare such law unconstitutional and void, and treat it so in all their actions.

This is not to say, nor even to imply, that every man is at liberty to disregard, or disrespect, whatever action of the government he may not personally agree with. It *is* to say that it is absolutely incumbent on every citizen to be so well read in the Constitution and the Declaration that he shall know for himself the limitations upon the government, and act accordingly. *Every citizen must hold himself, as well as the government, strictly to the Constitution.* The Constitution is a limitation, not, indeed, upon the *power* of the people, except in the prescribed way, but

326

upon the passions and caprices of the people. This is sound American principle. It is the fundamental principle of a government of the people. Let it not be forgotten that one of the chief fathers of this nation, Alexander Hamilton, in persuading the ratification of the Constitution, declared that—

Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. . . . In a society, under the forms of which the stronger faction can readily unite and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature, where the weaker individual is not secured against the violence of the stronger.—*Federalist L.I.*

And another of these, James Madison, nobly said:—

An *elective despotism* was not the government we fought for; but one which should not only be founded on free principles, but in which the powers of government should be so divided and balanced among several bodies of magistracy as that no one could transcend their legal limits.—*Federalist XLVIII.*

And when the agents of the people, appointed under the forms of constitutional government, take the very unconstitutional course that brings about just the anarchy and elective despotism here pointed

out, then it is the right of the people, by this double tenure, to see to it that such unconstitutional laws and proceedings are disregarded, and the Constitution made to prevail.—*Alonzo T. Jones, in "Rights of the People," 1895, pp. 258-260.*

October 29, 1896

"Allegiance to the Constitution" *American Sentinel* 11, 43 , pp. 340, 341.

THEY are not personal sovereigns in themselves who are referred to in the words "The power that be are ordained of God." It is the governmental power, of which the sovereign is the representative, and that sovereign receives his power from the people. Outside of the theocracy of Israel there never has been a ruler who has justly ruled on earth, whose dignity was not derived from the people, either express, or permissive. It is not any particular sovereign whose power is ordained of God, nor any particular form of government. It is the genius of government itself. The absence of government is anarchy. Anarchy is only governmental confusion. But the Scriptures say, "God is not the author of confusion." God is the God of order. He has ordained order, and he has put within man himself that idea of government, of self protection, which is the first law of nature, which organizes itself into forms of one kind or another, wherever men dwell on the face of the earth; and it is for men themselves to say what shall be the form of government under which they shall dwell. One people has one form; another has another.

This genius of civil order springs from God; its exercise within its legitimate sphere is ordained of God, and the Declaration of Independence simply asserted the eternal truth of God when it said, "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Whether it be exercised in one form of government or another, it matters not. The governmental power and order thus ordained is of God.

If the people choose to change their form of government, it is the same power still, and is to be respected still. The power is still ordained of God in its legitimate exercise, in things pertaining to men and their relation to their fellowmen; but no power, whether exercised through one form or another, is ordained of God in things pertaining

to God, nor has it anything whatever to do with men's relations toward God.

The Constitution of the United States is the only form of government that has ever been on earth that is in harmony with the principle announced by Christ, demanding of men only that which is Cesar's and refusing to enter in any way into the field of man's relationship to God. This Constitution sprung from the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and on this point simply asserts the truth of God.

The American people do not appreciate to the one hundredth part the value of the Constitution under which they live. They do not honor in any fair degree the noble men who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, that these principles might be our heritage. All honor to those noble men. All integrity to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. All allegiance to the Constitution as it not is, under which we live, which gives to Cesar all his due, and leaves men to render to God all that they, instructed by the word of God, guided by their own conscience enlightened by the Spirit of God, may see that he requires of them.

341

May the sweet face of Heaven shine in infinite pity upon the poor deluded souls who think they are doing God service in their efforts to subvert the Constitution, and men's liberties under it. And may Heaven's twice blessed mercy be on and about the poor people who have respect for Jesus Christ and their right to worship God, when these people shall have accomplished their purpose.—A. T. Jones.

November 19, 1896

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 11, 46 , p. 361.

NOW THAT the great national campaign is over, and the elements have become quieted, it will be well to take a view of the things that were prominent there. This can be done now without even seeming to be partisan; and the lessons to be learned will not have lost their value. It must be said too that there are important lessons to be learned. Some vital principles were involved on both sides. As to what cast was given to these principles, is a question of interest and is worthy of most careful study. The SENTINEL proposes to review the situation, for the sake of the principles involved, and the lessons to be gained for the present and the future. The field is wide—wider indeed

than perhaps many would suppose; but the study will well repay careful investigation and deep thought.

THE French Revolution, its characters and its characteristics, was one of the things that was frequently cited in illustration, or warning, in the late campaign. This too on both sides. Each side saw on the other side characteristics of that notable period. These things were not cited by the light-minded and for mere political effect at the moment, but by the most influential,—and in all seriousness, as real dangers to be seen and considered and avoided. This fact is of itself worthy of serious consideration yet by all the people of the land. If only one side had seen in the other these characteristics, and had seriously cited them in warning, it would have been worthy of careful thought; but when each side saw them in the other, and both were seriously citing them in warning to the people, the subject becomes doubly worthy of careful consideration by all. The SENTINEL hopes to look at this matter in a way that will be of interest, as we know it is of importance, to all.

HAVE you noticed how the papacy in the United States, in discussing and expounding the theory of the infallibility of the pope, speaks much of "the Supreme Court of the Church"? This phrase is adopted from a certain theory that is held regarding the Supreme Court of the United States. The papacy says that as the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States upon questions of the Constitution are final, so the decisions of "the Supreme Court of the Church" upon the Constitution of the Church—the Bible—are also final. She says that as there is no appeal from a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in interpreting the Constitution of the United States, so there is no appeal from the decisions of "the Supreme Court of the Church" in interpreting the Constitution of the Church—the Bible. She says that as the people are not allowed to interpret the Constitution of the United States, but must submit without question to the interpretation given by the Supreme Court, so the people are not allowed to interpret the Scriptures, but must submit without question to the interpretation given by the Supreme Court of the Church. Of Course this argues absolutism and infallibility for the Supreme Court of the United States, as it does for "the Supreme Court of the Church."

But why is the papacy in the United States using this illustration this way in argument? There are two grounds as the cause of it.

First, The Supreme Court of the United States has declared that the constitution means that "this is a Christian nation," and that "the establishment of the Christian religion" is in accord with this and other "organic utterances" "of the whole people." It is therefore to the interest of the papacy in the United States to insist that this interpretation of the Constitution is final, that it must be accepted by all the people without question, and that the people are not allowed to interpret the Constitution for themselves, but must accept as final this interpretation given by the Supreme Court. By insisting upon this, and getting this theory spread and generally accepted, she knows that just as soon as she can get some of her doctrines recognized in the law, and a decision fixing the constitutionality of such law, she then has the country fastened under her "infallible" authority.

Secondly, Certain leading politicians of the country have taken, and the last summer have advocated everywhere, this very doctrine of the infallibility of Supreme Court interpretations of the Constitution. The Papacy is glad of this, and promptly takes up the theory and passes it around as the infallible doctrine with respect to the Supreme Court and the Constitution. She is glad to have her position sustained by leading politicians of the country. It gives vast prestige to her theory. Not only this, but it greatly brightens the prospect of her getting the next step taken.

It becomes then a question for the serious consideration of the people of the United States, whether this papal theory of the Supreme Court is the correct one? Is that the view of those who established the Constitution? Is that the view of the statesmen who have shaped the course of the nation in its career of greatness? These are questions worth asking. They are questions for which it is worth while carefully to seek for the right answer. And to these questions the SENTINEL proposes to seek at original sources for the correct answer. Meanwhile, reader, what do you think of this papal theory of the infallibility of Supreme Court decisions?

A. T. J.

November 12, 1896

"Note" *American Sentinel* 11, 45 , p. 332.

The Constitution of the United States is the only form of government that has ever been on earth that is in harmony with the

principle announced by Christ, demanding of men only that which is Cesar's and refusing to enter in any way into the field of man's relationship to God. This Constitution sprung from the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and on this point simply asserts the truth of God. The American people do not appreciate to the one hundredth part the value of the Constitution under which they live. They do not honor in any fair degree the noble men who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, that these principles might be our heritage. All honor to those noble men. All integrity to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. All allegiance to the Constitution as it not is, under which we live, which gives to Cesar all his due, and leaves men to render to God all that they, instructed by the word of God, guided by their own conscience enlightened by the Spirit of God, may see that he requires of them!

November 26, 1896

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 11, 47 , pp. 369, 370.

THE one leading characteristic of the French Revolution was atheism. Not the atheism of men as individuals, but the atheism of men in organized, representative, governmental, capacity. It was strictly national atheism: being the action of the national assembly in its official character as such.

This national atheism was not a sudden wild break of men, in an effort to present to the world a novel spectacle: it was the direct, logical, result of a system that had formerly dominated the country.

There had been fastened upon France, through the governmental authority, a religion professedly Christian. It was not Christian; yet it was adopted and ever held by the national authority, as Christian. All national favors were for this religion; the national authority forced it upon all; the national power rigidly excluded all other forms of worship.

When the Reformation of the sixteenth century came, and therein Christianity was offered to the people of France, it was tabooed, denounced, warred upon, and at last, by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, was excluded. Then the nation was left under crushing weight of the old false religion; and it was not very long before the people of France found themselves under the necessity of relieving themselves of the incubus that was upon them.

This religion has been adopted and maintained for the supposed good of the State. It was proposed always to the State by "the Church" under the pretense that it was essential to the welfare of the State. It was found at last to be the greatest evil that afflicted the States. Instead of being for the good of the State, it was found to be only a continued and increasing curse. And in order for the State to find relief, it was essential to repudiate this national religion.

Now note: this religion, though not Christianity, was held by the people of France to be Christianity. The nation had been trained for ages in the opinion that it only was Christianity. They knew nothing else as Christianity. And to them, in repudiating it they were repudiating Christianity. In repudiating it, they did not pretend to be doing anything else than repudiating Christianity; for it was all that they knew as Christianity, and it must be repudiated. And when men intentionally repudiate Christianity, even though it be in something that is mistaken for Christianity, they commit themselves only to atheism. Thus it was that France attained to national atheism.

This too was nothing else than carrying to their legitimately logical conclusion the proposition and arguments, by which the country had been held under the power of that na-

370

tional religion. In arriving at national atheism, every step that was taken in the National Assembly, was logically derived from propositions that had been laid down by the church. Every argument offered was but the legitimate extension of the arguments already in print on behalf of the national religion.

For instance, it has always been argued, and was then argued, by the church, that the exclusive establishment and maintenance of that particular religion as the only Christianity, was essential to the welfare of the State: and that it was the province of the State, of its own motion by an official act to establish this religion for its own good. The church had long declared in behalf of the exclusive establishment of that religion, that "it cannot be doubted that it belongs to the prince to require *of full right* that which is necessary to the State."

Upon this it was argued in the Revolution that, As this religion had been established and maintained for the good of the State, and the event had demonstrated that it was the greatest evil of the State; as it undoubtedly belonged to the State itself to require of full right that which is necessary to the State; as it was now undoubtedly necessary to the State that it be relieved of this great evil; it followed

conclusively that the State had full right to repudiate the whole religious establishment. The full right to establish religion, or to do any other thing, for the welfare of the State, remains the full right to repudiate that religion, or to undo whatever may have been done, when it is found to be working evil instead of good to the State. There was no escape from this conclusion.

Holding what had been taught to them by the church, that "The church is in the State, the State is not in the church," they declared, "We are a National Convention: we have assuredly the right to change religion"—meaning the religion of the State. "The State used its right to suppress a corporation which had no longer a place in the new society."

Bear in mind that this national religion was held by all there to be Christianity, and when this was repudiated, it was intended to be the repudiation of Christianity; and when that was repudiated there was nothing left to them but national atheism. The only religion they had then to guide them was the religion of reason; the only god the god of reason.

Thus, "The boldest measures of the French Revolution in regard to the church, were justified beforehand from the point of view of the purest monarchical tradition." It "was only a rigorous application of the maxims of the ancient monarchy. It was simply Gallicanism to the utmost."

"It is well to remind the detractors of the French Revolution, that the National Assembly in this radical measure only imbibed the principles of the ancient French Monarchy." (*De PressensÈ*, "The Church and the French Revolution.") And these principles of the ancient French monarchy were derived altogether from the national religion. "The representatives of the ancient society . . . imagined that the very foundations had been removed, whereas the maxims of their fathers were being turned against them."

And now, just now, there is a national combination of religionists, determined to fasten upon the United States their religion as the national religion. It is proposed by them that the State needs this, and must do it by national acts for its own good. As certainly as they succeed in this, so certainly it will soon be found that instead of being for the good of the nation it is the greatest evil that ever befell the nation, and inevitably threatens only the ruin of the nation. Then a demand will be made that for the good of the nation this religion shall be officially repudiated by the nation as such.

Bear in mind also that this religion is now proposed to the nation for adoption as *Christianity*. It is not Christianity, but it is proposed as essentially and only Christianity. When adopted it will be adopted as Christianity; and when found necessary to be repudiated it will be treated still as Christianity. And intentionally to repudiate Christianity, even though this be brought about through apostate and false Christianity, is to land in atheism. And for the national authority to do this, is to land in national atheism. This is as certain now as it was before. And thus this nation, by encouraging this proposed national religion, will throw itself, as did France, into the terrible strait between the curse of a religious despotism working only certain ruin, and the curse of a national atheism which can work nothing less. Will the people, will Congress, will the nation, take warning in time? And by keeping themselves clear of all semblance of recognition of a national religion, will they do all in their power to enable this nation to escape the ruin which is but the logical result of the establishment of an exclusive national religion?

"To this day the problem entered upon in 1789 is still before us."—*De Pressens?*

The French Revolution and the United States Government began in the same year.

In the year 1789, and because of genuine respect to Christianity, the United States rejected all semblance of national religion, holding that no national religion is Christianity. Thus in the Constitution of the United States was embodied the very principle announced by Jesus Christ for earthly government, when he said, "My kingdom is not of this world;" "Render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's;" "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not."

In the year 1789, began the French Revolution—the inevitable logic of an exclusive national religion—an attempt of the French nation to relieve itself of the unbearable curse which had been put upon it in the exclusive establishment of a national religion. This religion was held to be Christianity, and because of its abominable practices and unbearable oppression, was hated and repudiated, and the nation was plunged into national atheism as the only escape.

Thus in these two nations in the same year God set before the world those two all-important lessons as to the right way and the wrong way. These lessons have been before the nations ever since for their instruction. By the example of the United States the other

nations were led gradually but constantly in the right way. But now, against Scripture, against the Constitution and every fundamental principle of the United States, against blessed experience, and in the very face of the terrible warning of the French Revolution, the allied religious forces of the United States are determined to accomplish here the establishment of an exclusive national religion.

Is it possible that the American people will allow themselves and the national power thus to be carried captive to error that cannot possibly mean anything but ruin!

"Who Is Warring Against the Government?" *American Sentinel* 11, 47 , p. 372.

THE *Christian Endeavorer* says that the Seventh-day Adventists are "carrying on a guerilla warfare against the United States Government." That paper is just as near the truth in this, as it is in some other of its prominent theories: as for instance that Sunday is the Sabbath, and that "the only preparation for heavenly citizenship is conspicuous and persevering fidelity to the duties pertaining to our earthly citizenship."

The trouble with the National Reform-Christian Endeavorers is, that they have become so powerful that they begin to think that they are the government, and consequently that whoever is opposed to their evil designs is against the United States Government. This is a mistake—just yet at least.

The principle of total separation of religion and the State, which is the fundamental principle of the Constitution and Government of the United States, as our fathers ordained the Constitution and established the Government, is the genuine principle that Christ announced with respect to governments on earth. And to this principle all genuine Seventh-day Adventists are not only friendly, but absolutely wedded—or, if you please, consecrated.

The men who ordained and established the United States Constitution and Government, totally separate from religion in general and from the Christian religion in particular, said, and with them the Seventh-day Adventists say:—

There is no argument in favor of establishing the Christian religion but may be pleaded with equal propriety for establishing the tenets of Mohammed by those who believe the Alcoran.

They said:—

It is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility [*sic.*], which would lead us back to the church of Rome.

They said:—

When our Blessed Saviour declares his kingdom is not of this world, he renounces all dependence upon State power; and as his weapons are spiritual, and were only designed to have influence on the judgment and heart of man, we are persuaded that if mankind were left in quiet possession of their inalienable religious privileges, Christianity, as in the days of the apostles, would continue to prevail and flourish in the greatest purity by its own native excellence, and under the all-disposing providence of God.

They said:—

To judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an unalienable right, which, upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated and the Reformation from popery carried on, can never be transferred to another.

They said:—

As every good Christian believes that Christ has ordained a complete system of laws for the government of his kingdom, so we are persuaded that by his providence he will support it to its final consummation.

They said that:—

Almighty God hath created the mind free. All attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness: and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either as was in his almighty power to do. The impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who, being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time.

They said that:—

We hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth that "religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence." The religion, then, of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right: it is unalienable because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated in their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men; it is unalienable also, because what is here a right towards men is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of civil society.

They said:—

Experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry, and persecution.

Further, and as to the effect of governmental recognition of religion upon the State itself, these same noble men said:—

Religious establishments are highly injurious to the temporal interests of any community.

Again they said:—

The establishment in question is not necessary to civil government. If religion be not within the cognizance of civil government, how can its legal establishment be necessary to civil government? What influence, in fact, have ecclesiastical establishments had on civil society? In some instances they have

been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of civil authority; in many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; IN NO INSTANCE have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty may have found in established clergy, convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it, needs them not.

And again they said:—

Attempts to enforce, by legal sanctions, acts obnoxious to so great a proportion of citizens, tend to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bonds of society. If it be difficult to execute any law which is not generally deemed necessary or salutary, what must be the case where it is deemed invalid and dangerous? And what may be the effect of so striking an example of impotency in the government, on its general authority?

All this was said in that day by the men who ordained and established the Constitution and Government of the United States, with the total separation of religion and the nation. And all this is said to-day by the Seventh-day Adventists. All this was said by those noble men in that day in uncompromising opposition to any sort of governmental recognition of religion, in the interests of religious and civil liberty, in sincere respect to Christianity, and for the best possible securing of the State. And all this is said to-day, in the same way and for the same reasons, by the Seventh-day Adventists and the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

And by these same tokens it is demonstrated that the Seventh-day Adventists and the AMERICAN SENTINEL are among the best possible friends that the United States Government has to-day; and that the best possible way for any man really to befriend the United States Government to-day is to stand with the Seventh-day Adventists and the AMERICAN SENTINEL in their uncompromising opposition to the encroachments of a national religion, as did the noble men who created the United States Government.

"Christianity and Confederation" *American Sentinel* 11, 47 , p. 373.

CONFEDERATION is a principle upon which success is commonly sought in business enterprises. Especially is it a marked feature of successful business policy at the present time. "In union there is strength;" and men who excel in business acumen have discovered how to apply the principle with the greatest profit to themselves in business transactions. The result is vast monopolies and trusts,

which gradually absorb to themselves the whole or a large part of the field of the business in which they engage; and become oppressive to the people and dangerous to the nation.

But what is especially significant in this connection is that the same principle is being employed as the basis of important operations by the church.

But it is worldly policy, and, because it is such, has no proper place in the church. The church's strength is to be derived in a different way. For the work to which she is ordained, her strength must come alone from God. The unity which is designed to be hers is altogether superior in kind to any that can be possible in a worldly enterprise.

No one will question this who believes the testimony of Scripture upon this point. It will be necessary only to call to mind a few texts bearing on the relation of the church to Christ, to see the nature of Christian unity, and that upon which it depends.

The Christian church is united to Christ. He is the "true vine," and Christians are the branches. John 14:1. He is the head; his church is the body. Col. 1:18; Eph. 5:23. Just prior to his ascension the Saviour said to his followers, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18), and this was made the basis of his great commission to them, "Go ye therefore into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." United to Christ, the invisible head, the church is to be pervaded by that harmony which exists between the various members of the human body in doing that which is dictated by the head, and endued with all power to perform the mission with which she has been entrusted. The means by which this connection with the visible head is maintained, is faith in the word of God. The agency which works in the body to manifest the divine power and wisdom of the Head, is the Holy Spirit. Such an arrangement leaves nothing to be desired.

This is God's plan of work for his church. There is another plan of church work, which embodies the wisdom and power of man. Under the latter plan unity is to a certain degree secured by confederation and the spiritual subordination of man to his fellowman. When the former system is abandoned the inevitable tendency is toward the latter. Without the unity of the Spirit, which makes the individuals whom it leads one in heart and purpose with Jesus Christ, and thus in harmony with one another, there must come an attempt at unity by binding men together through means that are merely human. By such means only the outward semblance of Christian unity is produced,

and not the unity itself. A visible confederacy, with a visible earthly head, takes the place of the invisible organization whose bond is that of the Spirit, united to the invisible head—Christ. It is but a very poor counterfeit of the divine system, yet it suffices to deceive many souls.

This is the light in which must be viewed the present marked movement within the church toward confederation. The divine unity has been lost. The power which the Saviour declared to be given unto him for his church, is not in the professedly Christian church to-day. The church realizes this fact, and realizes that she is not making headway against the world. And now she is seeking for greater power by the means and methods which are in vogue among worldly organizations.

The church has set herself to the task of improving upon the methods designed by God. "There is," it has been truthfully observed, "a constant tendency among men to say, or at any rate to feel, that the church, as God has left it to us, leaves something to be desired; and so men set themselves to supply this want. They get up schemes, associations, doctrines, which are confessedly without direct authority of Scripture." The church does not realize that, as she is to-day, she is not the church as designed and placed in the world by God.

The natural result of the effort to supply what the church feels to be lacking to her effectiveness in religious work, is the adoption of worldly methods and the seizure of worldly power. The worldly method subordinates man to his fellowman, and the worldly power, which is the power of the State, is employed to make this subordination effective. Out of this system arose the papacy in earlier times, and out of it nothing less than the living likeness of the papacy can come to-day.

We live in a time of multiplying organizations; and nowhere is this phenomenon more marked than in the field of religion. It would be needless to enumerate the many religious societies which have sprung not only into existence but into prominence within the last decade. They are societies which unite the members of antagonistic sects, and seem to present to the church the long-sought basis of Christian union. These societies have found in the movement for "Christian Citizenship" a common basis for action. In this movement therefore lies the greatest danger now, to the nation. Through this they are determined to seize the temporal power. Thus another mighty papal power is rising in this professedly Christian land.

In view of this remarkable movement, as of every marked development in the religious world, it is well to inquire, What saith the Scripture? The answer is to be found in the language of Isa. 8:12, 13: "Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread." The Lord will not conduct his work through confederacies. He will oppose these agencies, and work now as he ever has worked with that people, be they many or few, who are bound to him and to one another in the unity which he himself has instituted for his followers—the unity of the Spirit.

December 3, 1896

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 11, 48 , pp. 377, 378.

WE have before mentioned the fact that, on both sides, in the late political campaign, there was frequent mention made of the French Revolution. Each side charged the other with showing alarming characteristics of that notable period of history.

Last week in these columns we pointed out the most dangerous of all these characteristics that could possibly appear—the danger of an established religion professing to be Christianity. And though this greatest danger must, and will, be kept before the people, as it is the great and leading issue; yet there are others only less important, and that contribute to the success of this greatest of all, which must be point out, and which must be avoided by all who would escape the vortex toward which these things are certainly tending.

Only less remarkable than the national atheism that was developed in the French Revolution, was the development of a *one-man power*. As Napoleon was "returning from Notre Dame, after the ceremonies which had marked the conclusion of the Concordat," he exclaimed, "Now the French Revolution is finished." Napoleon could see plainly enough that he was the logical result of at least one series of events. And the situation that found its logical result in a Napoleon in France a hundred years ago, has to-day, in the United States, its counterpart in more than one of itsphases.

This is evident from the fact that it was apparent to both sides, and was much emphasized in the discussions by the leaders, in the late campaign. Nor was this seen only by men in this country. It was seen

and pointedly commented on by French thinkers also. Just before the National Conventions were held, the Paris *Figaro*, remarking upon the issues that were prominent in the campaign, said:—

"Are the Americans in quest of a Napoleon? Are they moving in the direction of a dictatorship, the precursor of demagogic or military despotism? In the case of a people which hitherto has made it a point of honor to renovate, and not to follow, history's general laws, this would certainly be an unexpected yet possible evolution."

Certainly if any are qualified to discern such symptoms, the French are the ones. To those thinkers the issues involved in the French Revolution are as familiar as are those of the American Revolution to American thinkers. And when these men, being to-day upon the very spot and among the memorials of the French Revolution, can look across the ocean and at such a distance see that which causes them with interest to ask, "Are the American in quest of a Napoleon? Are they moving in the direction of a dictatorship, the precursor of demagogic or military despotism?" surely it is time for the people of this country to ask themselves whether they had not better begin seriously to consider the situation.

Nor is it symptoms that suggest the French Revolution alone, that this writer sees here: he sees also that which is suggestive of the course of the republic of ancient Rome. Upon this he remarks that "if America like to indulge in the luxury of passing in a century and a half at most through all the stages to be found in the history of Rome, that is her affair;" and notes "the Cesarian tendencies which have shown themselves too often in the United States during the last thirty years."

Thus it is apparent that, from the examples of France and Rome, the one thing that strikes the attention of this writer, in studying the conditions in the United States, is the development of a *one-man power*. Thinkers, both writers and speakers, at home here, have called attention to the same thing. Indeed, it is strange that there should be anybody who thinks so little as not to be able to see it.

Looked at on strictly the civil side, the one great question at issue in France and Rome, at these crises in their history, was the question of "Capital and Labor," precisely as now in strictly the civil aspect this is the one great question in the United States. In France one hundred years ago, there were vast aggregations of capital, the power which it gave being used only to crush out all competition and all idea of competition, and the wealth itself being used only to satisfy

the extravagant and inventive genius of idle luxury; precisely as in the United States to-day.

On the other hand, and against the aggre-

378

gations of capital, were vast aggregations of labor, bent on gaining power by which there should be assured a more equable distribution of the good things of life that were monopolized by the few; precisely as there is in the United States to-day.

This condition of things produced in Rome a one-man power—Cesar. The like condition produced in France a one-man power—Napoleon. And now in the United States, the condition like to both that have gone before, as certainly as it shall be continued, can produce nothing less here than it produced in both instances before.

Indeed the elements at work to-day on both sides of this question, are themselves systematically developing a one-man power, and as systematically training men into ready submission to such power.

In the great business "Trusts" that are formed, men who individually have built up a successful business, deliberately surrender into the hands of the "Trust" their whole business and all their interests in that business, and shut down or start up only as the management of the "Trust" directs. However much the actual owner of the business may desire to go on with it, he cannot do so unless the manager of the "Trust" orders it. Thus it is in many of the leading businesses all over the land. And thus thousands of men all over the land have sold themselves, and are still selling themselves, to a one-man power; and are systematically training themselves into subjection to a one-man power. Only let the day come when a combination of these "Trust" interests shall have one of their number at the head of the government, and the country will find itself too, sold to a one-man power.

On the other hand, there are the great federations and Confederations of Labor, formed to oppose the "tyranny" of the federations and Confederations of Capital; but which themselves are only so many "Trusts" of another sort. Workingmen of every trade and occupation band themselves together and deliberately surrender into the hands of the president and the walking delegate the whole of their individuality. Their managers may sit in their offices in New York, Cleveland, Chicago, or wherever they may be, and send by telegraph a single word; and whether it be at midday or midnight, throughout half the country men will drop their tools and walk away from their

work. Individually they may have no sort of grievance; their own personal choice would be to continue work; but the word has come from one man, the chief, whom personally they may not know, and may never even have seen; and though they may not know why, yet the word has come and they quit work and walk away to spend days, or weeks, or months, in absolute idleness, and they and their families in want. How would it be possible more plainly to show the insidious growth of a one-man power? Thus multitudes of people all over the land have sold themselves, and are still selling themselves, to the dictates of a one-man power; and are systematically training themselves into unquestioning subjection to a one-man power.

And have there not been sufficient illustrations of this to awaken the country to the imminent danger of it? In 1894 one man sat in Chicago and so suspended traffic and transportation over all the country from Lake Erie to the Pacific, that governors of "sovereign States" considered it necessary obsequiously to solicit that they be permitted by this one man, a private individual, in Chicago, to journey on official business within their own States. Only let the day come when one of these chiefs, or one representing the same interests, shall be placed at the head of the government; is there room for doubt that the nation would find itself under a one-man power?

The religious elements of the country are also, both by doctrine and by practice, being systematically trained into the same thing. They are continually trained in the pernicious theory that they must control the government. They are continually trained in the despotic doctrine that governments do *not* derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; but from "the will of God," with themselves as the divinely-appointed expositors of that "will." And in the practice of this pernicious theory, and this despotic doctrine, in the *endeavor* to take possession of the government, they are systematically training themselves into ready and unquestioning subjection to a one-man power. Only let the day come when one of these managers, or one devoted to their interests, shall be placed at the head of the government, and the country will find itself under the domination of a one-man power.

Take then the element of the aggregations of Capital, and the element of the aggregations of Labor *against* the aggregations of Capital, and the element of the aggregation of religious but earthly power—these three elements embrace the vast majority of the people of the United States. And when, as is the undeniable fact, these three

elements are systematically training into blind submission to a one-man power, themselves and all whom they can influence, how long can it possibly be before the nation shall certainly fall under the domination of a one-man power?

This is not to say that these three elements will united to bring the country under a one-man power. It is only to call attention to the open prospect, that whichever of the three shall win, in the struggle for possession of the national power, the country must certainly fall under the domination of a one-man power.

We have not space this week to discuss this question in other important bearings. Besides, what has been said is enough to contemplate for a week. It will not do to pass this off with a "pooh-pooh." The situation may indeed be not exactly pleasant for you to contemplate, but there is no denying that this is a fair presentation of the situation as it really is before this country. And the situation as it is, calls just now for serious thinking. To pass it off without this serious thinking, is only surely to hasten the coming of such a condition of things as will compel serious thinking. It will be better to give the subject the serious thought that it demands, before it be too late.

Neither is there space now fully to point out the only safe course to take both for yourself and for the country. We can here cite but *one* admonition that the Lord gives to all for this time: "The Lord spake thus to me with a strong hand, and instructed me that I should not walk in the way of this people, saying, Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary." Isa. 8:11-13.

"Popular Government Repudiated" *American Sentinel* 11, 48 , pp. 378, 379.

THE American theory of popular government, upon which the laws and institutions of the United States have rested since the nation's birth, has been openly repudiated from the pulpit by a prominent Brooklyn clergyman, the Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott, successor of Henry Ward Beecher. Not only did Mr. Abbott announce to his congregation his own repudiation of this theory, but he also announced that it had been repudiated by the American people.

It is well known that Dr. Abbott long ago repudiated the Bible, for he has been for years one of the foremost of the expounders and defenders of the doctrine of Evolution. It need not be thought strange, therefore, that he should repudiate the only theory of government which rests upon Scriptural grounds.

The theory that "government rested on the consent of the governed," said Mr. Abbott, "was founded upon the proposition advanced by Rousseau that all men were born free and had surrendered their rights for the good of government." In this Mr. Abbott takes issue with the framers of the Declaration of Independence, who said, "We hold these truths to be *self-evident*, that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; . . . that to protect these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." We believe these truths are still self-evident to every unbiased mind.

"When we, with muskets," said Mr. Abbott, "faced the rioters at Chicago, who demanded that we should govern them only with their consent—that was America's answer to the declaration that government rests on the consent of the governed." If it was, then America should obliterate every tribute which she has paid to the memory of the men who wrote and signed the Declaration of Independence; since, according to this, they were the defenders and promoters of riot! But this is not the first time these noble men have been slandered in the name of religion.

These statements, however, only led up to the crowning assertion of the discourse, which was that "The right of a majority in a democracy is to enforce divine law; that is all." That is the kind of government this Brooklyn clergyman would have in the place of government by the consent of the governed; and, sad to say, a multitude of other preachers believe in this substitution, and are doing their utmost to make it an accomplished fact. They are at the head of a mighty movement of religious forces in this land whose avowed aim is to substitute for the "godless" government we now have, one which will "enforce divine law."

By this theory, the majority have the right to enforce divine law. The minority, therefore, have no rights at all; for of course the majority must control the government; and they must "enforce the divine law." It will of necessity rest with them to decide what

the divine law is. A decision must be made on this point, for there is no general agreement among men as to what the divine law includes, or what it commands. It is true, the divine law is stated in the Scripture; but there is almost nothing over which men are so universally divided as the meaning of Scripture. And besides this, the Scripture tells us that the divine law is spiritual, and that spiritual truths must be spiritually discerned. To be spiritually minded, not politically minded, is what is required at the very start in order to know what the divine law means.

This, however, will not greatly interfere with the action of the political majority. Almost any person is able to tell what the law of God means—to his own satisfaction; and "the majority" will no doubt be able to decide upon its meaning to their own satisfaction, at least sufficiently to enable the machinery of this "divine" government to be set in motion. The world has had "Christian" governments in the past—governments that have denied that they received any powers from the consent of the governed—and kings, emperors, and others who have stood at the head of such governments have never shown much hesitancy in deciding what the government must do to carry out the will of God. If they could not decide themselves they could inquire of the pope, and the governing majority might do the same to-day!

The minority in the government must, of course, submit to the will of the majority. Not to do so would be anarchy. The public—or governmental—"conscience" will then be the only moral monitor needed. Obedience to the government will be obedience to the divine law, and the individual conscience will find its occupation gone. The minority will secure salvation simply by obedience to the majority, for the majority will "enforce the divine law." This arrangement dispenses with the necessity for faith, or for Bible study, at least on the part of the minority. This accords exactly with the Christian Endeavor view that "The only preparation for the lofty privileges of the heavenly, is conspicuous and persevering fidelity in the fulfillment of the duties pertaining to our earthly citizenship."

And this is just what is presented to the world in the papacy. The papist does not need the Bible, for does he not have the priest to tell him what is right? And the priest has the prelate to instruct him, and these in turn have the pope, who is infallible! These represent the "majority" who govern the "minority"—the common people—under the papal system. Small wonder that under it there is no need felt, and little seen, of the word of God and faith. And that this scheme of

government by the enforcement of "divine law" presents the same features, is proof of its essentially papal character.

"A Stumbling to Tyrants Only" *American Sentinel* 11, 48 , p. 379.

NOW that in the interests of a religious despotism the Declaration of Independence is openly attacked, it is well to remember the words of Abraham Lincoln as to the merit of that document and the meaning of those who framed it, spoken when it was attacked in the interests of the civil despotism of slavery.

He said that by the Declaration its framers "meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and referred to by all, constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and, even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life of all people of all color everywhere. . . . Its authors meant it to be, as, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to all those who, in after time, might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.

"In those days our Declaration of Independence was held sacred by all, and thought to include all; but now, to aid in making the bondage of the negro [and *now* the bondage of the consciences of all—EDITOR SENTINEL] universal and eternal, it is assailed and sneered at, and construed, and hawked at, and torn, till, if its framers could rise from their graves, they could not at all recognize it."

It is well for the American people to know, and forever to bear in mind, that the Declaration of Independence can never be assailed, or sneered at, or hawked at, except in the endeavor to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism.

"'The Church' and 'the World'" *American Sentinel* 11, 48 , p. 380.

IT is a fact which should furnish food for serious thought to those church members who are trying to reform the world by law, that the world is able to discern a reform which is most imperatively needed within the church. The church says that immorality is increasing

alarmingly in the world, and that there must be legislation to stop it. The world in turn, points to a condition of things in the church which may with good reason be regarded as the chief cause of the downward trend in the world.

The greatest reformation that is needed to-day is in the church. Among those who realize this fact is the well-known evangelist, D. L. Moody, who for some time past has been conducting revival meetings for church members in New York City. Mr. Moody's effort drew forth some pertinent comments from the *New York Journal* of November 17. The *Journal* noted that the mission of the evangelist was "not to those who are sunk in poverty as well as sin, but to the congregations of the various evangelical denominations," and proceeded to observe that "the weakness of the class to whom Mr. Moody comes as a quickening preacher is a tendency to seek respectability rather than righteousness—to form their conduct not so much on the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth as on the traditions of their sects and the example of those around them. Hence it comes about that the atmosphere of a church is too often repellant to the sort of sinners who stand in greatest need of salvation, and of human help to lift them from the misery into which their ignorance, their passions or their vices, or all combined, have plunged them."

Respectability is not righteousness. Respectability is worldliness, and from the Christian standpoint, worldliness of the most dangerous type, since it can be made the counterfeit of righteousness. And this worldliness is in the church.

"If Mr. Moody," the *Journal* continued, "will tell his Christian listeners that severe respectability—as manifested in a disinclination to touch elbows with coats that are not of good cut, and repugnance to meeting on a cordial footing those who are not above a certain caste—gives point to the assertion so frequently made that the average city church is not much else than a social club for the exclusive use and enjoyment of the contributing members, he may broaden the minds and widen the sympathies of many excellent people who expect to be as well placed in the next world as they are in this."

The class of people for whom Sunday laws are particularly designed, are repelled from the church by the Pharisaical atmosphere which pervades it, and religious zealots now seek by legislation to drive the unchurched masses into this repulsive atmosphere.

What is needed is not that the people should be driven into the church in its present state, but that the Phariseism within it should

be driven out, by the straightforward preaching of that living Word which is sharper than a two-edged sword.

The *Journal* belongs to that "ungodly class of papers which issue a Sunday edition; yet it can see and state clearly enough what is the matter with the church. "More warmth of heart, less fear of criticism, closer study of the Bible; more attention to the precepts of the sermon on the mount, and less to church custom; a real recognition of the essential brotherhood and sisterhood of all men and women, whether they be respectable or the reverse; and a genuine desire to model their lives as near as may be on that of Jesus, who was no aristocrat—if Mr. Moody will preach thus to the brethren and sisters who flock to his meetings, he may kindle a fire of godly zeal in this sin-suffering metropolis. And we trust that before the evangelist concludes his labors here he will explain to the churches fully why it is that, as they so loudly complain, they have lost their hold on the masses. Above all, it is to be desired that he will not neglect to give some sound advice to the preachers. They need it. Too many of them are worldly minded, and not a few of them are more ardent for the success of their political party than they are for the spread of Christ's gospel."

And it is the very class of preachers described in the concluding lines of this quotation, that are most forward in the demand for Sunday legislation. They are the men who are endeavoring to make Christianity succeed by political means.

The church is in no position to take offense if the world should quote to her the proverb, "Physician, heal thyself." "First cast out the beam that is in thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast the mote out of thy brother's eye." With the worldliness removed from the church, the church will see clearly that legislation is not the proper remedy to cure the immorality that is in the world.

December 10, 1896

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 11, 49 , p. 385.

OF all the forms of government that stability of the republican form depends most upon the integrity of the individual.

Abraham Lincoln's definition of a republic is the best that can ever be given: "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

A republic is a government "of the people;" because the people only compose the government. The people then are governed "by the people;" that is, they are governed by themselves. The people are governed "by the people" "for the people;" that is, by themselves for themselves.

Such a government in the nature of things is only self-government. Each citizen governs himself. He does this by himself—by his own powers of self-restraint. And he does this for himself, that is, for his own good, for his own best interests: knowing at the same time that this is also for the good and for the best interests of his fellow-citizen.

Only in the proportion that this conception is fulfilled, is it possible for a republic to flourish. In the proportion that the people lose the power to govern themselves, in just that proportion the true idea of a republic must, and surely will, fail of realization. And in a republic, just as soon as a majority of the people have ceased to govern themselves by their own individual powers, the republic has in principle and in fact passed away.

And so surely as a republic passes away, a despotism takes its place. It may be an elective despotism, but it is none the less a despotism. It may, indeed, be a despotism of the many—of the majority; but it is none the less a despotism. In fact, in such cases, it always is at first a despotism of the many. Shortly after this it becomes a despotism of a few. And at last, ere long too, it becomes a despotism of one.

Any person, therefore, who allows himself to engage in anything that deprives him of the full and free government of himself, thereby enters upon a course that is contrary to free government. Whatever weakens or absorbs the individuality of the citizen, undermines the republic. It matters not what it may be, what form it may take, or what pretensions may be made in its behalf, to whatever extent it weakens or swallows up the individuality of the individual man—just to that extent it undermines the republic.

Party organization may be perfectly proper, but when it become so "straight" that the citizen cannot act upon his own individual preferences or convictions, without being ostracised or "read out;" or when it is turned to "the machine;" however much certain men may gain by it, the people are only the losers and the republic is weakened.

Business partnerships and corporations may be perfectly proper; but when they are employed to crush out competition or to swallow

up the individuality of owners, they violate the first principle of free government, and therefore are a menace to the republic.

Labor organizations may be beneficial; but when they are used to deprive the individual of the privilege of entering into any engagement that he may see fit to make; or so as to absorb the individuality of any member that he is not free to be employed under whatever circumstances that seem to him satisfactory, or that he is not free to come and go at his own pleasure without interference on the part of anybody; they invade the right of the individual to govern himself, and in so doing repudiate government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and are a menace to the republic.

Church organization is not only proper, it is divine; but when church organization is so managed and manipulated by men as to become in their hands a weapon to be held menacingly before politicians, business men and all others, by threats or whatever other means shall prove most effective, to deprive them of the freedom of individual action, according to their own individual conviction,—then such church organizations, become only a menace to the republic itself. They cease to be divine and become earthly, sensual, devilish, and thus the greatest possible menace to the republic.

Hon. Henry Watterson, in an interview for the press of this city, only a few days ago, made the following statement:—

In 1800 we were a few millions of people and we loved liberty. In 1900 we are nearly a hundred millions of people and we love money. Moreover, individually and collectively, we have a great deal of money. Most of this money is invested in what are called corporations. From a handful of individuals we have become a national of institutions. The individual counts for less and less, organizations for more and more.

In remarking upon this statement the *New York Journal*, of December 2, said:—

There is no disputing the truth of that. . . . What he feels as to the dangers of concentrating wealth, *the diminution of the importance of the individual*, and the dominance of the purse, an increasing minority of men of thought and masculine instincts feel.

Every organization, every influence, that diminishes the importance of the individual, is in antagonism to government of the people, and just so far as it does so, is inimical to the republic.

Yet no man can deny that *all* the forms of organization which we have referred to, are diligently working in all the ways pointed out, and in other ways besides, to diminish the importance of the

individual. The practice of each one is therefore in direct antagonism to government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Any one of them, then, to be continued and to "grow by that it feeds on," could end in nothing else than the subversion of the republic: this to be followed by the inevitable despotism, first of the many, then of a few, and finally of one. And when such only can be the tendency and end of any one of these, how much more, and how much more swiftly, must this be the end, with all of them working at the same time and only to that end.

What, then, is the remedy? Cultivate the individual. Restore the integrity, the manliness, the manly independence, *the individuality*, of the individual. This is the only remedy. Nothing else can possibly avail.

Thus again is strongly illustrated the importance of that scripture that was written for this time: "The Lord spake thus unto me with a strong hand, and instructed me that I should not walk in the way of this people, saying, Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread."

"The Roman Republic" *American Sentinel* 11, 49 , p. 386.

IT has been said of the early Romans that "they possessed the faculty of self-government beyond any people of whom we have historical knowledge," with the sole exception of the Anglo-Saxons. By virtue of this faculty, in the very nature of things, they became the most powerful nation of all ancient times.

But their extensive conquests filled Rome with gold. "Money poured in upon them in rolling streams of gold." With wealth came luxury. "Wealth poured in more and more, and luxury grew more unbounded. Palaces sprang up in the city, castles in the country, villas at pleasant places by the sea, and parks, and fish-ponds, and game preserves, and gardens, and vast retinues of servants" everywhere.

To get money by any means lawful or unlawful, became the universal passion. "Money was the one thought form the highest senator to the poorest wretch who sold his vote in the Comitia. For money Judges gave unjust decrees, and juries gave corrupt verdicts." "The elections were managed by clubs and coteries; and, except on

occasions of national danger or political excitement, those who spent most freely were most certain of success. Under these conditions the chief powers in the commonwealth necessarily centered in the rich. The door of promotion was open to all who had the golden key. The highest offices of State were open in theory to the meanest citizen; they were confined in fact to those who had the longest purses, or the most ready use of the tongue on popular platforms. Distinctions of birth had been exchanged for distinctions of wealth. The struggle between plebeians and patricians for equality of privilege was over, and a new division had been formed between the party of property and a party who desired a change in the structure of society."

As the power which wealth gave was used only to increase the wealth of those who had it, the sure result was the growth of envy on the part of the populace, and presently a demand which grew louder and still more urgent that there should be a more equable distribution of the plenty that was monopolized by the few. "All orders in a society may be wise and virtuous, but all cannot be rich. Wealth which is used only for idle luxury is always envied, and envy soon curdles into hate. It is easy to persuade the masses that the good things of this world are unjustly divided, especially when it happens to be the exact truth."

As these two classes were constantly growing farther apart—the rich growing richer and the poor poorer—there ceased to be any middle class to maintain order in government and society by holding the balance of power. There remained then only the two classes, the rich and the poor, and of these the rich despised the poor, and the poor envied the rich. And there were not wanting men to stir up the discontent of the masses, and present schemes for the reorganization of government and society.

Some of these were well-meaning men, men who really had in view the good of their fellowmen and the bettering of society and government; but the far greater number were mere demagogues—ambitious schemers who used the discontent of the populace only to lift themselves into positions of wealth and power which they envied others, and which, when they had secured, they employed as selfishly and oppressively as had any of those against whom they clamored. But whether they were well-meaning men or only demagogues, in order to hold the populace against the persuasions and bribes of the wealthy, they were compelled to make promises and concessions, which were only in the nature of larger bribes, and

which in the end were as destructive of free government and the republic as were the worst acts of the aristocracy of wealth itself.

After considerable see-sawing between the two parties for the possession of the governmental power, it was taken from both by the First Triumvirate—Pompey, Crassus and Cesar. These three men covenanted together "that no proceedings should be allowed to take place in the commonwealth without the consent of each of the three contracting parties." In eleven years the sole power fell to Cesar alone. In four years more, pretended patriots assassinated Cesar "to save the republic" from what they supposed was threatened in him, and thereby made only the more certain the very thing that they professed to fear from him, and which in fact was realized shortly from those who were worse than he.

Affairs had reached the point in the republic where a Cesar was inevitable, and though in the attempt to escape it they had killed the greatest Roman who ever lived, it was only hastened by the very means which they had employed to avoid it. This they themselves realized as soon as they awoke from the dream in which they had done the desperate deed. Cicero exactly defined the situation, and gave a perfect outline of the whole history of the times when he exclaimed, "We have killed the king; but the kingdom is with us still. We have taken away the tyrant; the tyranny survives." That tyranny survived in the breast of every man in Rome. And in just thirteen and a half years from that time, the State having gone again over precisely the same course, came again to the same point where the sole power was in the hands of a Cesar where it remained until both the monarchy and the empire of Rome perished forever.

Thus in the Roman republic, by the inseparable train of wealth, luxury, and vice, self-restraint was broken down, the power of self-government was lost, and that republic failed. And so every other republic must fail when the faculty of self-government fails by virtue of which alone a republic is possible. The Romans ceased to govern themselves, and they had to be governed. They lost the faculty of self-government. With that vanished the republic, and its place was supplied by a one-man power, an imperial tyranny supported by a military despotism.

We have thus sketched the history of the Roman republic. To sketch the history of the first French republic would be but to repeat the story almost point by point. No man can fail to see that up to a certain point the parallel is complete between that and the republic of

the United States of America to-day. Is it at all strange then, indeed is it not the most natural thing in the world, that disinterested thinkers should raise the query whether the United States, in one hundred and fifty years, is really going to pass "through all the stages to be found in the history of Rome"? And further ask, "Are the Americans in quest of a Napoleon? Are they moving in the direction of a dictatorship, the precursor of demagogic, or military despotism?"

We are not alarmists. We do not propose to be alarmists. We simply ask for sober thinking. It is our duty to present facts, and to call attention to the things which those facts with unfailing certainty indicate. And there can be no possible room for question that from the facts which are patent to-day to every one who will look about, it is time for every person in the United States to engage in the sober thinking to which we simply invite him.

"There Is No Difference" *American Sentinel* 11, 49 , pp. 387, 388.

A COMMON accusation made by Protestants against the Catholic Church, is that the latter adheres to the principle of the union of Church and State. It appears, however, that the Catholic position upon this point is, in this country at least, quite in harmony with that now maintained by the leading Protestant bodies. What the papal church would insist upon here is not a union of Church and State, but of religion and the State. This was authoritatively stated by the "Right Rev." Bishop Montgomery, of Los Angeles, Cal., in a recent lecture on the "Basis of American Citizenship," reported in the *Catholic News* (New York) of November 22.

"The trouble is," he said, "that people have come to believe that citizenship is wholly and altogether secular; particularly in these last few years the question has been put in the shape of the separation of Church and State. That hobby, ridden so faithfully and so earnestly by so many, has come to mean, in the minds of a great number, that the separation of Church and State means the separation of religion and State. And though in this country we are under such circumstances that there must ever be a separation of Church and State in the ordinary acceptance of the words, there is not and cannot be a separation of religion and State, if we remain the republic that our forefathers left us."

The Protestant churches do not favor a union of Church and State "in the ordinary acceptance of the words;" but they do advocate a

union of religion with the State, and the papal church says that there must be no "separation of religion and State" if the republic is to be preserved. The papal church therefore takes fully as "enlightened" a stand in this important matter as do the Protestants. Her attitude to-day is no less "liberal" than is theirs.

But the truth is that the papal church never advocated anything more than a union of religion with the State; so that the position stated by the *Catholic News*, and endorsed by the leading Protestant bodies to-day, is the same that Rome has always held. For back in the days of papal supremacy, the clashing religious sects of the present day were not in existence, and "religion" meant, to the State, only the religion held by the papacy. United with that religion, the State was in the truest sense united with the papacy. Bearing in mind now that the papal religion is the only religion recognized by the papal church as being the true religion—Christianity—the identity of her present position with that held by her in former times is perfectly plain. Rome advocates a union of religion with the State, but *her religion*, she says, *is the only true religion*. Of course no false religion ought to be united with the State; hence a union of religion with the State, from the papal standpoint, means nothing more nor less than a union of the civil power with the papacy.

And from the standpoint of any Protestant church which maintains this same principle, the conclusion reached must be similar. For though the various Protestant sects count

387

each other as branches of the great Christian Church, and even recognize the papacy as such a branch, each one believes that she holds more Christian truth than any of the others, and hence that she is, in a fuller sense, Christian, than are the others. Therefore, of course, she is better entitled than the others to a union with the State; since the State ought not to be joined with religious error. So, from the Protestant standpoint no less than from the Catholic, a union of religion with the State means, in its last analysis, a union of Church and State, in the fullest sense. And this meaning will take on a very practical and tangible character when the principle upon which it stands is sought to be carried into effect. The movement to unite religion with the State, once started, will speedily develop into a controversy over a union of Church and State, even "in the ordinary acceptance of the words." It cannot possibly lead to anything else.

Then is we would avoid a union of Church and State, it is absolutely necessary that the State should be kept separate from religion,—not separate from justice, from honesty, from integrity—but separate from religion, as the Christian men who established it ordained that it should be. There can be nothing more essential than this to our country's welfare.

"Look Up Your Laws" *American Sentinel* 11, 49 , p. 388.

SO speaks the *Christian Endeavorer* to its readers in its issue for the present month. "We suggest to Christian Citizenship committees," it says, "that they look up the laws of the several States and make a list of the laws on the books that are continuously broken. For example, most of the States of the Union have laws against swearing on the streets. In Chicago there are a few arrests every year under this law, but it is not generally known that there is such a law. There is also a law making it a special offense to deface buildings used for public worship. In some States this law embraces whispering, shuffling of feet and any loud noise during services. This law can be used to prevent playing of music as processions pass churches, etc."

This suggestion omits mention of the "sabbath laws" which are upon the statute books of nearly all the States; but there is no danger that they will be overlooked in the search for unenforced laws. They stand out too prominently for that. Then there are some other unenforced "laws" that might be mentioned, as for instance that among the statutes of the District of Columbia, enacted in 1723, which provides that any person who should "wittingly, maliciously, and advisedly, by writing or speaking," "deny our Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God," or "deny the Holy Trinity," "or the Godhead of any of the three persons, or the unity of the Godhead," "and shall be thereof convicted by verdict, or confession, shall for the first offense be bored through the tongue and fined twenty pounds sterling;" and for the second offense "shall be stigmatized by burning in the forehead with the letter B, and fined forty pounds sterling;" and for the third offense, "suffer death without the benefit of the clergy." There are still others that might be mentioned, but it can safely be left to the vigilance of the Christian Citizenship committees to rescue them from their oblivion and see that they are duly enforced.

Yes; hunt up all the obsolete laws on the statute books of all the States and have them enforced. That will be truly "Christian" work!

The very fact that they have lapsed into "innocuous desuetude" is evidence of their prime importance! Doubtless a little patient research in this line will be rewarded by rich discoveries.

"The Crusades—Old and New" *American Sentinel* 11, 49 , pp. 388, 389.

FOR more than a year the professed Protestantism of England and America, in their cry for the blotting out of the Turkish power, have repeatedly cited the Crusaders of the Middle Ages as an example worthy of imitation by the "Christian" powers of the world. Some have even called for the stirring up of a crusade to-day as those of the Middle Ages were stirred up. And now the Catholic press is using all this in her own favor, as "the strongest vindication of the Crusades of the Middle Ages." A writer in the *Forum*, for November, wants to see a new crusade raised from among the people as were the former ones; and he wants the Knights Templars and other such orders to be to-day the champions of the movement as they were of old.

Upon all this the *Catholic Standard* remarks that "whether or not the suggestion be put into practice, the very conception of it as a remedy for the American troubles, is the best answer to the modern vilifiers of the Crusades, and shows that those wonderful uprisings of the Christian masses in the Middle Ages were not the wild visionary and fanatical movements which the nineteenth century materialist would persuade us they were; but that they had their rise in solid reason and intense humanity as well as in lofty chivalry and deep religious fervor."

If such a thing as this proposed new crusade should occur, it would simply show that people to-day are as wild, visionary, and fanatical as those of the Middle Ages undoubtedly were; instead of showing that the Crusaders of the Middle Ages were the contrary. It could be no proof that the Crusaders of the Middle Ages were sober and sensible, to see a lot of people to-day acting as wildly and foolishly, and murderously, as did they.

As for the Crusades of old time having their rise in solid reason and intense humanity, the truth is that they had no connection whatever with any sort of solid reason; and it would be difficult to find in all history a more inhuman horde gathered from any people making any pretensions to being but few degrees removed from sheer savagery. It is not necessary here to cite instances: the reader can

review his history for these. But it is only the truth to say that in the whole contest distinguished by the Crusades of the Middle Ages the advantage in both humanity and chivalry undoubtedly lay with the Saracens and the Turks.

If this new crusade should start for the East and by any possibility should reach there, we should expect some of them at least

389

to be attacked by the Syrian fever. And if perchance it were the chief in command, who should be found consuming in his tent with that dreadful disease, we should expect to hear that the Sultan had sent into the camp of the Crusaders, camels laden with snow to cool the parched lips and quench the burning fever of their stricken commander, as did Sultan Saladin to Richard the Lion-hearted in the Crusades of old. And if the expedition should really come to a war, we might expect to hear at last that on the eve of battle, in the presence of both armies, and over the broken truce of the "Christians" the Turkish commander had openly appealed to Jesus Christ for the justice of his cause, and then had wiped them off the earth, as was done, all of it, by the Turks once before.

December 17, 1896

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 11, 50 , pp. 393-395.

THERE have been those who held to a distinction between the *nation* and the *Government* of the United States. They therefore have held that this might be a Christian nation without being a Christian Government. And when the United States Supreme Court declared that by "organic utterances," and according to the meaning of the Constitution, "this is a Christian nation," they said that that did not mean anything special as to the recognition of a national religion, because the court did not say that this is a Christian *Government*.

This distinction is not sound; but for the sake of the case, let us admit that claim just once, and see what will come of it. The Government of the United States is composed of three departments—the Legislative, the Judicial, and the Executive. It is impossible to deny this. Neither of these alone is the Government. No two of them together are the Government. All three are essential parts, and any one is only a part, of the Government. The three together—this is the Government.

Now in 1892 the judicial department of the Government definitely committed itself to the Christian religion as a governmental thing, by declaring that by "organic utterances" and the "meaning" of the Constitution, this is a Christian nation. And at every opportunity that has been offered since, this department of the Government has shown that it adheres to this doctrine.

In 1892 likewise the legislative department of the Government committed itself not only to the Christian religion as a governmental thing, but to that particular phase of it that is represented in Sunday observance. In 1893 this branch of the Government, by direct action, confirmed itself in this thing; and nothing has been done since to the contrary, by this department of the Government.

In 1892 also the executive department of the Government committed itself to the Christian religion as a governmental thing, by officially approving the action of the legislative department; and nothing has been done since to the contrary by this branch of the government. In addition to this, in 1896, the executive department of the Government, in a thanksgiving proclamation, did commit itself again specifically to the Christian religion as a governmental thing.

Now as it is undeniable that these three departments are the Government of the United States; and as it is also undeniable that these three departments have by repeated action committed themselves to the Christian religion as a governmental thing; it is equally undeniable that in the bad sense in which such a term is always used, the Government of the United States has been made and continues to be a "Christian Government."

What more could possibly be necessary to accomplish such a thing? Was it essential that all three branches of the Government should by definite action take such a step? All three have done it. Was it essential that all three branches of the Government should by repeated action take such step? All three have by repeated action done it. Then is it not undeniable that the thing has been done?

This is not to claim that all has been done that will be done. More, much more, will be done. This *is* to say, however, that the particular, the essential thing, of the recognition of a governmental national religion, has been done. And when more shall have been done, it matters not what it may be, in this direction, it is impossible for it to be essentially, or in principle, the doing of any new thing. All it can possibly be is the enlarging and deepening of the thing that has been already done.

Nor is this to say that the opposition should be any the less earnest to all that may be attempted in addition to what has been done. The opposition must never be less, nor less active, than it has been, but more if possible, to anything and everything of the kind, both to what has been done and what may be attempted. It is a wicked thing; and opposition to it is both civilly and religiously right. Never let up; and never surrender.

OF "trusts and monopolies," President Cleveland, in his late message, said: "Another topic in which our people rightfully take a deep interest may be here briefly considered. I refer to the existence of trusts and other huge aggregations of capital, the object of which is to secure the monopoly of some particular branch of trade, industry or commerce, and to stifle wholesome competition.

"Their tendency is to crush out individual independence and to hinder or prevent the free use of human faculties and the full development of human character.

"Through them the farmer, the artisan, and the small trader is in danger of dislodgment from the proud position of being his own master, watchful of all that touches his country's prosperity, in which he has an individual lot, and interested in all that affects the advantages of business of which he is a factor, to be relegated to the level of a mere appurtenance to a great machine, with little free will, with no duty but that of passive obedience, and with little hope or opportunity of rising in the scale of responsible and helpful citizenship.

"To the instinctive [*sic.*] belief that such is the inevitable trend of trusts and monopolies is due the widespread and deep-seated popular aversion in which they are held and the not unreasonable insistence that, whatever may be their incidental economic advantages, their general effect upon personal character, prospects, and usefulness, cannot be otherwise than injurious."

That is all true. And though this was written with particular reference to the trusts and monopolies of capital, it is just as true of trusts and monopolies of labor, religion, or anything else, as it is of those of capital.

In the dispatches of the same day that the President's message was printed, there was the following:—

ST. LOUIS, MO., Dec. 7, 1896.—One of the greatest labor organizations that the world has ever seen has just had its inception in this city. It is a universal building trades union, and includes the labor of every artisan from the digging of the foundation to the last touches upon a building.

There met here yesterday representatives of building trades from many cities at the call of the local building trades council. H. W. Stainbias, secretary of the St. Louis Building Trades Council, is authority for the statement that 2,500,000 persons are interested in the movement.

It is not proposed to antagonize the employers of skilled labor, but to show them the benefits of cooperation with the laborers who create wealth.

This later organization comes within the President's description of trusts, as certainly as does any organization of capital. For as-

394

suredly the object of this organization of building trades is nothing else than "to secure the monopoly of some particular branch of trade, industry, or commerce, and to stifle wholesome competition."

It is true that this building-trades trust suggests "benefits" that can come from their monopoly; and so does the coal trust, the sugar trust, and all the others. The President's answer to the claim of "benefits" to others made by the capital trusts is also an answer to this suggestion of "benefits" to others made by this latest, or any other, labor trust. Admitting that such a thing may incidentally and occasionally appear, it is only incidental and occasional, and "such occasional results fall far short of compensating the palpable evil charged to the account of trusts and monopolies."

And the greatest of these evils is that which the President points out, which we have before pointed out, and which only last week we dwelt upon—the destruction of individuality. As the President expresses it: "This tendency is to crush out individual independence and to hinder or prevent the free use of human faculties and the full development of human character;" the relegation of the individual "to the level of a mere appurtenance to a great machine, with little free will, with no duty but that of passive obedience, and with little hope or opportunity of rising in the scale of responsible and helpful citizenship."

The President recommends legislation that shall check the operations of trusts and monopolies of capital. But how can a law be made that will have the desired effect upon the trusts and monopolies of labor as well? Any legislation proposed which should bear upon the labor trusts, however, would be instantly and vigorously resented as an attack upon labor and an invasion of the rights of labor; and certainly would not be suffered to become law. Yet any law bearing only upon trusts and monopolies of capital, would certainly be

rejected by the courts as special or class legislation. Indeed, the President says that the legislation that has been enacted already, has failed, "simply because the laws themselves, *as interpreted by the courts*, do not reach the difficulty."

There is danger then, indeed there is a probability, that in the attempts to remedy the evil by legislation, it will be done in such a way that a governmental trust and monopoly will be erected which will be more destructive to individuality than all the other trusts and monopolies of all sorts together. The danger is that laws may be enacted and enforced, even by decrees of the highest courts, overstepping the boundaries of strict impartiality and general justice, and the assent of all be exacted simply *because it is the law*; and when any one presumes to question the law as to whether it is right, or strictly impartial or generally just, and refuses his assent to it because it is not such a law, he will be denounced as an enemy of the government and a revolutionist.

There is too much of this doctrine spread abroad in the United States already, that every law must be accepted and obeyed simply "because it is the law." Benjamin Harrison, while he was president, as he was "swingin' round the circle," made this his particular theme. In the late campaign he made a specialty of the same thing, and denounced as "revolutionists" all who should refuse assent to a decision of the United States Supreme Court on a constitutional question. The principles upon which the Government of the United States is founded, admit no such doctrine. Abraham Lincoln's whole political contest was waged against it.

Yet this doctrine is the stronghold of the religious combination that proposes by Sunday laws and religious legislation generally, to dominate the country, and which is already dominating it to vastly too large an extent. They never ask, nor do they care, whether a thing is constitutional, or whether it is right. They only want to know whether it is the law, or whether by any means it can be made the law. Then whoever opposes it or refuses to obey it—no matter how flatly unconstitutional and wrong it may be—he is denounced as an "enemy of the government," "revolutionists," "anarchists," "Adventist," etc., etc. And having the governmental power in their hands, and public opinion on their side, they can, and they do, make it very uncomfortable for the man who chooses to think for himself and to maintain the constitutional provisions and fundamental principles upon which the nation rests. The effect of this religious trust and

monopoly, precisely as is that of every other trust and monopoly, is to crush out individual independence and to hinder or prevent the free use of human faculties and the full development of human character;" to relegate the individual "to the level of a mere appurtenance to a great machine, with little free will, and with no duty but that of passive obedience."

It was not by any means a small club to be used to this end that President Cleveland put into the hands of this religious monopoly, when in his last Thanksgiving proclamation he committed the national government specifically to the patronage of the Christian religion—or rather, to that form of the Christian religion which is dealt in by this religious "Trust."

REALLY we did not suppose that anybody could be found who would defend President Cleveland's action in dragging the Christian religion into his last Thanksgiving proclamation. Many we knew would be glad that he did so, and would gladly use it for all that could be made out of it; but that any would attempt to justify it or defend it, we did not believe.

The issuing of a religious proclamation at all, even in the most general and non-committal terms, by the President of the United States, is so clearly an act of usurpation, that we could not think that anybody would have the face to defend such an act when he went so far beyond this as to adopt distinctly the religion of one class of the people of the country.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, . . . are reserved." No man can for a moment say that the power to appoint religious festivals, and prescribe religious exercises, has been delegated by the Constitution. Every person who ever read the Constitution, knows there is no delegation of any such power. For the President of the United States to do such a thing, is for him to act without authority, without the Constitution, without legal right. It is even more than this; for the makers of the Constitution and of the Government under it, particularly excluded religion, and specifically the Christian religion, from the cognizance of the national authority. Such an act of the President, therefore, is not only with the Constitution, but *against* the Constitution—against the spirit and express intent of the Constitution.

Yet for all this there are those who have the face actually to defend this latest thing of the kind. It will be of interest to the people to know who they are that do it, and how they do it.

The *Independent* was the first to do it. After quoting the particular sentence of the proclamation, it acknowledges that "this is a recognition of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the Christian religion in a proclamation addressed to all the people of the country, Christians and Jews alike." But why mention only Christians and Jews? "All the people of the country" are not composed of Christians and Jews. There are thousands and thousands of "the people of the country" who are neither Christians nor Jews, and yet who are entitled to just as much consideration from a President of the country as is any Christian in all the land. Was Mr. Cleveland chosen and elected to be the President of all the people of the country? or of only the Christians of the country?

But even though all the people of the country were composed of only Christians and Jews, then under a Constitution including both Christians and Jews the President of the country would have no kind of right in his official capacity to recognize exclusively Christian doctrines. To do so would be at once to give public notice that he did not consider himself the President of all the people; but of the Christians only. It would be to say that in his view the Constitution did not include Christians and Jews, but Christians only. And when as is the fact all the people of the country are composed promiscuously of Christians, Jews and non-religionists, living under a Constitution that was framed expressly to include *all* without any distinction whatever; when, in view of this the President, having taken an oath to maintain the Constitution, in his official capacity as President issues a document which is exclusively Christian, notice is thereby plainly given to all the country that he does not consider that the Constitution includes all the people, but Christians only; and that he considers himself under that Constitution as President, not of all the people, but only of the Christians of the country. This must be so, or else it will have to be admitted that a President who issued such a document was an exceedingly thoughtless personage.

As we did not suppose anybody would defend this thing, so also we would not have supposed that anybody would attempt to defend it in the way that the *Independent* does in the following words:—

Our President and governors are authorized by law to set apart certain days as seasons of thanksgiving and fasting. All that the law provides is the bare announcement of the time.

As it relates to the President of the United States, there is not a shadow of truth in this statement. As for the governors, it is true that

there are States that provide that they shall appoint days of thanksgiving. But as regards the President, it is absolutely false. There is no law authorizing him to do any such thing; not even as to "the bare announcement of the time." His doing of it is entirely without law, as well as without the Constitution. The *Independent's* pretense that there is such a law, is a fraud. But that a fraudulent thing should be supported by fraudulent means is natural enough; and, by the by, it is becoming enough too.

The *Independent* further says:—

If the President or governor says anything further [than the law provides] it is not a legal act.

Very good. That is true enough. And as it is certainly true that there is absolutely no law which provides that the President shall

395

say anything at all on the subject, it follows as also certainly true that what he does say on this subject "is not a legal act." That is true. We only wish all the people would tell him so; and instruct him to quit committing acts that are "not legal."

The *Independent* further says that when the President says anything further than the law provides, it is not a legal act, "but an expression of personal opinion or advice;" and that—

no Jew or pagan can rightly take exception to some recognition of Jesus Christ, as an expression of the President's personal faith. . . . Although addressed to all the people his little sermon is no more official than his address at the Presbyterian Home Missionary meeting in Carnegie Hall last winter.

Mr. Cleveland did not address that missionary meeting in his official capacity of President of the United States. He did not say to them, "I, Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, do hereby," etc. He did not write it out and say, "Witness my hand and the seal of the United States, which I have caused to be hereunto affixed." He did not close that address with "Done at the city of Washington, . . . in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and twenty-first.

"By the President, "GROVER CLEVELAND.

"RICHARD OLNEY, Secretary of State."

Yet all this was done to his Thanksgiving proclamation. In fact it would be impossible for any document to have more of an official character.

For any one to say, in view of all this, that what he said in the proclamation "is no more official" than was his address at the missionary meeting, is, if possible, more fraudulent than the

statement that he is "authorized by law" to make such proclamations. Though of course it should only be expected that all the statements on the subject would be of the same piece.

As the whole document, however, because of its being "not a legal act," was in itself only an expression of opinion, it may in that sense be admitted that the particular sentence was also "but an expression of personal opinion," "an expression of the President's personal faith." But even then, it is pertinent to inquire, What right has any man to attach the Great Seal of the United States to his personal opinions, and thus to pass them out to the country as official business of national importance? What right has any man thus to make his personal opinions the official opinions of the nation? What right has any man to put the national seal upon his personal faith and officially send it forth to the people of the country as a governmental thing to which they are expected to conform? What right has any man thus to make his personal faith the official faith of the nation?

But the climax of the *Independent's* ghastly defense is reached in the following:—

Suppose the President had been a Roman Catholic and referred to the invocation of Mary as a mediatrix, he would have made a mistake, because the prevailing sentiment of the land would be against him.

And is the *Independent* absolutely sure that there will never be so much of a prevailing sentiment in that direction that it will *not* be a mistake for a Roman Catholic in the presidential chair to refer to the invocation of Mary as a mediatrix, in a Thanksgiving proclamation? The *Independent* positively justifies such a thing whenever the prevailing sentiment may permit it. This is what the fathers saw when they made the National Government separate from religion, when they said: "Who does not see that the same authority that can set up the Christian religion in exclusion of all other religions, can with the same ease set up some particular sect of Christians in exclusion of all other sects?" Other presidents gave national recognition to religion in general. President Cleveland has given national recognition to the Christian religion in exclusion of all other religions. It is only a question of time when the next step will be taken, and a President will give nation recognition to some particular sect, *and that the Catholic sect*, in exclusion of all other sects.

Rome sees this too. And therefore Cardinal Gibbons's organ, the *Catholic Mirror*, also comes to the defense of this latest proclamation

and this latest phase of the development of National religion. The *Mirror* of November 28, says:—

The Cleveland and Cincinnati rabbis and congregations who have made all this disturbance about a trifle are placing themselves in the same boat with those cranks and bigots who would "leave God out of the Constitution," or indeed, refuse to recognize any overruling Providence whatever—who would practically make our government agnostic or infidel.

And finally there comes the Reform Bureau of Washington, D. C., in the *Ram's Horn*, of Dec. 5, 1896, declaring it to be "unusual if not unprecedented," and that "Thus at last we have a proclamation in accord with the Supreme Court dictum, 'This is a Christian nation.'" And in a communication to the Washington, D. C., *Evening Star*, of November 30, the same body says further: "The Thanksgiving proclamation is in this respect the first one that might not have been as appropriately issued in China or among the Choctaws, or wherever a Supreme Being is recognized. This is the first proclamation in accord with the long list of historic facts on the basis of which the Supreme Court said, on February 29, 1892, in a unanimous opinion (Trinity Church case): 'This is a christian nation.' This proclamation, with the burial of the spoils system and the arbitration treaty, will make this administration distinguished in history above any other since the war."

"Making National 'Holy Days'" *American Sentinel* 11, 50 , p. 395.

THAT our national holidays are fast taking on the character of "holy days," is evident from facts which are too plain to be overlooked.

The pious and sermonic tone of the President's Thanksgiving proclamation, its distinctly "Christian" character, and the efforts made by the clergy to secure a public observance of the day by cessation of work and worldly sports, at least during the time of church services, are things to which we have already called attention. They show that this national "festival" day is undergoing a rapid metaphorphosis which will leave it a religious day altogether, to be observed only in a religious manner. The following paragraph from the *Christian Statesman*, of November 28, adds to the evidence upon this point:—

We regret to be obliged to record that the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Pittsburg, at its meeting last Monday, tabled a resolution introduced by one of its members protesting against the popular way of spending a large part of Thanksgiving

Day in attendance upon football games. It is bad enough that so many college students and their friends, and members of athletic and even Young Men's Christian Associations and their supporters, have so little regard for the spirit of the day and the official proclamations for its proper observance. But when ministers and college officers not only wink at the devoting of the day largely to rough sports, but even more or less publicly refuse to condemn and thus in an effective way justify this mode of spending a day *specially set apart* for the quiet enjoyment of the home circle and the *duties of charity and religion*, what can be expected of our young men?

Thanksgiving day, however, is not the only national day upon which an effort is being made to put the stamp of religion. The evidence of this we find in the *Christian Endeavorer*, for December, 1896. That journal says:—

Many Christian Endeavor societies last year utilized Washington's Birthday for Christian Citizenship day. They found this plan to be helpful to the cause of Christian Citizenship. . . .

As Washington was distinctly a Christian citizen and showed his loyalty to his divine Master on every occasion, there is every reason why the celebration of his birthday should have a religious tone to it.

The *Endeavorer* further states that it was supposed that resolutions upon this point would be passed by the International Convention at Washington, but no resolutions were passed on any subject at that meeting. It adds, however, that in probably six hundred communities in this country the coming 22nd of February will be observed under Christian citizenship auspices.

When the popular observance of national holidays takes on a "religious tone," those who fail to observe them religiously will suffer social ostracism, to say the least. Already it is accounted nothing less than sinful to continue secular work or engage in "rude sports" during the hours of church service on Thanksgiving day. And a like result must follow the establishment of the religious observance of Washington's birthday.

It is worthy of notice that these national holidays will, under this change, stand upon exactly the same footing as the "holy days" of the Roman Catholic Church. Such days are marked by a religious observance, but not through their whole length. That church requires attendance at Mass or other religious services set apart for the day; and having complied with the church requirements in this respect, the Catholic communicant is at liberty to spend the remaining portion of

the day as his own inclination may direct. He is not debarred from indulgence in the popular forms of amusement and recreation, provided these do not interfere with the religious observances which the church prescribes. And not only will these days stand upon the same level as the Catholic "holy days;" they will serve the same purpose. The Catholic "holy days" are for the purpose of exalting and glorifying the church. And when the Protestant Church acquires the prerogative of directing the observance of national holidays, she will thereby exalt herself, and become invested with new power and authority in the eyes of the people. But the whole principle of such procedure is papal, and not Christian; and only that which is in the likeness of the papacy can come out of it.

The only days which can properly be observed religiously are those commanded to be observed by the Creator; for religion is a matter the direction of which is His prerogative alone. He has commanded us to keep holy his Sabbaths, which come on the seventh day of each week. But the leading church bodies have discarded these, and instituted "holy days" of their own. And this is nothing else than a parallel to the spirit and work of the papacy.

THERE is nothing which behaves more uncivilly than the "civil sabbath."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 50 , p. 400.

IN his efforts in behalf of temperance and also prohibition nobody can bid John G. Wooley more hearty God-speed than we do. But to his effort and hope to have the Church dominate and "run" the Government, nobody can be more opposed than are we. These views of religion are as political as those of the veriest National Reformer that has yet appeared. In *Our Day*, for November, 1896, he declares that—

This country will never be saved but by the enthronement of Jesus in the politics of the republic, and his coronation by the Christian voters as the "King of kings and Lord of lords," and Platform of platforms.

Whether the country is ever saved or not, this thing will never be. There will never be any enthronement of Jesus in the politics of the republic; nor will he ever be crowned by the Christian voters as King of kings, nor as anything else. There were some folks once before who proposed "the enthronement of Jesus in the politics of the

country," but he departed from them. In that day he said, "I receive not honor from men." And he says it yet.

THE apologists of the New England Puritans think they have a mighty weapon in defense of their heroes when they have demonstrated that there was no specific statute prohibiting kissing on Sunday. Upon this they declare that Sam. Peter's account of the Blue Laws is all a made-up story, out of enmity to the innocent Puritans. The truth of the matter is that the Bible was the code, and the Bible forbids "finding thine own pleasure" on the Sabbath day. And though this applies to the seventh day and not to Sunday at all, the Puritans decided that Sunday is the Sabbath, and then made this Scripture apply to Sunday observance. Then, by this piece of hocus pocus, Sunday being the Sabbath, and the Bible being the code, as the code forbade people finding their own pleasure on the Sabbath, and as assuredly it is a pleasure for a man to kiss his wife, it followed plainly enough that it was unlawful for a man to kiss his wife on Sunday. And now the vast National Reform Christian Endeavor combination are determined to have the Bible the code of the whole nation with themselves as final interpreters, as in that other Blue Law system.

ON Thanksgiving day last month, at Lincoln, Neb., Presiding Elder D. W. C. Huntingdon preached a sermon which was hardly anything else than a long, blind, unreasoning defense of the Puritans and all their enormities. This, however, is neither new or unusual. It is probable that the same thing was done at other places in the United States the same day. We notice it here only to call attention to it as one of the things, among many others of to-day, that needs to be watched and thought about. For, as has been well remarked, "if we are to be profited by the past, it is essential that we should study our history honestly and impartially. We cannot be true to ourselves if we begin by being false to our predecessors. If we credit them with motives they did not feel and could not have understood; if we claim for them things which they never accomplished; if we defend their indefensible acts; if we seek to prove them in the right when they were in the wrong, in their behavior toward others—it will follow that we will deal likewise in our own case, and prove dishonest and tricky as a nation and in our personal transactions." Any one who will defend or excuse to-day the barbarisms and enormities of the Puritans, will just as readily defend or excuse the like things if they should be committed under like circumstances to-day.

December 24, 1896

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 11, 51 , pp. 401, 402.

AMS this number of our paper is dated the day before Christmas, it might be expected that we should have something to say about the institution.

If such be the expectation of any, they shall not be disappointed. We are willing to contribute what we may for the benefit of those who would celebrate this universal festival.

We say this universal festival, not because we would be understood to say that Christianity is universal; but because the period now referred to as the "Christmas season" has been celebrated from time immemorial by all nations.

That which is now particularly celebrated as the Christmas, is the remains of the ancient festival whose celebration covered a longer period of time. This festival season was celebrated in honor of the Sun; and December 25 especially in gladness and rejoicing at his annual birth and the beginning of his return victorious over the powers of darkness or night.

In the reigns of Domitian and Trajan, Rome formally adopted from Persia the feast of the Persian sun-god Mithras, with December 25 as the birth festival of the unconquered sun—*Natales invicti Solis*. In the Louvre at Paris is the original of a mythological representation of this, which was found at Rome in a vault under the Capitol. It is entitled "Mithra Sacrificing the Bull." The central object of the piece is Mithra in a cavern sacrificing a bull. As already stated, Mithra represented the Sun; the bull was the symbol of the powers of night. The blood of the bull was to impart the power of regeneration. At the right hand in the cavern stands the Genius of Night with his torch turned down, extinguished. At the left stands the Genius of Day, with his torch held up, aflame. An inscription on the body of the bull reads: "To Mithra, the invincible Sun-God." The piece is intended to represent the victory of the Sun over the powers of darkness. This sacrifice was made annually at the winter solstice—the period that is now Christmas-time. Thus this annual festival was an established thing in the State and City of Rome.

About the middle of the fourth century, the *church* of Rome adopted this festival, making the birthday of the Sun, December 25, the birthday of Christ. And in a few years the celebration of this

festival of the sun had spread among the churches throughout the whole empire—east as well as west. In one of the homilies of Chrysostom, supposed to have been delivered on this festival day in A.D. 386, he expresses his own pleasure and "congratulates the people upon the progress made, through their zeal in establishing this new festival, *which they had borrowed from the Western Church*"; and "seems to speak of it as a custom imported from the West within ten years." The perverse-minded clergy readily sanctioned the practice and relieved all doubts, with the assurance that the festival which had been formerly celebrated as the birth of the real sun was a type of the festival of the birth of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness. And thus was established the Church festival of Christmas.

There are other items connected with the celebration of the day, whose origin and meaning are also worth mentioning. One of these is the Christmas tree. Just as the day itself and its celebration were adopted from pagan Rome, the use of the tree was adopted from the pagan Germans. And just as the day is a relic of sun-worship, so also is the tree. In *The Ladies Home Journal*, for December, Mrs. Lyman Abbott says of "The Christmas Tree": "A German friend tells me that the true Christmas tree is 'not a mere show, decorated for the momentary amusement of children. It is a sublime symbol of the soul life of the Germanic people for a thousand years.' . . . The tree itself 'is the celestial sun-tree.'"

Another item is the decoration of the houses and churches with vines, branches of trees, etc. This is derived from the sun-worshipping Druids of Britain. An early English writer says that the "trimmyng of the temples with hangyngs, flowers, boughs, and garlands, was taken of the heathen people, whiche decked their idols and houses with suche array." The ivy particularly was used in honor of Bacchus.

Thus it is that Christmas day, the celebration of the day, and the appurtenances thereto, are all heathen and only relics of sun-worship.

OUR readers will remember an article by Dr. H. L. Wayland, which not long ago was reprinted in the SENTINEL, from the *Independent*, in which he criticised the Canadian Sunday law by which some Seventh-day Adventist preachers were fined and imprisoned. Dr. Wayland rightly enough spoke of it as religious persecution.

Dr. W. H. Withrow, of Toronto, in a letter to the *Independent*, undertakes to defend the Canadian Sunday law, and to justify the persecutions that were inflicted by it. He says of the preachers who

were fined and imprisoned, that "their religion had nothing to do with it. It would have been the same if they had been agnostics or Jews. The law simply forbids Sunday labor, and the law must be obeyed whether men are barbers, saloon-keepers, or Seventh-day Adventists."

This is the argument that is usually made in such cases; but instead of being in any sense a legitimate argument, it is a sheer subterfuge. This is not to say that all who use it have thought enough upon it, intentionally to use it as a subterfuge. Though it is quite clear that many of them have not cared to think enough on the subject to know whether it is a subterfuge or not. They know that such is the law, and that it enforces exactly what they believe religiously; and that is as far as they care to inquire. Yet all that any person needs to do in order to see that it is not only a subterfuge but one of the meanest subterfuges that was ever employed, is only to think about two steps from where he professes proudly to stand.

All those people profess to believe in religious freedom. They profess to hold that every man has the right to believe or dissent from any doctrine, dogma, ordinance, rite, or institution of any church, as he may choose for himself. They profess to be proud that they believe in such freedom as this. Yes, they even boast that they are the divinely-appointed conservators of such religious liberty as this.

Yet, while loudly professing to recognize this right as inalienable, under cover of this subterfuge they deny the right and actually

402

attempt to sweep it entirely away. This subterfuge is that they get church dogmas or institutions embodied in the law, and then demand *obedience to the law*, throwing upon the dissenter the odium of "lawlessness and disrespect for the constituted authorities," while they pose as the champions of "law and order," the "conservators of the State, and the stay of society"!

Of all the pretenses that were ever employed, this is perhaps the subtlest [*sic*]. By it throughout the Middle Ages, anything and everything that the church could invent was forced upon the people. Its slimy trail can be traced throughout the history of the "Protestant" sects, in thus forcing upon the people such peculiar institutions as were characteristic of the sect that could obtain controls of the law. And now it is made to flourish again, by all the sects together, in thus forcing upon the people the one thing in which they are all agreed,

and in which they have obtained control of the law, the observance of Sunday, "the Christian sabbath."

Sunday, not only according to their own showing, but by every other fair showing that can be made, is a religious institution, a church institution, only. This they all know as well as they know anything. And yet they work constantly to get this church institution fixed, and more firmly fixed, *in the law*, with penalties attached that are more worthy of barbarism than of civilization; and then, when anybody objects to it, they all cry out that "it is not a question of religion, it is simply a question of *law*. We are not asking any religious observance; all that we ask is *respect for law*"!!

The Christian and Protestant answer to all this is that neither the Sunday institution nor any other religious or ecclesiastical institution *has any right to a place in the law*. And even when it is put into the law, this does not take away the right of dissent. The divine right of dissent from religious or ecclesiastical institutions abides ever the same, whether the institution is out of the law or in the law. So long as the religious rite or institution is not in the law, they themselves acknowledge the inalienable right of every man to disregard it utterly. Whereas, as soon as they get the dogma fixed in the law, they deny the right of anybody to disregard it at all: though it is precisely the religious thing that it was before. But instead of the right to disregard it being taken away by this change of position of the church dogma, the truth is that when the institution is fixed in the law, the right of dissent then extends *to that law*. The *subterfuge* cannot destroy the *right*.

From the church organizations the courts have caught up this cry. And, though acknowledging that the Sunday institution is religious; that it is enacted and enforced at the will of the church; and that the logic of it is the union of Church and State; yet they insist that, as it is in the law, and the law is for the public good, no right of dissent can be recognized; but the dissenter "may be made to suffer for his defiance *by persecutions*, if you call them so, on the part of the great majority."

This argument is as old as is the contest for the right of the free exercise of religious belief. It was the very position occupied by Rome when the disciples of Christ were sent into the world to preach religious freedom to all mankind. Religious observances were enforced by the law. The Christians asserted and maintained the right to dissent from all such observances, and, in fact, from *every one* of

the religious observances of Rome, and to believe religiously for themselves, though in so doing they totally disregarded the laws, which, on the part of the Roman State, were held to be beneficial to the population. Then, *as now*, it was held that, though religious belief was the foundation of the custom, yet this was no objection to it, because it had become a part of the legal system of the government, and was enforced by the State for its own good. But Christianity *then* refused to recognize any validity in any such argument, and so it does now.

When paganism was supplanted by the papacy in the Roman Empire, the same argument was again brought forth to sustain the papal observances which were enforced by imperial law; and through the whole period of papal supremacy Christianity still refused to recognize any validity whatever in the argument.

In short, this argument—this "miserable excuse"—whether made by churches or by courts, is the same old serpent (Rev. 12:9, 12, 14) that tortured the Christians to death under pagan Rome; that burnt John Huss at Constance, and Michael Servetus at Geneva; that whipped, and banished the Baptists, and banished and hanged the Quakers, in New England. Whether used by the Roman State and the Catholic Church, or by other States and other churches; whether in the early centuries, or in these last years of the nineteenth century, of the Christian era; that argument is ever the same old serpent, and Christianity has always refused to recognize any validity whatever in it, and it always will.

"'National' Reform and the Papacy" *American Sentinel* 11, 51 , p. 403.

THE "National Reform" movement is under the impression that it is combating the papacy. For some time past its official organ, the *Christian Statesman*, has devoted considerable space to an exposition of the evils of that un-American and antichristian system. It seems not to be aware that those same evils are paralleled in its own system of "National Reform."

The *Statesman* of November 28, contains an article on "Romanism and Loyalty," which discusses the Roman Catholic doctrine of papal infallibility in its relation to loyalty to the State. The *Statesman* seems to have at least a dim perception of the important bearing of this papal doctrine upon the "National Reform" doctrine

that the United States is a "Christian nation;" for after setting forth the papal position, it says:—

And now comes the consistent Roman Catholic demanding that our nation must go to the Roman Catholic Church to know what is right and what is wrong. He insists that this is doing nothing more than to assert God's sovereignty over the nation; that Christ speaks to the nations through his infallible vicegerent on earth.

Intelligent Roman Catholics can see plainly enough the logic of the "National Reform" movement. They know that if carried to its conclusion as the National Reformers hope to see it, a situation will be reached in which logic and consistency will demand that this nation shall defer to the Roman Catholic Church as the proper interpreter of the divine will in civil affairs. Already they are beginning to call attention to the logical demands of the situation, and standing upon this vantage ground, Rome hopes, not unreasonably either, when the opportune day shall arrive, to gain a signal victory.

The papal church alone offers to the world a human authority which is recognized as "infallible" in the interpretation of the will of God. It matters not that the infallibility of this authority is disputed. It alone claims to be infallible, and is believed actually to be infallible by a large division of the nominally Christian Church. If an authoritative human interpreter of the divine will must be found, the weight of evidence, as between all human authorities, cannot lead elsewhere than to the papacy.

And this authoritative human interpreter of the will of God is exactly what the "National Reform" system demands. That system maintains that the United States is a "Christian nation"—a "sovereign moral being in direct relations with God, capable of knowing his moral law given in the Bible." It treats the State as a personal entity possessing moral accountability, and therefore bound to fulfill the law of God. But the Government operates only through human agencies. It must operate through these or cease to be a Government. It has a chief executive, a Supreme Court, and a supreme legislative body; and these three branches of the Government exercise supreme authority in the departments over which they are placed. Without such a recognized supreme human authority, no branch of the Government would be complete or capable of performing its functions.

The national Government could not proceed at all without a President, a Congress, and a Supreme Court. If then the Government is to act in a religious capacity, it must have a supreme human

authority to decide what its action shall be in this sphere, as in the domain of the secular. And as it must act as a "Christian nation," it must have a supreme human authority to decide what is the will of God, as revealed in the Christian religion.

The National Reformers themselves admit, under pressure, that this must be so. Dr. David McAllister, the spokesman of the Reform party, in the hearing given last March by a committee of Congress on the proposed "Christ an amendment" to the Constitution, was forced to just this position, as appears in the following extract from the official report:—

MR. BURTON—Is not this the theory: Each man regards the day he believes to be the Sabbath, and the Government protects him in his worship from disturbance or interference?

DR. McALLISTER—Not only must this be the case in regard to every man, but the State and the nation must decide for themselves whether they will keep one day or not.

MR. CONNOLLY—Suppose the Bible has already settled that question, how could any act of Congress interfere with it if that is to be in the Constitution.

DR. McALLISTER—Because *we must interpret the Bible*.

"And now"—to quote the *Statesman* again—"comes the consistent Roman Catholic demanding that our nation must go to the Roman Catholic Church to know what is right and wrong." Of course; what else could be expected from the consistent Roman Catholic? and what could be more consistent and logical from the "National Reform" standpoint? If the nation must have a supreme human interpreter of the Bible to instruct it in keeping the law of God, could it do better than to turn to that church which claims to be infallible in her religious teaching, and is accepted by millions of its citizens as infallible? It would be no slight advantage to the nation to possess an infallible Congress, Supreme Court, or President. Why, then, should our Government pass by the opportunity to secure an "infallible" guide in the important sphere of religion, to which it now stands fully committed?

We repeat, that as between all human authorities to which the Government may turn for guidance in the performance of religious duties, the preëminence lies with the papacy. The papal church has acted in that capacity for centuries; she is the oldest "Christian" denomination, as well as the largest in this country; and, as we have said, millions of the citizens of this Government already believe in her infallibility and in her claim of right to dictate conduct to the civil

power, if any other church or religious body is chosen to interpret the divine will for the nation, the same objections will apply to it as to the papacy, without any of the advantages which can be urged in the latter's favor.

If any further evidence were needed that the whole tendency of the movement to make the United States a Christian nation, is to place this Government under the domination of the papacy, it is supplied by recent events in the shape of official acts of the Government itself, in each of its three departments. In February, 1892, the Supreme Court declared that the United States "is a Christian nation;" and the joy with which this utterance was hailed by the "National Reform" party, and the use they have made of it, shows that, whether due to the influence of National Reform sentiment or not, it is directly in the line of what their movement aims to secure. And if any question might remain as to the precise religious significance of the Supreme Court's declaration, it would be answered by the references made in the decision to the "Christian" character of Sunday laws, and by the fact that this same court has upheld Sunday laws as a proper exercise of the legislative power of the State, on the ground that they are for the benefit of mankind. Bearing in mind that Sunday as a "Christian" day originated with the Roman Catholic church, and is pointed to by that church as the special sign of her spiritual authority, there remains no room for doubt that if "this is a Christian nation" by virtue of its religious laws and its belief in the sacredness of Sunday, it is a Roman Catholic Christian nation and nothing else.

Again, in August, 1892, Congress legislated upon the question of which day is the Sabbath, and decided that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the Sabbath with the meaning of the fourth commandment. In this the supreme legislative body of the nation took its stand squarely on papal ground.

And finally, the nation's chief executive, in the latest national Thanksgiving [*sic.*] proclamation, sets his official seal of approval to the doctrine that the United States is a Christian nation, thereby investing Thanksgiving with the character of a "Christian" holy day. But "Christian" holy days other than those set apart in Scripture constitute an exclusive feature of the papal religion. They have the stamp of the papacy upon them, and no other.

It is perfectly clear, therefore, that the National Reform movement is not combating the papacy in any way except on paper, and that it is

actually in perfect harmony with the papacy, and that all its work is only in the line of justifying the latter and strengthening her hands for the accomplishment of her evil designs. The two systems are in principle one and the same, and equally ruinous in their results.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 11, 51 , p. 408.

A WASHINGTON, D. C., correspondent sends us the following: "A delegation of members of the Anti-saloon League called on the President and had a conversation with him with reference to proposed religious legislation. They referred to the criticisms that had been made in the papers with reference to his Thanksgiving proclamation; and as they reported in their public meetings, the President said emphatically that this is indeed a Christian nation, and it was only a matter of time when everyone would have to come to accept the situation." Evidently it was due to no oversight on the President's part that his Thanksgiving proclamation for 1895 read as it did.

A WESTERN religio political journal raises the query how far a Christian can follow the divine injunction to "turn the other cheek" to the smiter before reaching the point where "forbearance ceases to be a virtue." It mentions by way of illustration that a certain minister in an Iowa town had been active recently in securing the indictment of a druggist for violation of the prohibition law, whereupon the druggist becoming angry, undertook one day to chastise the preacher upon the street, but the latter drew a revolver and shot him, inflicting a dangerous wound. This was a "regrettable" outcome, the journal says, but it adds that "it is a stern question how long the champions of law and order may be expected to stand dumb before the insults and assaults of law-breakers and assassins."

Was this a case of "Christian" shooting? And if the wound proved fatal—as perchance it did—was the druggist killed in a "Christian" way? This may not have been any better for him than if the shot had been fired by a highway robber, but the minister thereby avenged the "insults" offered him and perchance avoided bodily injury.

How far did Jesus Christ go in submitting without resentment to the insults and violence offered him? How long did he suffer them before striking his persecutors to the ground? It might be profitable for those who profess to do all things in His name, to consider these questions in their bearing upon this subject.

¹ See "Too Few to Have Rights," on page 4.

² See "Too Few to Have Rights," on page 4.

³ Eze. 20:12.

⁴ *Ques.* How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

Ans. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

Q. How prove you that?

A. Because by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin.—"*An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine*," by Rev. Henry Tuberville: *Imprimatur*, the Right Rev. Benedict, Bishop of Boston: Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay St., New York, 1833, p. 58.

⁵ This boycotting resolution, sent up to Congress from the "evangelical" churches in all parts of the country, after prescribing what was demanded of Congress in respect to the World' Fair, runs as follows: "*Resolved*, That we do hereby pledge ourselves and each other, that we will from this time henceforth refuse to vote for, or support for any office or position of trust, any member of Congress, either senator or representative, who shall vote for any further aid of any kind for the World' Fair, except on conditions named in these resolutions."

⁶ "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," by Mgr. Segur; *Imprimatur*, Joannes Josephus Episcopus, Boston; Thomas B. Noonan & Co., Boston, p. 213.

⁷ "So far as the writer knows," says Mr. Crafts, "there is but one among the State and national and international reform societies that was officially organized by the churches; this one exception being the official institution, at his suggestion, of the American Sabbath Union, by fourteen evangelical denominations, through official votes at their national conferences."—*Practical Christian Sociology*, page 53.

⁸ This fact was thus expressed by Dr. H. H. George after Congress had yielded to the demand of the confederated churches: "I have learned that we [the churches] hold the United States Senate in our hands." And if this be true of the Senate, how much more so of the House.

⁹ "Practical Christian Sociology," pp. 26, 27.

¹⁰ 1 Cor. 11:26.

¹¹ "Practical Christian Sociology," pp. 24, 25.

¹² Eze. 20:12.

¹³ Gen. 1:2.

¹⁴ Eph. 4:24.

¹⁵ 2 Cor. 4:6.

¹⁶ Eze. 13:7.

¹⁷ Eze. 11:16.

¹⁸ Works of Thomas Jefferson, vol. 7, p. 3.

¹⁹ Treaty with Tripoli. "American State Papers," Class I., Foreign Relations, Vol. II., p. 18.

²⁰ Works of Jefferson, vol. 5, p. 236.

²¹ Writings of James Madison, vol. 3, p. 305.

²² Report of Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads commissioned to the Senate Jan. 19, 1829, by Hon. Richard M. Johnson. See "American State Papers," class vii., p. 225.

²³ By W. F. Crafts, Ph.D., published by Funk & Wagnalls, New York.

²⁴ "Christian Sociology," p. 41. Italics ours.

²⁵ *Id.*, p. 43.

²⁶ "Practical Christian Sociology," p. 44.

²⁷ "Practical Christian Sociology," p. 34.

²⁸ 1 John 4:8.

²⁹ 1 John 4:20.

³⁰ Isa. 8:12, 13.

³¹ "Practical Christian sociology," pp. 52-54.

³² *Id.*, pp. 47, 48.

³³ Senator Hiscock, Congressional Record, July 13, 1891, p. 6755.

³⁴ Senator Hawley, *Id.*, p. 6728.

³⁵ Rom. 13:1.

³⁶ The original word here rendered "power" is by some translated "authority." "Liddell & Scott's Lexicon" defines it as "power or authority." The "Century Dictionary" defines "power," as "the ability or right to command or control; dominion; authority;" etc. With this agrees also the "Encyclopedic Dictionary," while Webster gives "power" as a synonym of "authority."

³⁷ Col. 1:16, 17.

³⁸ Eph. 6:12.

³⁹ Col. 2:15.

⁴⁰ Such "power" is of course simply brute force; it has in it no element of authority; and this is true no matter what claims may be put forth by or in behalf of those who exercise it.

⁴¹ Eze. 28:12-15.

⁴² Isa. 14:12-15.

⁴³ This is not saying that Christians should forcibly resist civil rulers. There are circumstances, however, under which the Christian must refuse obedience to so-called civil laws. President Fairchild says: "In a case of this kind, either of two courses is possible; to disobey the law, and resist the government in its attempt to execute it, or to disobey and quietly suffer the penalty. The first is revolutionary, and can be justified only when the case is flagrant and affects such numbers that a revolutionary movement will be sustained. . . . The second course will, in general commend itself to considerate and conscientious men. It is a testimony against the law as unrighteous, and at the same time, a recognition of government as a grave interest."

⁴⁴ "The framers of the Constitution," says Richard M. Johnson, "recognized the eternal principle that man's relation with his God is above human legislation, and his right of conscience inalienable. Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our own bosoms."

⁴⁵ 1 Peter 2:14.

⁴⁶ Isa. 61:1.

⁴⁷ Isa. 58:6.

⁴⁸ Eph. 3:11.

⁴⁹ Eph. 1:9, 10.

⁵⁰ 1 Peter 1:10, 11.

⁵¹ Heb. 4:2.

⁵² Rom. 1:16.

⁵³ Gal. 3:16.

⁵⁴ Gal. 3:29.

⁵⁵ Rom. 2:28, 29.

⁵⁶ See "God in the Constitution" on page 26.

⁵⁷ John 3:16.

⁵⁸ John 12:32.

⁵⁹ John 5:44.

⁶⁰ Isa. 9:6, 7.

⁶¹ Ps. 2:6-8.

⁶² Dan. 7:13, 14.

⁶³ "Practical Christian Sociology," p. 93.

⁶⁴ *Id.*, p. 94.

⁶⁵ James Allison, D. D., who, in approving this book, described himself thus: "I am a Presbyterian minister and editor of the *Presbyterian Banner*, as well as Chairman of the Committee of Instruction and Discipline of the Pennsylvania Reform School."

⁶⁶ "Practical Christian Sociology," p. 96.

⁶⁷ *Id.*, p. 98.

⁶⁸ Eze. 20:12.

⁶⁹ See article "Dr. Haegler's Chart" on page 44.

⁷⁰ From "Practical Christian Sociology," Funk & Wagnalls Co., N. Y. By permission.

⁷¹ Letter to Frances W. Gilmer, "Works of Thomas Jefferson," Vol. 7, p. 3.

⁷² "History of the United States," Vol. VI, pp. 156-158.

⁷³ Rev. John Witherspoon, D.D., LL. D., President of Princeton College, and one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

⁷⁴ Madison to Jefferson, 9 January, 1785. Madison, I, 180.

⁷⁵ Washington to George Mason, 3 October, 1785. Spark's ix, 187.

⁷⁶ Semple's "History of the Baptists," etc., 71; Foote's "Sketches of Virginia" 364.

⁷⁷ Madison, i, 214.

⁷⁸ Hening, vii, 86.

⁷⁹ Bancroft, Vol. IV, p. 417.

⁸⁰ "History of the United States," Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10, p. 161.

⁸¹ *Id.*, page 166.

⁸² *Id.*, page 167.

⁸³ *Id.*, page 168.

⁸⁴ "'Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, and other Organic Laws of the United States," compiled under the order of the United States Senate, by Ben: Perley Poore, p. 812.

⁸⁵ Abd-ul-Mejid came to the throne by the death of his father, Mahmud II., at the very moment when Mehemut Ali seemed about to make himself master of the Turkish Empire. Says the "Encyclopdia Britannica," Art., "Turkey": "The young Sultan entered upon his reign unusually as an independent sovereign, but really under the protection of the European powers." And again, in the same connection, but of a little later period, it is said of the Czar: "The suppression of the National Hungarian Government by Russia in 1849 had heightened in the Emperor Nicholas the sense of his own power. He now looked forward to the speedy extinction of Turkey and in 1858 proposed to the British ambassador, Sir H. Seymour, a plan for the division of 'the Sick Man's' inheritance as soon as he should expire."

⁸⁶ "Encyclopedia Britannica," Vol. 23, p. 651.

⁸⁷ Ps. 76:16.

⁸⁸ Rev. 7:1-3.

⁸⁹ Dan. 11:43.

⁹⁰ Dan. 12:1-4.

⁹¹ Rev. 19:16.

⁹² Ps. 2:

⁹³ Dan. 7:27.

⁹⁴ From chapter XI, "Rights of the People."

⁹⁵ "By a sort of factitious advantage, the observers of Sunday have secured the aid of the civil law, and adhere to that advantage with great tenacity, in spite of the clamor for religious freedom and the progress that has been made in the absolute separation of Church and State. . . . And the efforts to extirpate the advantage above mentioned, by judicial decision in favor of a civil right to disregard the change, seem to me quite useless."—*U. S. Circuit Court*. See "Due Process of Law," pp. 32, 116.

⁹⁶ These are the very words of the United States Circuit Court for the western district of Tennessee, in August, 1891, and in behalf of Sunday too. See "Due Process of Law," where the decision is printed in full.

⁹⁷ "The Pagan religion was in truth, so closely interwoven with all the arrangements of civil and social life that it was not always easy to separate and distinguish the barely civil or social from the religious element. Many customs had really sprung from a religious source, whose connection, however, with religion had long been forgotten by the multitude, and remembered only by a few learned antiquarians, lay too far back to be recalled in the popular consciousness."—*Neander, Church History, Vol. I, sec. 2, par. 17*.

⁹⁸ John 1:23.

⁹⁹ Isa. 40:6-8.

¹⁰⁰ Rev. 18:7.

¹⁰¹ Luke 16:16.

¹⁰² 1 Peter 1:11.

¹⁰³ Rom. 1:16.

¹⁰⁴ Ps. 33:9.

¹⁰⁵ 2 Cor. 5:17; Eph. 2:10.

¹⁰⁶ Gal. 2:21.

¹⁰⁷ John 13:34.

¹⁰⁸ Rev. 22:14.

¹⁰⁹ Rom. 8:7, 8.

¹¹⁰ Heb. 11:6.

¹¹¹ 2 Cor. 11:14.

¹¹² 2 Cor. 10:4. For all other foot notes see next page.

¹¹³ Mark 16:15.

¹¹⁴ Neander's "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. I. Sec. 1, Part 1, Div. 3, par. 2.

¹¹⁵ Matt. 28:20.

¹¹⁶ Heb. 4:12.

¹¹⁷ Rev. 6:2.

¹¹⁸ Eph. 6:17.

¹¹⁹ The doctrine and the sale of indulgences were powerful incentives to evil among an ignorant people. True, according to the Church, indulgences could benefit those only who promised to amend their lives, and who kept their word. But what could be expected from a tenet invented solely with a view to the profit that might be derived from it? The venders of indulgences were naturally tempted, for the better sale of their merchandise to present their wares to the people in the most attractive and seducing aspect. The learned themselves did not fully understand the doctrine. All that the multitude saw in them was, that they permitted men to sin; and the merchants were not over eager to dissipate an error so favorable to their sale.—*D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," Book I, chap. 3.*

¹²⁰ Acts 8:18-23.

¹²¹ Rom. 8:22.

¹²² Ps. 42:1.

¹²³ Acts 16:31.

¹²⁴ Ps. 76:10.

¹²⁵ D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," Book IX, chap. 8.

¹²⁶ D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," Book XIV, chap. 1.

¹²⁷ Dr. W. W. Everts (Baptist). In a State Sunday convention at Elgin, Ill., Nov. 8, 1887.

¹²⁸ Matt. 22:29.

¹²⁹ "History of Romanism," Book II, chap. 1.

¹³⁰ D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," Book VIII, chap. 6.

¹³¹ Eze. 18:20.

¹³² "History of the Reformation," Book XIII, chap. 6.

- ¹³³ "A Catholic Dictionary," published by Benziger Bros., "Printers to the Holy Apostolic See," New York, 1808. All italics ours.—ED.
- ¹³⁴ "Faith of Our Fathers," p. 97, edition of 1893.
- ¹³⁵ "A Catholic Dictionary," Art. "Conscience."
- ¹³⁶ "Faith of Our Fathers," p. 208; edition of 1893.
- ¹³⁷ *Id.*, p. 254.
- ¹³⁸ D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," Book XX, chap. 15. Italics ours.—ED.
- ¹³⁹ *Ib.*
- ¹⁴⁰ For the facts and particulars, see *Missionary Review of the World*, for February.
- ¹⁴¹ "History of the World," Vol. III, chap. xlvii.
- ¹⁴² *Ib.*
- ¹⁴³ 2 Cor. 3:17.
- ¹⁴⁴ Rom. 8:2.
- ¹⁴⁵ Gal. 2:20.
- ¹⁴⁶ "Church History," Vol. II, p. 298.
- ¹⁴⁷ Eusebius Life of Constantine, book iv., chap. xx.
- ¹⁴⁸ Torrey's Neander, p. 300.
- ¹⁴⁹ *Ib.*
- ¹⁵⁰ *Ib.*, note 5.
- ¹⁵¹ *Ib.*
- ¹⁵² *Ib.*
- ¹⁵³ *Id.* p. 301.
- ¹⁵⁴ Schaff's Church History, Vol. II, sec. 27.
- ¹⁵⁵ Church History, p. 217.
- ¹⁵⁶ From chap. V., "Rights of the People."
- ¹⁵⁷ John 6:15.
- ¹⁵⁸ Matt. 26:52.

- ¹⁵⁹ John 18:36.
- ¹⁶⁰ 2 Cor. 10:3, 5.
- ¹⁶¹ Matt. 18:37, 39.
- ¹⁶² Matt. 8:12.
- ¹⁶³ John 3:17.
- ¹⁶⁴ 2 Cor. 4:19, 20.
- ¹⁶⁵ Luke 6:27, 28.
- ¹⁶⁶ History of the World, Vol. II, chap. XVII.
- ¹⁶⁷ History of the World, Vol. II, chap. XVII.
- ¹⁶⁸ *Ib.*
- ¹⁶⁹ *Ib.*
- ¹⁷⁰ *Ib.* chap. XVIII.
- ¹⁷¹ *Ib.*
- ¹⁷² Taken by us from the "Christian Citizenship edition" of *The Recorder*, of Flint, Michigan, March, 1896.
- ¹⁷³ Mark 16:16.
- ¹⁷⁴ Rev. 11:15.
- ¹⁷⁵ 2 Peter 3:1-13.
- ¹⁷⁶ Isa. 53:24.
- ¹⁷⁷ Luke 20:35, 36.
- ¹⁷⁸ Ps. 2:8, 9.
- ¹⁷⁹ See "Communism in the Pulpit," New York *Independent*, March 26, 1896.
- ¹⁸⁰ John 6:15.
- ¹⁸¹ Luke 12:14.
- ¹⁸² James 4:12.
- ¹⁸³ Century Dictionary, "Law."
- ¹⁸⁴ "History of the Reformation," Book XIII, chap. I.

- ¹⁸⁵ *Id.*, Book IX., chap. VIII.
- ¹⁸⁶ *Id.*, Book VII, chap. I.
- ¹⁸⁷ Cowper.
- ¹⁸⁸ Luther.
- ¹⁸⁹ From Madison's Memorial to the Virginia Legislators, 1785.
- ¹⁹⁰ Torrey's translation of Neander's "Church History," Vol. I, p. 86.
- ¹⁹¹ *Id.*
- ¹⁹² Acts 16:16-24.
- ¹⁹³ Acts 16:37-39.
- ¹⁹⁴ "Sketches from the Life of Paul," p. 76.
- ¹⁹⁵ Acts 22:24-29.
- ¹⁹⁶ Acts 25:2-11.
- ¹⁹⁷ Acts 25:25-27.
- ¹⁹⁸ Acts 26:22, 23; 27-29.
- ¹⁹⁹ Encyclopedia Britannica, Art. Henry IV.
- ²⁰⁰ "Life Inside the Church of Rome," page 4 of preface.
- ²⁰¹ Book XVIII., chap. I., section VII., under "Reflections on the Conduct of the Romans," etc.
- ²⁰² Millman's "History of Latin Christianity," book 2, chap. 4.
- ²⁰³ Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. V., p. 405.
- ²⁰⁴ Thomas Armitage, D.D., LL. D., author of "History of the Baptists."
- ²⁰⁵ Rev. R. Furman, D. D.
- ²⁰⁶ Vol. IV., p. 528.
- ²⁰⁷ Rev. R. Furman, D.D.
- ²⁰⁸ Lowell's "Present Crisis."
- ²⁰⁹ Sir Henry Taylor.
- ²¹⁰ Jefferson's "Notes on Virginia," Query XVII.

²¹¹ Dr. David McAllister, editor *Christian Statesman*, in Report of Hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, March 11, 1806, page 29.

²¹² "Jew and Gentile," Vol. I, p. 65.

²¹³ Vol. II, p. 185.

²¹⁴ All paganism is at bottom a worship of nature in some form or other, and in all pagan religions the deepest and most awe-inspiring attribute of nature was its power of reproduction. The mystery of birth and becoming was the deepest mystery of nature; it lay at the root of all thoughtful paganism, and appeared in various forms, some of a more innocent, others of a most debasing type.—*Encyclopedia Britannica*, Article "Christianity."

²¹⁵ "Ancient Religions," p. 17.

²¹⁶ See "Encyclopedia Britannica," Vol. III., p. 198.

²¹⁷ "Schaff-Herzog," Vol. IV., Art. Tammuz.

²¹⁸ "Ancient Religions," p. 20.

²¹⁹ "Armenian Poems," page 4 of Introduction.

²²⁰ Article "Armenia."

²²¹ Archbishop Khorine Nar Bey De Lusignan, a descendant of the last dynasty of Armenian kings. He was an eloquent preacher and a distinguished poet. He died at Constantinople in 1892, poisoned, it was commonly believed, by emissaries of the Turkish Government for political reasons.

²²² Michael Ghazarian Nalbandian, born in Russian Armenia in 1830; died in 1866 of lung disease, contracted while confined in a Russian prison as a political suspect. He was a graduate of the University of St. Petersburg. His writings and picture are alike forbidden in Russia, but both are secretly circulated.

²²³ The article to which reference is here made will appear shortly in tract form as a number of the "Religious Liberty Library."

²²⁴ "History of European Morals," Vol. I, page 308.

²²⁵ *Id.*, page 403.

²²⁶ "Three Episodes of Massachusetts History," Vol. I. page 477.

²²⁷ *Id.*, pages 480, 481.

²²⁸ All italics in these extracts are ours.—ED. SENTINEL.

²²⁹ 90 Ga. 396-399.

²³⁰ "Church and State," by James T. Ringgold, Dean of the Baltimore Law School, and author of "The Law of Sunday," etc.

²³¹ For the facts here referred to, see articles in our issue of February 27, by Chas. E. Buell, Chief of the Division of Church Statistics in the 11th U.S. Census.

²³² "Limitations of Police Power," pp. 175-6, see 76. The italics ours in both this and in other citations in this article.

²³³ "Constitutional Limitations," p. 585, ch. xiii (ca. 1890).

²³⁴ "Testimony for the Church," Vol. I, p. 212.

²³⁵ Gen. 14.

²³⁶ Patriarchs and Prophets, chap. 12, par. 12.

²³⁷ *Id.*, par. 14.