

The Signs of the Times, Vol. 22 (1896)

March 19, 1896

"The Logic of Religious Legislation" *The Signs of the Times* 22, 12 , p. 9 .

BY A. T. JONES

IF the principle be admitted that the state has the right to legislate in regard to religion, and to enforce religious observances, then no blame can ever be attached to the Roman Empire for putting the Christians to death. Nor can it be admitted that such dealings with the Christians was persecution.

The enforcement of right laws can never be persecution, however severely the law may deal with the offender. To hand a murderer is not persecution. To hunt him down, even with bloodhounds, to bring him to justice, is not persecution. We repeat, therefore, that the enforcement of right laws never can be persecution.

If, therefore, religion or religious observances be a proper subject of legislation by civil government, then there never has been and there never can be any such thing as religious persecution. Because civil governments are ruled by majorities, the religion of the majority must of necessity be the adopted religion; and if civil legislation in civil things be right, the majority may legislate in regard to their own religion. Such laws made in such a case must be right laws, and the enforcement of them therefore can never be persecution.

July 2, 1896

"What Is Patriotism in America?" ¹¹ *The Signs of the Times* 22, 26 , pp. 2-7 (402-407).

An address by
ALONZO T. JONES

(Author of the "Two Republics," "Rights of the People," etc.)

The Great Principle Involved—The Struggle in Virginia—Memorials by Presbyterians and Baptists—Work of Jefferson and Madison—Declaration of Independence—Object of the Constitution—Recent Decision of the Supreme Court—The Steps Romeward—Our Duty.

FELLOW-CITIZENS, LOVERS OF RIGHT AND TRUTH: As announced, I am to discuss before you this afternoon, "What Is Patriotism in This Country?" That is a question which needs now to be understood. Of course, in any country, in brief, patriotism is love of country. But love of country is more than love of the

mountains and hills, the plains, valleys, rivers, and rills of which the country is made up. So I will read the established definition of patriotism, in order that we may proceed on firm ground: "Patriotism is the spirit which prompts obedience to the laws of one's country, and to the support and defense of its existence, rights, and institutions." So you can see that love of country extends to the love of its institutions and the principles which make a country what it is in all respects. If it were simply the mountains and hills, valleys and plains, of which the country is made up, I could be just as patriotic in Germany as I can here. Yet

403

can therefore see that it is not the material earth, but the principles, which make the country what it is.

The Principles of This Government.

In order for us to know what patriotism is in this country, it will be necessary for us to know what the principles are which make this country what it is, and what it has been all these years, and to see what will be the results if these principles are not maintained; because there is no question whatever but what the principles upon which the nation was founded in the beginning are what has made the country what it has been all this time. And any forgetting or violation of these principles must destroy our country for what it has been, and make it precisely what these feared it would be who made it what they did make, in order that it might be what it has been.

The Great Principle Involved.

The chief principle which is now involved in national existence was the chief one which was involved when the country was made, when the government was established; and that is the question of religion and the state. What are their relationship, if they have any? How shall they stand one towards the other if there be any relationship between them? It is to these questions and that particular principle to which I shall call your attention to-day; because, as our fathers well knew and said, it is only in the separation of religion and the state that religious liberty can ever be assured to the people; and only by religious liberty being assured to the people can civil liberty ever be assured to the people.

Before the Declaration of Independence was made, the colony of Virginia published a declaration of principles, of which this is a part:—

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 of violence, and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience.

That was made before the Declaration of Independence. Virginia had an established religion, as the colonies all had, except Rhode Island, and they were trying to free themselves from the establishment of religion. That was the first step. As soon as the Declaration of Independence had been made, the

Presbyterians, Quakers, and Baptists of Virginia followed the lead that was made by the Colonial Legislature and sent in a petition to the General Assembly, asking for the disestablishment of religion in the new state of Virginia; and one reason which they gave for the disestablishment of religion was this:—

It is impossible for the magistrate 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.* ²²

That petition was presented to the Legislature, where Jefferson and Madison actively supported it. Washington was not in a place where he could support it at that time, but he did support it, however. But Jefferson and Madison were the leaders in the support of that petition for the disestablishment of religion in Virginia. The bill passed, and religion was disestablished in Virginia. No sooner was that done, however, than an attempt was made to re-establish it. That campaign had been conducted practically, you see, against the establishment of some particular church. The Episcopal Church was the established church at that time, and the campaign being conducted along this line, the minds of the people had been directed only to the disestablishment of a particular church or the separation of a particular church from the state. So that when that church was disestablished, and there was a separation of church and state in that sense, there was a movement made to establish religion—not any particular denomination, not any particular profession—but general Christianity. This was presented in the form of a bill, and establishing a provision for teachers of *the Christian religion*,—not the teachers of *any particular denomination*. But those who had presented the original petition and carried it through, against the establishment of religion, knew that the principles upon which they had done that were equally involved in this other, and, in the right against it, they put forth the same arguments with more added to them. They said again, if that is done, somebody will have to decide what is the Christian religion, and, in order to do that, as there are many phases of the Christian religion, and many denominations, each one professing to be the Christian religion, it will devolve upon the magistrate in some way to decide which one of these denominations most fully represents the Christian religion, and just as soon as that is done by the magistrate, it will lead the nation and the people back to the Church of Rome; and they said, We don't want that. So they repeated that "it is impossible for the magistrate 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." They truly ask:—

Who does not see 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 in exclusion of all other sects?

Who does not see that now? They supposed everybody ought to see that. There were enough in Virginia to see it, and to say that it could not be done. Who does not see now that the same authority that can establish the Christian religion in exclusion of all other religions, can also establish any particular sect of religion

in exclusion of all other sects. They said that the first principles of this bill "differed from the Inquisition only in degree." They said this was only "the first step," to which the Inquisition would certainly be the "last, in the career of the intolerance;" and they did not propose to take that first step.

Again they said that "it is right for every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience," and that he was responsible only to the Judge of all for the exercise of that right. That principle was the principle upon which the Gospel was first propagated, the principle of the Reformation from popery. That right of worship can never be transferred to another. So you can see that the one thing above every other thing that our fathers had in mind when they established religious liberty in this country, was to escape the domination of the Church of Rome. They said so in so many words. They said, "We want the people and the country to be kept forever free from it." Now, in order that the people and the country may be kept free from the domination of the Church of Rome, they saw that it was essential that no favor be shown to any religion by law or by the government in any way. They said that in so many words, they said it plainly, and they stuck to it, until religious liberty absolute and complete was established in the state of Virginia. This was before the na-

404

tional government was formed, while these colonies had become free and independent states, as of right they ought to be.

Now, that was done after a long discussion, in which Jefferson was engaged. It continued nearly ten years. It took nearly ten years to decide that contest in the state of Virginia. But so certain did it appear that the bill establishing a provision for teachers of Christian religion would pass if it were allowed to come before the assembly, that a motion was made simply to gain time. They were so certain that it would pass, that Jefferson and Madison did not want it to come to a vote. Madison made a motion that the whole subject be postponed until the next General Assembly. In the meantime, however, the bill was printed and distributed among the people, so that the next General Assembly could be instructed upon the question when they came together, and could vote directly upon the instructions which they had received. Fortunately, the motion was carried. As soon as this was accomplished, Madison wrote a remonstrance against it, and, along with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, it was one of the

Grandest Public Documents

that was ever made. Most people have forgotten that it ever existed, and many who remember that it existed have forgotten what it says. But I hope you will never rest until you hunt up that memorial and remonstrance which was written by Madison at that time, and read it over and over again until every principle and every sentence in it become ingrained in your very make-up. That you may see what is involved in it, I will read only a few passages from the remonstrance; but before doing that I will read a few sentences from the bill that was framed by Thomas Jefferson—

Well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free; that 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; that 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 and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring 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 [Of course it was so. Our fathers were right on that subject, and we, their children, need to see what they said, and remain right]; that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical. ³³

That is so. Yet doubtless you all know that within the last ten years the United States Government, and you the people, and we the people, who compose the government, have been compelled to pay out money for the propagation of opinions which we did not believe. The Congress of the United States has been making contributions of money to several different churches in the past, but now to the Catholic Church alone, because the others got ashamed of it and quit. But this present year hundreds of thousands of dollars of United States money has gone to the Catholic Church for the propagation of her opinions. Well, Jefferson and our fathers said this thing was sinful and tyrannical. William S. Linton, of Michigan, went up to Congress, and he made such a stir over the thing that it is being shut down upon, but not nearly as suddenly as it ought to be.

It is the same way with religion in the schools, taxing them to pay contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which they do not believe. It will never do. I read further:—

Be it therefore enacted by the General Assembly, That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, or molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or beliefs; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in nowise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

Now for the remonstrance by Madison, in 1779:—

We the subscribers, citizens of the said commonwealth, having taken into serious consideration a bill printed by order of the last session of the General Assembly, entitled "A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion," and conceiving that the same, if finally armed with the sanction of law, will be a dangerous abuse of power, are bound as faithful members of a free state, to remonstrate against it, and to declare the reasons by which we are determined. We remonstrate against the said bill:—

Because 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 upon the evidence contemplated in their own minds, can not follow the dictates of other men. It is unalienable also, because what is here right towards men is a duty towards the Creator. . . . True it is that no other rule exists by which any question which may divide a society can be ultimately determined than the will of the majority; but it is also true that the majority may trespass upon the rights of the minority. ⁴⁴

These were some of the things that were said, I read simply enough to show you the trend of the document. It was knowing what was in that and sticking to it that made our country what it was, and what it has been all these years, and only by knowing that and sticking to it, can the country remain what it has been, the home, the very citadel, of liberty, both civil and religious, for all mankind.

Now, the two points which we have made so far are these: Our fathers wanted the country and the people to be forever free from the domination of Rome and popery, and in order to do that they said that the government must be free, and separated entirely from any religion of any kind, in any way, and that by doing that they would be sure of *not being led back to Rome*.

The Constitution.

It is now proper for us to look around and see if there are any special principles being revived, against which our fathers fought in the establishment of this government; and if we find such, then learn from the original principles of this government, and the fathers of this government, just what to do. "Patriotism," "patriotic," and "patriot" all come from a Greek word referring to forefathers. So patriotism in a country, love of country, is not simply the love of the earth and the mountains of which the country is composed, but of the institutions and the principles which our forefathers established, which have made our country what it has been so far. Now, let us look again at what they said.

There was a movement then to establish religion, and those who opposed it were charged with anarchy, atheism, and every other epithet that the people chose to apply to them; but they were right, and they knew it, and they held to the right, regardless of what the people said.

While that campaign was going on in Virginia, which finally ended in the passage of this bill written by Jefferson, and which was finally passed by a majority of four to one in the Legislature, the national government was being formed. The people generally were discussing the relation of religion to the state, and the relation of the Christian religion to the state, and these principles of religious liberty went into the United States Constitution.

When the Constitution was presented to the people, there was this declaration, and only one upon this subject, that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust in these United States. That was right; but that is all that the original Constitution said upon the subject. The Constitution of the United States was thus made, deriving its powers from the people, and those powers were delegated powers only, and the powers not delegated were reserved. If the Constitution said nothing upon the subject, it would have been forever excluded, but they did not show their opinion that no religious test should ever be required as a qualification for any public office in these United States.

That was submitted to the people in just that way, but the people were not satisfied that the Constitution should simply say nothing particular on the subject. The people insisted that the Constitution should declare in so many words that the government should not legislate on the question of religion. So when the Constitution was submitted to the people for ratification, objection was made to it in every state upon this point, and in some of the states, the only condition upon which they would ratify it was upon the consideration that an amendment would be made to the Constitution, stating that the government should not legislate upon religious matters.

Influence of Massachusetts.

Everything depended upon whether it was ratified by Massachusetts. If she refused to ratify it, her influence would defeat it. In the convention in which Massachusetts decided to ratify the Constitution, this very subject of its relationship to religion was discussed fully, and it was decided in favor of the government having nothing whatever to do with any question of religion. So you see the question was discussed in the making of the Constitution, and the one state whose influence in the ratification of the Constitution carried the rest, and assured the Constitution and government as our fathers made it—the one question upon which they stood was the question of the relation of the church and state, and in the first amendment which was made to the Constitution, it was declared that "*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*"

Then in 1797 Washington made that treaty with Tripoli, in which he and the fathers who originally made the Constitution, and had discussed this question thoroughly, said that "the government of the United States is

405

not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion."

You see, therefore, from the Declaration of Independence to the adoption of the national Constitution and the first amendment to it, the one subject which led all other subjects, was that question of the separation, the utter separation, of religion from legislation. And why was it done?—Done that this country might not be led back to the Church of Rome. They said so. It was done in order that popery might not dominate here. They said so. That is the principle upon which the government was founded, and it is patriotism to stick to these principles.

But now, mark, in order that that might be done, they said that no legislation in favor of Christianity and no magistrate's decision can be allowed; for it is impossible for the magistrate to do this without leading us back to the Church of Rome.

Well, now, we are ready to see whether anything has been done, whether any of these consequences have begun to follow. I suppose that you here are familiar with the fact that the Church of Rome has made some statements with reference to taking possession of this country. She has made them, and she has made them plainly, all the way down from Leo XIII. to names that are familiar with you here in San Francisco. But, friends, I am compelled to say to you, and I will give you evidence that will satisfy you, that the Church of Rome has more foundation for that than perhaps you have thought, and more than a good many people have thought, because of there having been done that thing which our fathers said never could be done without leading us back to the Church of Rome. This thing has been done in an official way, so that there has been an official foundation laid for Rome to assert predominance. That is the worst part of the thing. If there were no foundation upon which she could stand and make her declaration, there would not be near so much in it, altho there is enough in that statement whenever it is made, to cause the people to wake up and say that it is time to look out.

The Steps Romeward

Now, in 1892, the Supreme Court declared in a decision from the bench, that "this is a Christian nation." Our fathers said it is impossible for the magistrate to do anything of the kind "without erecting a claim to infallibility, which would lead us back to the Church of Rome." The Supreme Court did it, and then entered upon a long argument to prove it. It is true that they did not get any evidence from Jefferson, or Madison, or Washington, but they did from Ferdinand and Isabella, who established the Inquisition. The first citation which the Supreme Court of the United States makes to prove that this is a Christian nation in the meaning of the Constitution, is a quotation from Ferdinand and Isabella in sending out Columbus to take possession of the lands he should discover, in the name of the Catholic god. Now, if nothing more than that had been done, you could see what would inevitably follow. When the Supreme Court of the United States said this is a Christian nation, and proved it by documents of Ferdinand and Isabella, Rome said, "Of course it is, and it is a Catholic Christian nation." This is the mischief of the thing. She has said that over and over. She has said it since that declaration was made by the Supreme Court of the United States. She said it upon the declaration of the Supreme Court, and proofs furnished by the court. I do not say that she is right. I do not say that the court is right; but when the Court lays the foundation, is it surprising that she should build upon it?

That decision was rendered in February, 1892. In July of that same year, Leo XIII. published a letter in the United States, in which he said:—

"What the Church has done for other nations in the past, she will now do for the United States."

But she never said it before.

By the way, friends, I will not call your attention to a list of things which have occurred in succession from the time that that declaration of the Supreme Court was made up to last spring. The court said "this is a Christian nation," and produced a long argument to prove it. In July 11 of that same year that letter of Leo XIII. was published, stating that what the church had done for other nations in the past, she would now do for the United States. In October of the same year Francis Satolli was sent to this country, a personal representative of the pope, ostensibly to represent the pope's interests, but in reality to be a permanent delegate at the capital of the nation. September 5, 1893, at the World's Catholic Congress in Chicago, this same Satolli delivered to the Catholics of America the following message from Leo XIII.—

In the name of Leo XIII. I salute the great American republic;
and I call upon the Catholics of America to go forward, in one hand
bearing the book of Christian truth, and in the other the Constitution
of the United States. ⁵⁵

What has given Leo a love for the Constitution of the United States all at once?—The interpretation of the Supreme Court of the United States, saying that it is the meaning of the Constitution that "this is a Christian nation," and proving it by documents of Ferdinand and Isabella. That it is which has opened the way for Leo to express his great love for the Constitution of the United States.

How did they look upon it in 1871? I read from the *Catholic World* of that year (September, p. 736), the article if by Dr. Bronson, and he stated this in speaking of the Constitution:—

As it is interpreted by the liberal and sectarian journals that are doing their best to revolutionize it, and is beginning to be interpreted by no small portion of the American people, or *is interpreted by the Protestant principle*, so widely diffused among us, . . . *we do not accept it*, or hold it to be *any government at all, or as capable of performing any of the proper functions of government*; and if it continues to be interpreted by the revolutionary principles of Protestantism it is sure to fail. . . . Here it is we so often say that if the American republic is to be sustained and preserved at all, it must be by the *rejection of the principles of the Reformation*, and the *acceptance of the Catholic principle* by the American people. ⁶⁶

Now, then, what did our fathers say in making the Constitution?—That it is the right of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, and that is according to the principles upon which the Gospel was first propagated and the Reformation from popery carried on; and this right can never be transferred to another. This is the principle of the Constitution as our fathers made it; and they said so. But these said that that principle of the Constitution as thus interpreted, they did not accept, and did not recognize the government as having any of the proper functions of government at all, and that it could only live by the rejection of the Protestant principle and the accepting of the Catholic principle. And the Supreme Court of the United States did reject that principle of

our fathers, when they made that decision, and they did accept and lay down the principle of Catholicism. Then it was that the Catholics could accept the Constitution of the United States, and go forward bearing the Constitution of the country in one hand and the Catholic Bible in the other—for what? This is for what:—

Bring your fellow-countrymen [I continue to read from Satolli's address], bring *your country*, into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness—Christ and his church.

Now, to bring this country into immediate connection with any church is not patriotism as our fathers established it. Never! This commission of Satolli's can never be patriotism. They may profess it all they choose, but it is not that. It is directly in opposition to and violation of the governmental principles which our fathers established. But I say again, they are not making these statements without some foundation; and the Supreme Court laid the foundation for them, and it is not surprising that they should build upon it; but it is time that the American people waked up and saw to it that neither they nor the Supreme Court of the United States build upon it.

A Parallel Case

The Supreme Court of these United States once said that the black man had no rights which the white man was bound to respect. Abraham Lincoln said that was not true. He said that that decision was wrong. The courts said that was what the Constitution meant, what the Constitution was intended to mean and did mean. Abraham Lincoln said that decision was wrong, and being wrong must be reversed. It is time that the American people should follow the example of Abraham Lincoln, and say that this decision of the Supreme Court in reference to this being a Christian nation is wrong and must be reversed. Upon that question in that day Abraham Lincoln stood. When a white man governs himself, that is self-government; but when he attempts to govern another, that is more than self-government, that is despotism. If any man chooses to be religious for himself, that is religious liberty; but when any man or any set of men chooses to be religious for themselves and for others too, that is

406

despotism—religious despotism. When any man calls for legal recognition of his religious opinions, he proposes in that to be religious for himself and for the other man too, and when we have that, civil liberty is gone. Well, Satolli's speech continues:—

Here you have a country which will repay all effort not merely tenfold, but a hundred-fold. And this no one understands better than the immortal Leo. And *he charges me*, his delegate, to speak out to America words of hope and blessing, words of joy. Go forward, in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth—the Bible—and in the other the Constitution of the United States.

But what are they to do that for?—They are to do that in order to "bring this country into immediate connection with that great secret of blessedness, Christ

and his church." It was on September 5, 1893, that that was said. On September 24, of the same year Prof. T. O'Gorman, of the Catholic University at Washington, stated this in the World's Parliament of Religions: "That by right of discovery and possession, dating back almost nine hundred years, America is Christian," and he then cited evidence in proof of "an acquaintance between America and the church in times when the only Christianity in existence was Catholic," and that therefore this is "a nation that shall find its perfection only in *Catholic* Christianity." He had a basis for this statement that by right of discovery and possession this country is Catholic. The Supreme Court settled that question, and proved that it was so, because Ferdinand and Isabella started Columbus to discover and bring it under their dominion, and the only religion at that time was the Catholic religion. If this country is Christian by right of discovery and possession, then it is *Catholic* Christian.

Rome and America.

October 18, 19, 1893, the jubilee and Cardinal Gibbons was held at Baltimore. The night of the 18th Archbishop Ireland delivered a speech, in which he said:—

I preach the *new*, the most glorious crusade. Church and age! *Unite them* in mind, in the name of humanity, in the name of God. Church and age! . . . Monsignor Satolli, the church, and the age. ROME IS THE CHURCH; AMERICA IS THE AGE.

That means a union of Rome and America,—church and state united. But our fathers said that must never be. They established the Constitution against that idea.

At a banquet the next night Vice President Stevenson sat on the right hand of the cardinal. Archbishop Ireland was called upon and made another speech. At the table he said:—

I do not know whether or not you appreciate the full value of *the union* you see typified here to-night,—the *union* of the *Catholic Church and America*; the fraternity between the church and the non-Catholics of the nation. The Vice President of the United States come here and takes his seat alongside of the cardinal. The spirit of fraternity *between church and state* thus typified, is the result of *the work of our American cardinal*.

On September 21, 1894, Bishop Keene came back from Rome, having been there on a mission, and in an interview said:—

The policy of the pope in view of the recent overtures in Italy, is the *union of the church with* the great democratic powers of the future—that is, *America* and France. This is his hope, and toward it all his remarkable energies are bent.

So it stands plainly stated that all Leo's remarkable energies are bent to the union of the Catholic Church and America. Three days later, September 24, the newspaper despatches stated that Bishop Keene was the bearer of a rescript from Pope Leo XIII., the import of which was as follows:—

The papal rescript *elevates the United States to the first rank as a Catholic nation.*

But where did that idea start? In 1871 it was not recognized as a Catholic nation. Not until 1892, when the Supreme Court made its decision,—not until then did Rome say that it was a *Catholic* nation, because it was discovered by Catholics. Rome is logical enough to find an argument; but I hope the American people will be logical enough to find an argument which will annihilate that argument. The despatch continues:—

By the new rescript the country is freed from the propaganda, and is *declared to be a Catholic country.* . . . The importance not only to Catholics, but to all citizens of the United States, *of this radical change* in the relations to Rome of the church in America, can scarcely be overestimated.

But what would any citizen, in the mind of Rome, have to be, to be concerned in the declaration that this is a Catholic country? Do you not see that they propose to take possession of it, citizens and all? It is important that American citizens should look into this thing and see what there is in it.

A letter from the Vatican dated October 14, 1894, to the New York Sun, republished in the Philadelphia *Catholic Standard*, says:—

The United States of America, it can be said without exaggeration, are the chief thought of Leo XIII. in the government of the Roman and Universal Catholic Church. . . . A few days ago, on receiving an eminent American, Leo XIII. said to him, "But the United States are the future; we think of them incessantly!" [There is no doubt that that is so.] This ever ready sympathy has its base in the fundamental interests of the holy see, in a peculiar conception of the part to be played and the position to be held by the church and the Papacy in the times to come. That is why Leo XIII. turns all his soul, full of ideality, to what is improperly called his American policy. It should be rightly called his *Catholic universal policy.*

Again Leo says (encyclical of Jan. 6, 1895), "She [the church] would bring forth more abundant fruits, if in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the *favor of the laws, and the patronage of the public authority.*" That is his encyclical to the people of the United States. Liberty is not enough. She must have possession and power. Now, let us see. The decision of the Supreme Court is final in every sense and every respect. But the Supreme Court has said that "this is a Christian nation." That is intended to be final and everlasting, and she can build upon it what she chooses. Here is a statement of Father Lyons, of Baltimore:—

It is strange that a rule which requires a Supreme Court to give final decisions on disputed points in our Constitution, should be abused and slandered when employed by the Catholic Church. Citizens and others may read the Constitution, but they are not allowed to interpret it for themselves, but must submit to the interpretation given by the Superior [Supreme?] Court.—*Catholic Mirror, March 2, 1895.*

Are you ready to accept that doctrine? American people, are you ready to accept that doctrine? Never! You ought to understand, then, what use is being made of it. Abraham Lincoln said it was a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. The people made the Constitution, and the people can interpret the Constitution when its courts interpret it wrong. The people took up the Dred Scott Decision, and they interpreted the Constitution quite another way, and they had a right to do so. And upon that subject, and in defense of that principle, Abraham Lincoln took his stand before the people. The people of these United States have the rightful mastery of both Congresses and courts,—not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the decisions of the men who pervert it. The people are the supreme authority, and to them the last appeal goes. They put infallibility in no man, neither executive nor judicial. You see, therefore, that the doctrine is a mistake that the people are not allowed to interpret the Constitution for themselves. But he goes on:—

The Bible is the constitution of the Catholic Church, and while all are exhorted to read this constitution, the interpretation of its true meaning must be left to the superior court of the church founded by Christ. The decision of our Federal Supreme Court is final; the *decision of the superior court of the church is final also.*

So you see where they are running that parallel. When the Supreme Court cries out, "This is a Christian nation," Rome says "That is so, and that decision is final, and the proof that the court presented is correct. Ferdinand did issue that document giving Columbus authority to discover countries and bring them to the religion of Ferdinand and Isabella. That is all correct, and that decision is final; and that being so, this is a Christian Catholic country. And the Catholic Bible is the constitution of the church, the rule of Christian countries; and the superior court of the church is the interpreter of that book, and her interpretations is final. Do you see the logic of the thing? That is where it will lead us if the decision of the Supreme Court be correct. Where is there a flaw in it? Isn't it time that the American people began to think? Isn't it time to find out what is patriotism in the United States?

I will read Satolli's interpretation of the Constitution, and it is important to remember the statements which our fathers made. The *New York Advertiser*, under date of March 11, 1895, points the following:—

Private advices received here give an interesting and important communication from Mgr. Satolli to officials in Guatemala, concerning that country's following the course of Nicaragua in sending to Rome an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary. In the course of the document reference is made as to the *propriety under the United States Constitution of official relations between Washington and Rome*, and an interpretation given of that feature of the Constitution relative to the separation of church and state. Mgr. Satolli's letter was written while negotiations were pending about four months ago. It refers at length to difficulties in church administration in Guatemala, and suggests that certain changes desired by the government would be accompanied

by an equivalent of serious advantage to render less burdensome the condition of the church in Guatemala. The document then adds:—

"The condition of the Catholic Church in the United States, in whose Constitution was inserted the article of separation of the state from any religious sect, can not escape our consideration."

Does he speak of the separation of the state from religion?—No; "from any religious sect." This is the very thing which our fathers repudiated. *They* repudiated the establishment of *any* religion, in order that they might escape dealing with any sect; but now Satolli interprets the Constitution in the very way which our fathers rejected. He will declare that the Catholic religion is not sectarian, that the Catholic Church is not a sect, it is Christianity. Isn't the very name general? Isn't the name universal? The rest of them are all sects. The Baptists are sectarian, the Congregationalists are sectarian, but we are the religion. He continues:—

I might almost say it causes no surprise. If up to date no official relations exist between the government and the holy see [what is the cause?], it is because the great majority of the population is anti-Catholic.

It is not because the Constitution repudiates it, but because the majority of the peo-

407

ple are anti-Catholics. The people can not interpret the Constitution, but Satolli can interpret it. It is not allowed to the people to interpret the Constitution, but the Supreme Court can interpret it, and the court says that this is a Christian nation. Satolli says that you can not say any sect; for the Roman Church is not a sect. It is, therefore, according to the interpretation of the Supreme Court and Rome, a Catholic Christian nation.

It is stated that this is the first time, so far as it is known, that Mgr. Satolli's mission has been extended outside of spiritual questions, and he has dealt with governmental subjects. He had full authority to deal with governmental subjects, but not until the Supreme Court had opened the door for him had he dealt with governmental subjects in relation to his religion.

Now, we have seen what our fathers said when they began to make the nation, that it is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference without erecting a claim to infallibility; and the Supreme Court has done that, and that is leading us right back precisely to that place where our fathers said it was bound to lead us, if that thing was established. That is why it is time to think, friends. That is why it is time to inquire, What is patriotism in the United States?

The Inevitable Logic-Persecution

Now, if it is to be so, that religion is to be an element in the government, and that the government is to recognize Christianity, and is to legislate in behalf of Christianity, then I must submit that the Catholic Church is entitled to get itself recognized if it can. Why not? If the door is opened, and one must be recognized,

that some phase of Christianity must be established, is she to sit still, and let some other one get the power and then oppress her? Are others to sit still and let her get power to oppress them?—No; it is not to be expected that the other churches will sit still and allow her to make use of the governmental power to oppress them. So Protestantism will have to see to it that she gets the recognition of the government; and I have seen Protestants who would not be very gentle toward the Catholics if they had the power.

It there is a likelihood that Protestantism will get governmental recognition, is it to be expected that Catholicism will sit still and say nothing against it, and run no race to reach the goal first? There is where the mischief comes in, in the recognition of religion at all on the part of the government. If the government opens the door, some one will get the power, and any religionists who get the power will use it for the oppression of those who do not agree with them. I care not what religion it is, it will use that power in an oppressive way. It never has failed, and never can fail. I do not care if it be the religion to which I myself belong, let that religion get the power, and there will be oppression. But what I am striving for is to keep myself and all those who are joined with me in religion so filled with the grace of God that they will never want the power. Sometimes people have said to me, "If you had the governmental power, you would be just as bad as they are." Of course I would. I would have to be as bad as they are to get it, and having necessarily to be as bad as they are in order to get it, I would be as bad as they are when I got it; so I want to have so much of the power of the grace of God that I will never want it.

When any one wants to mix religion with civil government, it shows that they have lost the power which belongs to that religion; and when they get a power which does not belong to it, nothing can come but oppression and persecution. Our fathers saw all that; they knew all that, and they hoped to keep this country forever exempt from any phase of it. And, in order to do that, they said that the government never shall have anything to do with the question of religion in any way whatever. They were right; for Jesus Christ himself said, "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not." He said it, and you will find it in John 12:47. That is religious liberty coming from the Lord of mankind. Now if the God of mankind tells us plainly that if any man hears his words and believes not, he will not judge him, you may rest assured that he will never qualify any man or any set of men to put themselves in a position where they will condemn, or slight, or set at naught, any person who does not believe what the Lord says, or what they think he says. It is the devil who has sought to put himself above Jesus Christ. If they put themselves above Jesus Christ, and in the place of God, they are bound to act like the devil. It is so. It is so.

[A voice: "Peter York says it is a lie."]

We are dealing with Jefferson, Washington, Madison, Lincoln, and Jesus Christ, and what they said, and what they did; what Jesus Christ said is religion, and what Jefferson laid down as the principles of civil government, are true principles of liberty, and are what our fathers hoped might forever be maintained. Love of these principles is patriotism in the United States, and Christianity anywhere upon the earth.

September 24, 1896

**"Catholicism vs Christianity. No. 1" *The Signs of the Times* 22, 35 ,
pp. 8, 9 .**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

Every Man His Own Saviour.

"HOW SHALL a man be just with God?" This has been the great inquiry of men ever since the days of the man of Uz, and long before. In fact this has been the great inquiry of all men in all ages; it is the great inquiry still; and is yet to be a far more absorbing topic than it is now.

At each of the three great religious epochs of the world's history—the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage; the Apostolic Age; and the Era of the Reformation—this has been the one great question at issue; and in our day it is again to be the great question at issue in the great controversy which is to be the culmination of all questions and of all earthly ages.

How then are men made righteous—justified, saved from sin—according to the way of the Papacy?—It is by penance. Proof? Here it is: "*Penance*, by which the sins that we commit after baptism are forgiven." "The sacrament of penance, in which the forgiveness of sins is granted to the penitent."—*Catholic Belief*, pp. 80, 366. One of these says that penance is the means by which the sins that we commit "*after baptism*" are forgiven. It is, therefore, important to know when, according to that system, baptism is to be administered; and by this to know how many sins can be committed *before* baptism. Here is the authoritative statement on that point:—

From what has been said, you may well judge how reprehensible is the conduct of Catholic parents who neglect to have their children baptized at *the earliest possible moment*, thereby risking their own souls, as well as the souls of their innocent offspring.—*Faith of Our Fathers*, p. 313.

Well, then, as baptism is to be administered to the child at the earliest possible moment, it were literally impossible for such person ever to commit any sins except after his baptism. And as penance is the means of obtaining the forgiveness of sins committed after baptism, it follows as plainly as that two and two make four, that, according to the Papacy, penance is the way of forgiveness of all sin, is the way of justification, of salvation. There is no escaping this conclusion from these premises. And indeed the Papacy has no desire to escape this conclusion, for this is her specific doctrine.

Penance being the means of justification, the way of salvation from sin, what then is penance? Here is the authoritative answer:—

In the case of those who have fallen into mortal sin after baptism, when the guilt of such sin and the everlasting punishment

due to it are forgiven, there still very often remains a *debt of temporal punishment*, to be paid by the sinner. This *debt* remains, not from any imperfection in the power of absolution in the sacrament of penance, nor from any want of efficacy in the atonement of Jesus Christ; but because by God's will, chastisement for past sins helps us to compensate for the imperfection in our repentance, and serves as a correction.—*Catholic Belief*, p. 191.

Now when the guilt of the sin, and the everlasting punishment due to it, are both forgiven and so have passed from the sinner, and yet he is not saved until a debt of temporal punishment has been paid by himself then upon what does his salvation turn? and who is his saviour?—Plainly his salvation turns altogether upon the punishment; and as this debt of punishment is to be paid by the sinner himself, it just as certainly follows that the sinner is his own saviour. And thus penance, punishment, is the papal way of salvation.

Nor is this all—but the Lord himself is made responsible for it, so that it is literally set forth as the divine way of salvation and the divine means of justification. For it is plainly said that this debt of punishment, to be paid by the guiltless sinner, remains "because *by God's will* chastisement for past sins helps us to compensate [to pay] for the imperfection in our repentance, and serves as a correction." As the Lord forgives both the guilt and the everlasting punishment of the sin, and yet by his own will has fixed it that the sinner must still pay a debt of punishment in order to be justified and saved, then it is certain that according to the papal system, God has made punishment, which is penance, the means of justification and the way of salvation.

And indeed this is also further stated by this same authority, as follows:—

From this we see that . . . he has not dispensed us from doing with the help of his grace what we can to punish ourselves for the offences and outrages we have offered to God. Good sense tells us that this is both right and just.—*ib.*, p. 192.

Everybody who will think on the subject can easily enough see that instead of its being good sense, it is an utter lack of every element of sound sense that tells a man that it is in any sense either right or just that he should punish himself to save himself from himself. Yet as punishment is the only way of salvation known to the Papacy, and as self is its own saviour, even this thing of a man—punishing himself to save himself from himself is logical enough. And so essentially is punishment—penance—the papal way of salvation that even the dying thief, whom the Lord Jesus himself pardoned on the cross, is made to do penance. Here are the words:—

The pardon granted to the penitent thief in the saving words:
"Amen, I say to thee, this day

601

thou shalt be with me in Paradise" (St. Luke 23:43), can not be taken as proof that we are dispensed by God from doing works of penance. *That* was a wonderful and special grace granted under extraordinary circumstances, namely, when the blood of redemption was actually being shed upon the cross; moreover, the dying thief,

besides bearing testimony to the divinity of Jesus Christ, confessed his guilt, and, *in the spirit of penance*, suffered the torment of his crucifixion, and the cruel breaking of his limbs, as penalties justly due to his sins.—*ib.*, p. 193.

All this doctrine that men must punish themselves to save themselves springs from the utterly false, even heathenish, idea that God is harsh, stern, forbidding, and exacting, instead of gentle, loving, winning, and merciful. It looks upon him as so ill-tempered and stern that he has to be "moved" by men's doings so well that they get him into a good humour, and by punishment making themselves such pitiable objects that he can finally be persuaded by the Pope, or somebody else, to yield and "save" them. And here is that thought authoritatively expressed:—

We stand in continual need of actual graces to perform good acts, both before and after being justified. . . . The good acts, however, done by the help of grace *before justification*, are not, *strictly* speaking, meritorious, but serve *to smooth the way* to justification, *to move God*.—*ib.*, pp. 76, 77.

Thus by her own showing, the god of the Papacy is of such a disposition and character that it is necessary for *men*, wicked men, to do "good acts" in order to move him; and then, after they have thus moved him, it is still essential that they shall pay "a debt of temporal punishment," in order to induce him to allow them the justification which they have so hardly earned. To such a god as that it is no wonder that the Inquisition is a pleasing tribute.

This is self-salvation as set forth by the Papacy. Next week we will consider a few scriptures setting forth God's way of saving men.

October 8, 1896

"Catholicism vs Christianity. No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 22, 40 , p. 6 .

BY ALONZO T. JONES

The Free Salvation of God.

THE article on the Catholic doctrine of penance, which makes every man his own saviour, closed two weeks ago with the statement:

Thus by her own showing, the god of the Papacy is of such a disposition and character that it is necessary for *men*, wicked men, to do 'good acts' in order to move him; and then, after they have thus moved him, it is still essential that they shall pay 'a debt of temporal punishment' in order to induce him to allow them the justification which they have so hardly earned."

But such is not the God of the Bible. Such is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Such is not his way of justifying men. Such is not his way of salvation. Here is his own announcement of his name, which is simply the

proclamation of his character and his disposition toward all mankind: "I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee. . . . And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed: The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." This is the true God.

"Merciful"—full of the disposition to treat people better than they deserve. Mercy is not to treat people as they deserve. Mercy is not to treat people better than they deserve, in an outward way. It is not to wait till one is "moved" by good deeds and punishments to grant what has been thus already caused. No, no. It is the *disposition*, the very heart's core of the being, to treat all persons better than they deserve. This is the Lord, the true God. "He doth not afflict from the heart, nor grieve the children of men." Lam. 3:33, margin. "He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust." Ps. 103:10-14. His mercy is great above the greatness of the heavens. Ps. 118:4.

"Gracious"—extending favor. And that without measure; for it is written: "Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." Eph. 4:7. And the measure of the gift of Christ is but the measure of "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." And this is the measure of the full and free favor that God has extended to every soul on this earth, just where he is, and just as he is. And this boundless grace to ever one, brings salvation to every one in the same measure as is given the grace, which is the measure of the gift of Christ. For again it is written: "The grace of God *which bringeth salvation*, hath appeared to all men." Titus 2:11. As the grace, the favor, of God is full and free to every one; and as this grace brings salvation; so the salvation of God is a full and free gift to every one. Tho it is freely given, he will compel no one to take it. As it is freely given, it must be freely received. And the receiving of the free gift of God is the exercise of the faith which he has also freely given to every man. "For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, *it is the gift of God.*" Eph. 2:8. "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed." Rom. 4:16.

This is God's way of justification; by grace, through faith; and of faith, that it might be by grace. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare *his righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past, through *the forbearance* of God." Rom. 3:24, 25. Justification is the free gift of God through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, who is altogether the free gift of God. For "as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon *all men to justification* of life." Rom. 5:18. And the receiving of this gift of justification, this gift of righteousness, as the free gift of God which it is, this is the exercise of the faith which God has given. And this is justification, this is righteousness, *by*

faith: "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference." Rom 3:22. The faith being the gift of God, the righteousness which it brings and which it wrought by it is the righteousness of God. And this is righteousness, justification, *by faith alone*, of which by her own boast the Catholic Church knows nothing; and in so boasting advertises her utter lack of Christianity.

True, men are to repent, and they will repent when they find God as he is in truth, as he is revealed in Jesus Christ. For "it is the goodness of God" that leads men to repentance; and repentance itself is the gift of God. Rom. 2:4; Acts 5:31. True repentance being the gift of God, is perfect in itself, and needs no punishing of ourselves to compensate for the imperfection in it. But when the repentance is of ourselves, it has no merit that can bring to us any good, and all the punishment of ourselves that could ever be inflicted by ourselves or in ten thousand purgatories never could compensate for the imperfection of it. For it is simply impossible for any man to save himself by punishment or in any other way.

The salvation, the justification, offered to mankind by Christianity, is altogether of God by faith. The salvation, the justification, offered to mankind by the Papacy, is altogether of self by penance. The salvation offered by Christianity saves to the uttermost all who will receive it. The salvation offered by the Papacy brings to utter destruction all who follow after it. And yet the professed Protestantism of to-day recognizes "Christianity" in the Papacy! Than this, nothing could possibly show more plainly how completely apostate such Protestantism is, not only from true Protestantism, but also from true Christianity.

October 15, 1896

**"Catholicism vs Christianity. No. 3" *The Signs of the Times* 22, 41 ,
pp. 4, 5 .**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

LAST week we considered the free salvation of God by the faith that is the free gift of God, the faith that works by love.

The Catholic Denial of Faith.

Now of this faith it is the boast of the Catholic Church that she knows nothing. This is the very doctrine of faith, and of justification by faith, which produced the Reformation and made original, genuine Protestantism. And of this faith, and of the Reformation which was produced by it, the Catholic Church speaks thus:—

As in revolutions the leaders try to gain the people over by the bait of promised independence, so at the time of the so-called Reformation—which was a revolution against church authority and order in religion—it seems that it was the aim of the Reformers to

decoy the people under the pretext of making them independent of the priests, in whose hands our Saviour has placed the administering the seven sacraments of pardon and of grace.

They began, therefore, by discarding five of these sacraments. . . . They then reduced, as it appears, to a matter of form, the two sacraments they professed to retain, namely, Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. To make up for this rejection, and enable each individual to prescribe for himself, and procure by himself the pardon of sins and Divine grace, independently of the priests and of the sacraments, they invented an *exclusive means, never known in the church of God, and still rejected* by all the eastern churches and *by the Roman Catholics throughout the world*. . . . They have framed a new dogma of *Justification by Faith Alone, or by Faith only*.

Luther invented, as we have said, the doctrine, and was the first to affix such a meaning to the word *faith*. . . . And from that period only there existed man who saw in the word "faith," occurring so frequently in Holy Scripture, that which has never been seen by the fathers, doctors, saints, and by the whole Church of God.—*Catholic Belief, pp. 365, 366, 374*.

The Faith of the Creed

THESE extracts are enough to show, and they declare plainly enough, that the Catholic Church does indeed know nothing of the faith which is of God, and which, because it is of God, bears in itself sufficient power and merit to justify and save the sinner who will allow it to work in him the righteousness of God. What meaning then does she affix to the word "faith"? Here it is:—

These texts, all of which refer to saving faith, prove beyond a doubt that not trust in Christ for personal salvation, but the *faith of the Creed*, . . . is the faith availing for justification.—*Ib., p. 370*.

But who made the creed?—Men, and men only. Constantine was the chief agent in the making of the original Catholic creed, the Nicene Creed. Men being the sole authors of the creed, and "faith" being "the faith of the creed," it follows at once that that faith is solely of themselves, of their own manufacture, and not the gift of God at all, and is therefore not true faith at all. For the true faith, the faith that really saves, is "not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." And as men only made the Catholic creed, and as Catholic faith is only "the faith of the creed," it is as certain as anything can be that the Catholic faith is a base counterfeit that she would pass off upon all the world, and by force too, to supplant the true faith.

It is not enough, however, to say that it is a mere human invention; it comes from lower down than that. And she herself has given us the means of tracing it to its original. Here it is:—

By *faith* is not meant a trust in Christ for personal salvation, but evidently a firm belief that Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ, the Son

of God, that what is related of him in the Gospel is true, and that what he taught it true.—*ib.*, p. 369.

Examples of This Faith

Now there are recorded in the Scriptures several examples of this same identical "faith" here defined. And now, as we read these examples, and have the plain word of God as to what they were who held this "faith," we can have no difficulty in knowing the real nature and origin of the Catholic faith, "the faith of the creed."

Here is one: "And in the synagogue there was a man, which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him." Luke 4:33-35.

Here is another: "And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. And he straitly charged them that they should not make him known." Mark 3:11, 12.

And here is another: "And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way. And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" Matt. 8:28, 29.

And yet another: "Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth. And there were seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests, which did so. And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" Acts 19:13-15.

In these examples there is every element of the "faith" above defined and set forth as the "saving faith" of the Catholic Church. Every one of these devils showed "evidently a firm belief," and actually proclaimed it, "that Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ, the Son of God"! And that legion of them that found a home with the swine and set the whole two thousand of them crazy, showed also "evidently a firm belief that what is related of him in the Gospel is true." For from the beginning of the Gospel in this world it had been related of him that he should bruise the devil's head; and it was indeed related of him that he should destroy the devil. And that this legion of devils had "evidently a firm belief" that this is true is clearly shown by their terrified inquiry, "Art thou come hither to torment us *before the time*?" They thoroughly believed that this time of torment was coming, as it had been related; and what they feared now was that it was to befall them "before the time."

Not only do these examples supply every element of that which is authoritatively defined and set forth as Catholic "saving faith," showing it to be but the faith of the devils, but the Scripture plainly states that that is just the kind

of faith that it is. Here are the words: "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; *the devils also believe*, and tremble." James 2:19. There is the plain word of the Lord, that this "faith" that is proudly set forth as the Catholic faith is simply the faith that the devils have. And *it does not save them*. It has no power to change their lives. They are devils still. And, moreover, Jesus forbade them to preach this "faith."

Trusting a Dead Faith.

THIS is precisely "the faith of the creed." It is of themselves and not of God. And being only of themselves, it is impotent to bring to them any virtue to change the life; it is powerless to work in them any good. Being incapable of working, it is a faith that is dead. And those who hold it, realizing that it is lifeless and so unable to do anything for *them*, are obliged to give it the appearance of life by doing great things for *it* in the multiplication of dead works. For, works that are not of faith, that are not wrought by the faith itself, are dead works. They are worse than valueless, for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Any faith that is not able to itself to produce, to work, but works of God in him who professes it, is a dead faith. It is "the faith of the creed." It is the "faith" of the devils. It is the "faith" of the Papacy. And when such "faith" is passed off for Christianity, it is the mystery of iniquity, wherever it is found. And therefore it is that the Scripture, immediately after describing this "faith" of the devils, exclaims: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" "Seest thou how *faith wrought* with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?" James 2:20, 22. Thus the works by which faith was made perfect, were wrought by the faith itself. When the faith is living, the works of faith appear just as certainly as when the tree is living the fruit appears in its season.

645

The only thing that will be accepted in the judgment is *works*. The only works that will be accept in the judgment are works of *righteousness*. And the only righteousness that will be accepted or countenanced in any way whatever in the judgment is the righteousness of *God*. And this righteousness is a free gift to men, and is wrought in man by faith alone—"even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference."

It is true that "the Church" says that "this faith," "the faith of the creed," this faith of the devils, "leads to trusting in Christ, and to all other virtues." But it is a notable fact that it has not done this for the devils. And it is just as notable and just as apparent that "this faith" has not, in all these hundreds of years, led the Catholic Church to trusting in Christ nor to any other virtues.

October 22, 1896

**"Catholicism vs Christianity. No. 4" *The Signs of the Times* 22, 42 ,
pp. 6, 7 .**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

ROME gives an illustration to show the difference between the faith of Christ and "the faith of the creed," and here it is:—

To show the unfairness of taking the word "*faith*," occurring in the Holy Scripture, in this new Protestant sense of trust in Christ for pardon, to the exclusion of any other dispositions or means, and not in the Catholic sense of belief in revealed truths, . . . allow me to use the following illustration: Suppose a man afflicted with a grave disease sends for a physician of repute. The physician comes and prescribes, and to inspire the patient with more confidence, tells him, "Only believe in me and you will be cured." Can we suppose that the poor sufferer, on the departure of the physician, would say: "I shall take no medicine, for the physician said: 'Only believe and you will be cured?'" This way of reasoning and acting seems impossible to be adopted in regard to the cure of the body, but respecting the cure of the soul it is an unhappy matter of fact that thousands of persons fall into this sad mistake.—*Catholic Belief*, pp. 374, 375.

Now there is not the least doubt that this statement perfectly illustrates the difference between the faith of Christ and Catholic faith, for it proceeds altogether upon the view that there is no more power or virtue in the word *of God* than there is in the word of *a man*; that the word of Christ, the heavenly Physician, has no more power to cure than has the word of an earthly physician. And that is indeed just the difference between true faith, the faith of God, and Catholic faith, "the faith of the creed."

The Faith a Power to Work

True faith finds in the word of God, the word of the heavenly Physician, the living—creative—power of God to accomplish all that that word says. When the centurion asked Jesus to cure his sick servant, Jesus said, "I will come and heal him." But the centurion said, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." And Jesus himself decided this to be "faith," and even "so great faith" as he had not found in Israel, and then said to the centurion, "Go thy way; and as *thou hast believed*, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour." Matt. 8:5-13.

A nobleman also came to Jesus beseeching him: "Sir, come down ere my child die. Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy son liveth. And the man *believed the word* that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way." And when the man neared his home "his servants met him, and told him, saying, Thy son liveth. Then inquired he of them the hour when he began to amend. And they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him. So the father knew that it was at *the same hour in which Jesus said* unto him, *Thy son liveth*; and himself believed, and his whole house." John 4:46-53.

This is faith, genuine faith. It finds in the word of God itself all sufficiency to accomplish all that the word expresses. And over and over again, in fact in all the cases recorded in the New Testament, it was believing the word spoken and thus receiving the power of that word to accomplish of itself the thing that was spoken—it was this faith that healed the sick, restored the palsied, made the impotent to talk, and *forgave the sinner*. This is believing God. This is faith.

But when the word of God is held to be as powerless as the word of a man; when the word of Jesus Christ is held to be as empty of healing virtue as is the word of a mere human physician; when the word of the living God is thus reduced to the level of the word of men, and to all intents and purposes is received as the word of men, and the words of men themselves, formulated into a creed, are really put in the place of the word of God; then such belief, such faith, is only of themselves and is as powerless and as empty of saving virtue as are the men themselves. It is the same story over again, of the effort of men to save themselves by themselves from themselves. And this "faith" that is altogether from men themselves, that stands only in the words and wisdom of men—this "faith of the creed" that is identical with the "faith" of the devils—this, by her own showing, by her own boast, and by her own illustration, is the faith of the Catholic Church. Very good. We accept her showing in the case. Undoubtedly it is the truth. The illustration is perfectly satisfactory.

Self to Work It Out.

There is another statement that she makes which so clearly reveals again the essential nature of the "faith" which is held, and the salvation that is offered, by the Catholic Church, that it is worth quoting. Here it is:—

We seem to hear Jesus, our heavenly Physician, say: I died for all, and thereby prepared in my blood a remedy for all. If you would have the merits of my passion and death applied to you, to free your souls from sin, you must . . . believe that I am what I declare myself to be, and believe what I teach. *Do also what I have told you to do, and then* you shall have the merits of my passion and death applied to you and you shall be justified.

This is in very substance, and even in terms, the old covenant. It is identical with the covenant "from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage." Gal. 4:24. Here are the terms of the old covenant, the covenant from Sinai. "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, *if* ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, *then* ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." "And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Ex. 19:4-6, 8.

Their agreement to obey his voice indeed, was an agreement to keep the Ten Commandments indeed. For when his voice was heard from Sinai the Ten

Commandments alone were spoken. And of these it is written: "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13.

So that in substance this covenant from Sinai, just as certainly as this Catholic statement, says, I have done this great thing for you. Now, if you would have the benefit of it, believe what I teach, *do also what I have told you to do*, and *then* you shall have it and you shall be justified. And the people all said they would do it, and this, too, *with the hope of being justified*. These two statements are identical in substance and in doctrine. The thought of both is that man must *do* righteousness in order to *be* righteous, instead of first *being* righteous in order to *do* righteousness.

Meaning of the Old Covenant

It will not do, tho, to say that as the Lord made the statement from Sinai, therefore this statement from Rome is truth. The Lord had a purpose in this covenant from Sinai even tho it did then "gender to bondage." That covenant from Sinai corresponds to Hagar in the family of Abraham. The children of that covenant, the people who entered into it, correspond to Ishmael, the child of Hagar. As Hagar was a bondwoman, so the child that was born of her was a bondchild. And thus she gendered to bondage. As Hagar represents the covenant from Sinai, and her child was a bondchild, so the covenant from Sinai gendered to bondage and the children of that covenant were bondchildren.

Moreover, Ishmael was "born after the flesh." And as Ishmael represents the children of the covenant, so they were "after the flesh" and knew only the birth of the flesh. Knowing only the birth of the flesh, and minding only the things of the flesh, they thought themselves capable of fulfilling all the righteousness of God. The Lord knew full well that they could not do it; but they did not know it, and they would not believe that they could not do it. In order to convince them that they could not do it, and enable them to see it so plainly that they themselves would confess their inability to do it, the Lord gave them a full and fair opportunity to try.

Within forty days they had fully demonstrated their utter inability to do what the Lord had told them, and what they had freely promised to do. They were in deeper bondage than ever. They were *then* willing to have the Lord deliver them from the bondage of sin to the liberty of righteousness by his own power, through his own word, in his own promise, even as he had delivered their father Abraham. In a word, they were then willing to attain to righteousness, to be justified, *by faith*, instead of trying to obtain it by works. They were willing to be children of promise, instead of children of the flesh.

Having found by this experience that "the minding of the flesh is enmity against God, and it not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," they were willing to be born again and of the Spirit of God, rather than to trust longer to the ways of the birth of the flesh. Having found that by this old and temporary covenant they were *lost*, they were willing to be saved by the new and everlasting covenant, which is this:—

"I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every

man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."

In this covenant there is no "if." It depends not upon what we shall do, but upon what God will do "unto all and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference. For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

A Wicked Perversion.

Such was the covenant from Sinai, such was its nature, and such its purpose. And that the recording of it, with the nature and experience of those who caused it to be made

663

and who entered into it, was necessary for future ages, is demonstrated by this repetition of it in the Catholic system of "faith." That covenant was faulty, as it rested upon the promise of the people to obey God's law without faith in Jesus Christ; but this repetition of it is infinitely faulty and altogether bad, as compared with the original example. For there, altho it was their own sinfulness and self-righteousness that led to the making of it, yet through the sad experience of it God would draw them away from themselves to the knowledge of Christ. While here and in this, the Papacy takes the very revelation of the Gospel of Christ itself and perverts it into the old covenant, and through this perversion draws men away from Christ to the exaltation of self. It puts the old covenant in the place of the new. It puts works in the place of faith. It puts bondage in the place of freedom. It puts ceremonies in the place of Christ. And it puts man in the place of God.

This is the Papacy, and this her doctrine of "faith." And as God said of Hagar and Ishmael in the family of Abraham, and of the covenant from Sinai and its children in the family of Israel, so he says of this same wicked thing as it would be in the family of Christianity: "Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." Gal. 4:30.

There never was a truer description of the Papacy than that it is "a method of forgetting God, which shall pass as a method of remembering him."

October 29, 1896

"The Immaculate Conception" *The Signs of the Times* 22, 43 , pp. 6, 7 .

BY ALONZO T. JONES

THERE is a large number of Protestants as well as other non-Catholics who entertain the mistaken view that the doctrine of the immaculate conception refers to the conception of Jesus by the Virgin Mary. The truth is that it refers not to the conception of Christ by Mary, but to the conception of Mary herself by her mother.

The official and "infallible" doctrine of the immaculate conception as solemnly defined as an article of faith by Pope Pius IX., speaking *ex cathedra*, on the 8th of December, 1854, is as follows:—

By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, we declare, pronounce, and define, that the doctrine which holds that the most blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, by a special grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved free from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and, therefore, is to be firmly and steadfastly believed by all the faithful.

Wherefore if any shall presume, which may God avert, to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us, let them know, and moreover understand, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have made shipwreck as regards the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the church.—*Catholic Belief*, p. 214.

What the Dogma Means

In these days of the general acceptance of Catholicism as Christianity, and the compromises with the Catholic Church, and apologies for her, it is well that we should study such things as this, that we may know for ourselves what is their real effect upon the doctrine of Christ, and what their consequences in those who accept the dogma. The first consequence of it is to make the Virgin Mary, if not actually divine, then the nearest to it of any creature in the universe, and this, too, in her human nature. In proof of this we have the following statements of Catholic fathers and saints:—

The ancient writer of "De Nativitate Christi," found in St. Cyprian's works, says: Because (Mary) being "very different from the rest of mankind's human nature, but not sin, communicated itself to her."

Theodoret, a father who lived in the fifth century, says that Mary "surpassed by far the cherubim and seraphim in purity."

In the Greek liturgy of St. Chrysostom, a father of the fourth century . . . the following words are directed to be chanted by the choir during the canon of the mass: "It is truly meet that we should

679

praise thee, O mother of God. . . . thou art the mother of our God, to be venerated in preference to the cherubim; thou art beyond comparison more glorious than the seraphim.'

"Theodore, patriarch of Jerusalem, said in the second council of Nice, that Mary 'is truly the mother of God, and virgin before and after child-birth; and she was created in a condition more sublime and glorious than that of all natures, whether intellectual or corporeal.'"—*Id. pp. 216, 217.*

This then puts the nature of Mary infinitely beyond any real likeness or relationship to mankind.

Having this clearly in mind, let us follow to the next step. And here it is in the words of Cardinal Gibbons:—

We affirm that the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Word of God, who, in his Divine nature is, from all eternity, begotten of the Father, consubstantial with him, was in the fulness of time again begotten, by being born of the Virgin, thus being to himself from her maternal womb, a human nature of *the same substance with hers*.

As far as the sublime mystery of the incarnation can be reflected in the natural order, the Blessed Virgin, under the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, by communicating to the Second Person of the unalterable Trinity, as mothers do, a true human nature of *the same substance with her own*, is thereby verily and truly his mother.—*Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 198, 199.*

Now put these two things together. First, we have the nature of Mary defined as being but only "very different from the rest of mankind," but "more sublime and glorious than *all natures*;" thus putting her infinitely beyond any real likeness or relationship to mankind as we really are.

Next, we have Jesus described as taking from her a human nature of the *same substance* as hers.

Robs the World of a Saviour

It therefore follows, as certainly as that two and two make four, that in his human nature the Lord Jesus is "very different" from mankind, is further from us than are the cherubim and the seraphim, and is infinitely beyond any real likeness or relationship to us as we really are in this world. And in this it follows also that the dogma of the immaculate conception puts Jesus Christ infinitely beyond the reach of mankind as far beyond our reach indeed as tho he had never offered himself at all. Thus completely does the doctrine of the immaculate conception rob the world of Jesus Christ, the Saviour, to just the extent that the doctrine is received.

We know the answer that "the Church" makes to this—that Mary and Joseph especially, and all the other saints, intercede with him for those who would have his help, and that through these he is enabled to reach mankind tho he himself is so far beyond us. But this is as great a fraud as is all the rest of the scheme. For the Virgin Mary and Joseph and all the rest of the saints *are dead*, and can not intercede for anybody. For the word of God says plainly that "the dead know not anything." Eccl. 9:5. And "in death there is no remembrance of thee." Ps. 6:5. And Jesus said to his disciples all, "Whither I go ye can not come." John 13:33.

November 5, 1896

**"The Immaculate Conception.' No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 22, 44 ,
pp. 4, 5 .**

BY A. T. JONES

IN our study of this Catholic dogma last week we saw how completely it puts Jesus Christ away from men, by giving Mary a nature infinitely beyond any likeness or relationship to mankind, and teaching that from her Jesus Christ received the same nature, totally unlike mankind. This is absolutely the opposite of truth.

Made Lower than Angels.

In the first chapter of Hebrews, Jesus, the Son of God, is presented in his divine nature as equal with God and as God indeed, the Creator and Upholder of all things as "so much better than the angels," that he has "a more excellent name than they," and as so much higher than the angels that "all the angels of God worship him." In the second chapter of the same book, he is presented in his human nature as "lower than the angels," even as man himself. Thus it is written:—

"One in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou *madest him a little lower than the angels*; thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. *But we see Jesus*, who was made a little *lower than the angels*."

Thus, instead of his human nature being "beyond comparison" higher than angels, cherubim, and seraphim, it was made as much lower than they as man himself was made lower.

Nor is it only as man was lower than the angels *before he sinned*. It was *not* as man was lower than the angels in his *sinless* nature, that Jesus was made lower than the angels in his human nature; but as man was lower than the angels in his *sinful* nature, as he is since he by sin became subject to suffering and death. For so it is written: "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for *the suffering of death*. . . . *that he* by the grace of God *should taste death for every man*. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect *through sufferings*."

Partook of Our Nature.

Thus, as man in his sinless human nature was made a little lower than the angels, and then by sin stepped still lower to suffering and death; even so Jesus, that he might bring him back to the glory of God, in his love followed him down

even here, partakes of his nature as it is, suffers with him, and even dies *with* him as well as *for* him in his *sinful human nature*. For "he was numbered with the transgressors"—he died as a malefactor between two malefactors. This is love. This is Jesus our *Saviour*, for he comes to us where we are, that he may reach us and lift us up from ourselves unto God.

Yet this blessed saving truth is even more plainly stated, thus: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." He, in his human nature, took the same flesh and blood that we have. All the words that could be used to make this plain and positive are here put together in a single sentence. See: The children are partakers of flesh and blood. Because of this *he* took part of the same. But that is not all: He *also* took part of the same flesh and blood as the children have. Nor is this all: He also *himself* took part of the same flesh and blood as we. Nor yet is this all: He also himself *likewise* took part of the same flesh and blood as man.

Thus the Spirit of inspiration so much desires that this truth shall be made plain and emphatic that he is not content to use any fewer than all the words that could be used in the telling of it. And therefore it is declared that just as, and just as certainly as, the children of men are partakers of flesh and blood, *he also, himself, likewise*, took part of the same flesh and blood as we have in the bondage of sin and the fear of death. For he took this same flesh and blood that we have, in order "that through death he might . . . deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

Blood-Relationship.

Therefore, instead of its being true that Jesus in his human nature is so far away from men, as they really are, that he has no real likeness nor relationship to us, it is true that he is in very deed our kin in flesh and blood relation—even our brother in blood-relationship. For it is written: "Both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is *not ashamed to call them brethren*, saying, I will declare they name unto my brethren."

This great truth of the blood-relationship between our Redeemer and ourselves is clearly taught also in the Gospel in Leviticus. There was the law of redemption of men and their inheritance. When any one of the children of Israel had lost his inheritance, or himself had been brought into bondage, there was redemption provided. If he were able of himself to redeem himself or his inheritance, he could do it. But if he were not able of himself to redeem, then the right of redemption fell to his nearest of kin in blood-relationship. It fell not merely to *one* who was *near* of kin among his brethren, but to *the* one who was *nearest* of kin who was able. Lev. 25:24-28, 47-49; Ruth 2:20; 3:12, 13; 4:1-12.

Thus there has been taught through these ages the very truth which we have found taught here in the second chapter of Hebrews—the truth that man has lost his inheritance and is himself also in bondage. And as he himself can not redeem himself nor his inheritance, the right of redemption falls to the nearest of kin who is able. And Jesus Christ is the only one in all the universe who is able. He must also be, not only *near* of kin, but the *nearest* of kin; and the nearest of kin by

blood-relationship. And therefore he took our very flesh and blood, and so became our nearest of kin. And so also, instead of being farther away from us than are the angels and cherubim and seraphim, he is the very nearest to us of all persons in the universe.

He is so near to us that he is actually one with us. For so it is written: "Both he which sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are *all of one*." And he and we being one, he being one with mankind, it is impossible to have a mediator between him and men, because he and mankind are one and "a mediator is not a mediator of one." Gal. 3:20. And as certainly as Jesus Christ is one with mankind and "a mediator is not a mediator of one," so certainly this truth at once annihilates the "intercessions" of all the Catholic saints in the calendar even tho they were all alive and in heaven instead of being all dead.

He Feels Our Infirmities

But the scripture does not stop even yet with the statement of this all-important truth. It says further: "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Heb. 4:15. Being made in his human nature, in all things like us we are, he could be, and was, tempted in all points like as we are.

As in his human nature he is one with us, and as "himself took our infirmities" (Matt. 8:17), so he could be "touched with the *feeling* of our infirmities." He felt just as we feel and knows all about it, and so can help and save to the uttermost all who will receive him. As in his flesh, and as in himself in the flesh, he was as weak as we are, and of himself could "do nothing" (John 5:31), when he "bore our griefs and carried our sorrows" (Isa. 53:4), and was tempted as we are, feeling as we feel, by his divine faith he conquered all by the power of God which that faith brought to him and which in our flesh he has brought to us.

Immanuel: God with Us

And thus "what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the *likeness* of *sinful* flesh." did. The law could not bring us to God nor could it find in the flesh the righteousness which it must have, because the flesh had fallen away from God and could not reach him again. But tho the sinful flesh could not reach God, yet God in his eternal power and infinite mercy could reach sinful flesh. And so "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, . . . full of grace and truth." "God was manifest in the flesh," even "sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the

law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:3, 4.

O, his name is called Immanuel, which is "God with us"! Not God with *him* only, but God with *us*. God was with *him* in

693

eternity, and could have been with him even tho he had not given himself for us. But man through sin became without God, and God wanted to be again with us. Therefore Jesus became us, that God with him might be God with *us*. And that is his name because that is what he is.

Therefore and finally, as certainly as in his human nature, Jesus Christ is one with us, and as certainly as God with him is God with us, so certainly the nature of the Virgin Mary was just like that of all the rest of us, and so certainly the dogma of the immaculate conception is an absolute falsehood.

O, then, receive him. No ladder is required to reach him, for he himself is the Ladder which reaches from the earth where we are, to the highest heaven. No bridge is needed. There is no abyss between us and him, for he is of ourselves *as we are* on the earth. And "with his divine arm he grasps the throne of God, and with his long human arm he gathers the sinful, suffering human race to his great heart of love," that we may be one with God.

Confess to him your sins; he will never take advantage of you. Tell him your griefs; he has felt the same and can relieve you. Pour out to him your sorrows; "he hath carried our sorrows," he was "a Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" he will comfort you with the comfort of God.

November 12, 1896

"Seeing the Invisible" *The Signs of the Times* 22, 45 , pp. 5, 6 .

BY A. T. JONES

THE Christian is to see, and does see, the invisible. He is to "look at the things that are not seen" (2 Cor. 4:19), and he is to see—*he can see*—the things that he looks at.

"The things that are not seen are eternal;" and the things that are eternal are the things of God; for he is "the King, *eternal*, immortal, *invisible*, the only wise God," and "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are *clearly seen*" (Rom. 1:20), though not with the natural eyes—the eyes of this world.

There are things even of the natural order, which are invisible to the natural eyes unaided. There are innumerable worlds that cannot be seen at all—that are invisible—without the telescope; there are the countless forms of life in this world of ours that are invisible without the microscope. And all men are eager, and delighted, to use either the telescope or the microscope whenever it is possible, in order that they may see these things that are otherwise invisible. And the invisible things even of the natural order awake more interest, and engage more profound study than do the visible things.

Why should not then the invisible things of the spiritual order awake interest and arouse study as well as the invisible things of the natural order? It may be answered that they do. Yes, that is true; but the interest shown, and the study carried on, in this line, is so largely done in a defective way, that, practically, the effort amounts to very little, and brings no benefit to the greater part of mankind.

The Fatal Defect

The one grand defect, and, indeed, a fatal one, in the efforts of the greatest part of mankind to see the invisible things of the spiritual order, the invisible things of God, has always been that it is attempted to be done *in the natural way* and with *the natural faculties*. Because of this the gods of the heathen have always been but the reflection of the natural character of the worshipers, and even then must needs be represented before the devotee in some shape visible to the natural eye, whether it be in the form of the heavenly bodies, or of sticks or stones, or of graven or molten images, or of pictures. So that all false worship—all idolatry—is but the result of effort to grasp the spiritual in the natural way, to comprehend spiritual things with the natural faculties.

But it is eternally true that "spiritual things are *spiritually* discerned." 1 Cor. 2:9-14. The truly spiritual things—the things of God—it is impossible truly to discern in any other than the truly spiritual way. For "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." John 4:24. It is only by the Spirit of God that the things of God can be discerned. For, "as it is written: Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things that God hath prepared for them that love him. But *God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit*; for the Spirit searcheth all things; yea, the deep things of God." 1 Cor. 2:9, 10.

Thus it is evident that God has put within the reach of man the means by which he can see "the invisible things of him." And the Spirit of God and the revelation which he by that Spirit has given, are the means by which men may know the things of God and may see the invisible things of him. For, again it is written: "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God *knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God*. Now we have received, *not the spirit of the world*, but the Spirit which is of God; *that we might know the things* that are freely given to us of God." 1 Cor. 2:11, 12.

Altho it be eternally true that spiritual things are only spiritually discerned; and although it be evident that it is by the Spirit of God alone that the things of God are known; yet it is also true that even this good Spirit men desire to see—they desire that it shall be *visible*—before they will receive it, even as it is written: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, *whom the world cannot receive*, because *it seeth him not*, neither knoweth him." John 14:16, 17. Thus the sole means by which the things of God can be made known to the world—even this the world insists shall be discerned and known in the worldly way. But this will never do. This the Lord could never, by any means, allow in any degree.

God's Way Must Stand

God can never accommodate himself nor his ways to the ways of this world. This world is wrong, and all its ways are wrong ways. And for the Lord to accommodate himself in anything to the ways of this world, would be only to confirm the world in its wrong ways. If the world could see God, or the things of God, *with worldly eyes*, and could know God or the things of God with worldly knowledge, this would at once reduce God to the level of this world, and all the things of God to the level of the things of this world. And this would be only to confirm, by the sanction of God, this world forever in its own ways as they are, making the ways of this world the ways of God, and making iniquity and transgression and sin eternal.

But God wants to turn this world from its own ways unto himself, that it may know

710

him as he is. He wants to lift this world up to himself and to his ways, instead of allowing the world to bring him down to its own level and to confirm it in its own wickedness. And in order that this may be accomplished, he must, in the very nature of things, require that the world shall see with other than worldly eyes, and know with other than worldly knowledge. The world must forsake all worldly elements and all worldly methods, and accept and use exclusively the means which God has supplied, or else it can never see God as he is in truth.

And whosoever will do this will see him as he is, and everywhere, and to all eternity. He who would refuse the use of the telescope and the microscope, the means by which alone he can see the invisible things of the natural order, might strain his eyes till the faculty of sight should be lost, in an effort to see those things, *and all in vain*; for without these instruments he simply *can not* see the things which he would see. Even so the things of God can no man see, who refuses to use the means which God has supplied for this purpose. Without the instruments which God has supplied, man may strain all his powers to the breaking point in the effort to see God as he is in truth *and all in vain*; without these he simply *cannot* see him. And this, not because God has arbitrarily fixed it so that he *shall not* see him if he does not do so, and so, and simply and only because that if he will not use the instruments by which alone the invisible things of God may be seen, literally he *can not* see them. "Except a man be born again [born *from above*, margin] he *cannot* see the kingdom of God." John 3:3.

What, then, are the instruments by which men may see the invisible things of God? We shall answer this next week.

November 19, 1896

"Seeing the Invisible. No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 22, 46 , pp. 4, 5 .

BY A. T. JONES

How Ritualism Denies Faith

LAST week we studied scriptures showing that if men are to see the things of God they must use the instruments which God has provided for seeing the invisible.

We have read that "the Comforter," "the Spirit of Truth," "which is the Holy Ghost," the world cannot receive "because it *seeth him not*, neither knoweth him." And further, on this it is written that "we receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith*." Gal. 3:14. That is to say, therefore, not only that the world cannot receive the Spirit of God because it *seeth him not*, but that the world *sees him not* because it does not believe. Instead of *believing*, in order that it may *see*, the world wants to see in order that it may *believe*. But to those who believe and therefore do receive him, Jesus says, "Ye *know him*, for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you;" and, "Ye *see me*;" and "I will manifest myself to him." So that it is literally true that *by faith* we know God and the things of God, and see the invisible things of God.

By Faith We See

It was "by faith" that Moses endured "as seeing him who is invisible." Heb. 11:27. It is written that "the pure in heart shall see God;" and he purifies the heart "by faith" (Acts 15:9); and therefore it is by faith that men see him who is "the invisible God." Col. 1:15. And in order that all men may see "the invisible things of him," and "him who is invisible," "God hath dealt to *every man the measure of faith*." Rom. 12:3. Faith is "the gift of God." Eph. 2:8.

It is not the gift of God in the sense that the natural faculties, as reason, might, hearing, etc., are the gifts of God, so that it should be of ourselves. It is the gift of God in the sense that it is from above and beyond ourselves, a supernatural faculty bestowed since sin entered, and acting only at the free choice of the individual himself. "For by grace are ye saved, *through faith*, and *that not of yourselves*; it is the gift of God." "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17); and the word of God is able to make things to be seen which before did not appear, and which indeed were not; so that faith, acting through the word of God, sees in very truth, and sees clearly, the invisible things of God.

How True Faith Acts

True faith, the faith that is the gift of God, the faith of which Christ is the Author, the faith of which the word of God is the channel—this faith hears the word of God and depends upon the divine power of that word itself to accomplish the thing which that word says. For when the centurion came to Jesus asking that his servant should be healed, he said to the Lord, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." Thus he expected the word of the Lord itself to accomplish that which it said when the Lord should but speak the word. And this

the Lord pronounced not only "faith" but "great faith:" even such as he had not found in Israel. And this, too, in the face of the fact that the Scripture, upon the knowledge of which Israel was greatly priding itself, had long before plainly stated this very thing, in these words: "As the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so *shall my word be* that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but *it shall accomplish that which I please.*" Isa. 55:10, 11.

To expect the word of God to do the thing which that word says, and to depend wholly upon that word itself to do it, this the Lord Jesus pronounces faith. This is true faith. This is the faith by which men can see the invisible thing of God as certainly and as easily as by the telescope and the microscope they can see the invisible things of the natural order. This is the faith *which works* by love purifies the heart, so that he who is thus "pure in heart shall see God," *invisible tho he be*. For this is the faith by which he who exercises it sees the invisible. This is the faith which, working through the word of God, accomplishes the new birth (1 Peter 1:23) by which a man is enabled to see the kingdom of God, which "except a man be born again *he cannot see*" at all.

This is why it is that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Faith is of God, and whatsoever it works is the work of God; while whatsoever is not of faith is not of God, but is of the world. And all that is in the world is not of the Father, but is of the world. 1 John 2:16. Whatsoever is not of faith is of the world, is of the nature of the world, and is of the way of the world, and perverts the way of God to the ways of the world, and demands that God shall accommodate himself to the world and accept a worship that is altogether of the nature and spirit of this world.

Catholicism Demands the Visible.

No stronger proof, therefore, could possibly be given, of the absolute falsity, the sheer worldliness, and the utter naturalness, of any system of religion, than that it must needs avail itself of *visible* representations of the object of its worship. And of all the systems of religion that are in the world, there is no one which insists more upon the *visible* and upon seeing the visible than does the Roman Catholic system. It is essential to that system that it shall have "*a visible head.*" It must needs have a *visible* kingdom. It must have a *visible* sacrifice. Professing to worship the Crucified One, the Catholic Church must have *visible* "crucifix" by which to do it. Professing to glory in the cross of Christ, she must have a multitude of *visible* crosses of her own by which to do it. There must be a *visible* interpreter of the Scriptures. And for all the worshipers according to that system, there must be *visible* representations of the object worshiped, in the shape of images and pictures. Throughout the whole system the one chief essential is the seeing of the *visible*.

In an encyclical of Leo XIII., "On the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin," describing the purpose of the rosary, that is, of the beads which are used by Catholics in their prayers, he says: "The rosary is arranged not for the consideration of dogmas of faith and questions of doctrine, but rather for putting forth facts to be

perceived *by the eyes* and treasured up in the memory." Even tho it be recognized that the invisible exists and is to be worshiped, yet it can be comprehended and worshiped only through, and by the aid of, *the visible*. This is the characteristic of all heathenism and of all idolatry. And this is only to say that by this characteristic the Catholic system of religion is demonstrated to be essentially heathenish and idolatrous.

What Ritualism Signifies.

We know full well of the plea that is made in defense of the use of images, pictures, etc., in the worship of the Roman Catholic Church; that is, that "the honor which is given them is referred to the originals which they represent, so that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads or kneel, we adore Christ and venerate his saints, whose likeness they represent;" and "the bowing before an image outside of us is no more to be reprehended than the worshiping before and internal image in our own minds; for the external image does but serve the purpose of expressing visibly that which is internal."—*Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 285, 287. But if they only saw Him whom they profess to worship, they would not need any image of him, either external or internal, nor any representation of him either visible or otherwise. They could then be true worshipers, worshiping him who is invisible, in spirit and in truth.

This plea that is made in justification of the use of images and of the visible, is in itself the greatest condemnation of the use of images and of the whole system of Roman Catholicism; for it is a confession of inability to see the invisible, and therefore a confession that the whole system is destitute

725

of true faith and a stranger to the new birth, and altogether without God.

The Catholic system being confessedly unable to see the invisible, is clearly not of faith. And as whatsoever is not of faith is sin, it is perfectly clear that the whole Catholic system is a system of sin. And the professed Protestantism that panders to it, that compromises with it, that courts it, and that is "wheeling into line with it," is simply like unto it. The one is "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," "the mystery of iniquity," "the beast;" and the other is "the image" of it.

December 3, 1896

"Living Faith" *The Signs of the Times* 22, 48 , p. 6 .

BY A. T. JONES

THE term "living faith" is strictly proper, because faith indeed is a living thing. The just live by faith, and no man can live by what has no life in it.

Again: Faith is the gift of God (Eph. 2:8), and he is the living God; Jesus is its Author (Heb. 12:2), and in him is life—he is the life. In the nature of things that which comes from such a source must be of itself imbued with life.

Again: Faith comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17); that word is "the faith word" (Titus 1:9), that is, the word *full of faith*; and that word is "the word of life" (Phil. 2:16). Therefore as the word of God brings faith, and is full of faith; and as that word is the word of life, it is evident that faith is life, is a living thing, and brings life from God to him who exercises it.

The Life of Faith

What life is it then which faith brings to men? Coming as it does from God, through Jesus Christ who is the "Author of life," the only life with which it is imbued and which it could possibly bring to men is *the life of God*. The life of God is what men need and what we must have. And it is the life that God wants us to have; for it is written: "Walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being *alienated from the life of God*." Eph. 4:17, 18.

Jesus came that men might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. John 10:10. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." 1 John 5:11, 12. And Christ is received by faith, and he dwells in the heart by faith. Eph. 3:17. Therefore as the life of God only, eternal life, is in Jesus Christ, and as Christ dwells in the heart *by faith*, it is as plain as anything can be that faith brings the life of God to him who exercises it.

It is the life of Jesus himself that is to be made manifest in our bodies, "for we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." 2 Cor. 4:11. And the life of Jesus is manifested in us, by Christ himself living in us; for "Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh I live *by the faith* of the Son of God." Gal. 2:20. This is living faith.

The Blessing of the Real Presence

Again He says, "I will dwell in them and walk in them;" "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you;" and "because I live, ye shall live also." John 14:18, 19. It is by the Holy Spirit that he dwells in us; for he desires you "to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, *that Christ may dwell in your hearts*." Eph. 3:16, 17. And "at that day"—the day that ye receive the gift of the Holy Ghost—"ye *shall know* that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and *I in you*." John 14:20. "And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us." 1 John 3:24. And we "receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith*." Gal. 3:14.

"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." We must have the blessing of Abraham in order to receive the promise of the Spirit. The blessing of Abraham is righteousness *by faith*. See Rom. 4:1-13. Having this, Abraham "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had." And

we, *having this*, can freely receive the promise of the Spirit circumcising the heart unto holiness and the seal of the righteousness of the faith which we had. Having the blessing of Abraham, and so being sons of God, God *sends* forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts. Gal. 3:26; 4:4-6. Having the blessing of Abraham, that you may receive the promise of the Spirit through faith, *then* ask that ye may receive—yea, ask and ye *shall* receive. For the word of God has promised, and faith cometh by hearing the word of God. Therefore ask in faith, nothing wavering, "for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened."

Such is living faith—the faith that comes from the living God; the faith of which Christ is the Author; the faith which comes by the word of God; the faith which brings life and power from God to men, and which works the works of God in him who exercises it; the faith which receives the Holy Spirit that brings the living presence of Jesus Christ to dwell in the heart and manifest himself still in mortal flesh. This and this alone is living faith. By this Christians live. This is life itself. This is everything. Without this, everything is simply nothing or worse; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.

Living Faith Works

With such faith as this, that is, with *true* faith, there never can arise any question as to works; for this faith *itself works*, and he who has it, necessarily works. It is impossible to have this faith and not have works. "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith *which* worketh by love." Gal. 5:6. This faith being a living thing, cannot exist without working. And coming from God, the only works that it can possibly work are the works of God.

Therefore anything that professes to be faith which of itself does not work the salvation of the individual having it, and which then does not work the works of God in him who professes it, *is not faith at all*, but is a fraud that that individual is passing off upon himself, which brings no grace to the heart, and no power to the life. It is dead, and he is still dead in trespasses and sins, and all his service is only a form without power, and therefore is only a dead formalism.

But on the other hand, the faith which is of God, which comes by the word of God and brings Christ, the living Word, to dwell in the heart and shine in the life—this is true faith which through Jesus Christ only lives and works in him who exercises it.

Christ himself living in *us*; Christ in you the hope of glory; God with us; God manifest in the flesh *now, to-day* in *our* flesh, by the faith of Jesus Christ—this and this only is living faith. For "every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ *is* come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ *is* come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world. Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that *is in you*, than he that is in the world." 1 John 4:2-4.

Therefore, "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves." Jesus said unto them and to us all: "Have the faith of God." Mark 11:22, margin.

The Signs of the Times, Vol. 23 (1897)

February 25, 1897

"The Real Presence" *The Signs of the Times* 23, 8 , p. 4, 5 .

BEFORE the Lord Jesus Christ went away from the world, he said to his disciples, "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you."

As he was about to ascend to heaven from the Mount of Olives, he said again to his disciples, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." "And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

The presence of Christ with his people is thus an assured fact. Nor is it only with them in an outward and separate sense, but with them in the inward and essential sense of oneness with them. He is *with* them by being *in* them. And so it is written, "I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." 2 Cor. 6:16.

But his name is Immanuel, which is "God with us." "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." Therefore the presence of Christ with his people is the presence of God also. It is the presence of both the Father and the Son, for they "are one." And so he has said, "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John 14:23.

An abode is a dwelling-place. We will come unto him, and make him our dwelling-place. "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, *with him also* that is of a contrite and humble spirit." Isa. 57:15. "My presence shall go with thee." Ex. 33:14. And as God is real, and Christ is real, so their presence is real. Their presence with the believer in Jesus is a real presence. This is the true real presence.

How, then, is this real presence manifested? Here is the answer to that question: "Strengthened with might *by his Spirit* in the inner man; *that Christ may dwell in your hearts*," "that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Eph. 3:16, 17, 19. "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2:9. Thus it is by his Spirit that Christ dwells with his people. It is by the presence of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer that the real presence of Christ is manifested to those and in those that are his. For "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. 8:9.

This is more fully stated in the Saviour's last talk with his disciples (John 14:16-23), before his death. He says, "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you." As he will not leave his children comfortless, he gives them the Comforter. He gives them the Comforter, because he will come to them.

Consequently, it is by "the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost," that Christ dwells with his people, and that his real presence is manifested to them and in them. So he says: "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; *whom the world can not receive*, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. . . . At that day *ye shall know* that I am in my Father, and ye in me and *I in you*." In the day that the child of God receives the Holy Spirit, he knows that Christ dwells in him; he knows the real presence of Christ with him and in him.

This Spirit of Truth, the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, which brings the presence of Christ, the world can not receive, "because it *seeth* him not, neither knoweth him." And the world sees him not because it does not *believe*. Instead of *believing*, that it may see, the world wants to see, that it may *believe*. And so, because the world sees not the Spirit of God, and therefore can not receive him and can not know him. But to those who do believe, and therefore do receive him, Jesus says, "Ye know him for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." The promise of the Spirit is received "through faith," and then we know him. So that it is literally true that by *faith* we know God and the things of God.

Such is the true doctrine of the real presence of Christ with those who are his, and of his manifestation to them and in them. In one word this is the Gospel. Without it there is no Gospel of Christ. The Lord's own definition of the Gospel is that it is Christ in believers, the hope of glory. And here it is: "Be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel which ye have heard. . . . Whereof I Paul am made a minister . . . to fulfil the word of God; even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints; to whom God would make know what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles *which is Christ in you*, the hope of glory whom we preach." Col. 1:23-28. Christ in men, the hope of glory; God manifest in the flesh; this, and this alone, is the Gospel of Christ. And therefore Paul tells us that "it pleased God . . . to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen." Gal. 1:15, 16. Not revealed *to* him only, but revealed *in* him, and revealed *to* him by being revealed *in* him. He was to preach Christ in men, the hope of glory; but he could not possibly do this unless he knew Christ in himself, the hope of glory. It was not enough to preach about this—he must preach this in very fact. It was not the thing to do to preach *about* him, but to preach *him*.

Thus "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. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body." 2 Cor. 4:6, 7, 10. "But I through the law am dead to the law, that

5

I might live unto God. 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. 2:19, 20.

Such is the Scripture doctrine, the true doctrine, of the real presence of Christ with his people and in his people. It is the presence of Christ himself in the believer by the creative power and overshadowing of the Spirit of God. This is the mystery of God.

A. T. JONES.

March 4, 1897

"In You or in the Eucharist?" *The Signs of the Times* 23, 9 , p. 132 .

THE Christian doctrine of the real presence is "Christ in *you*."

The Catholic theory of the real presence is "Christ in *the eucharist*."

The Christian doctrine of the real presence is Christ in the believer by the creative power and overshadowing of the *Spirit of God*. The Catholic theory of the real presence is Christ in the eucharist by the *word of the priest*.

In the Christian doctrine of the real presence there is an inward change or conversion of the soul of the believer himself by the power of the Holy Spirit, by which he is made a "new creature." In the Catholic theory of the real presence there is what is called an "inward change or conversion" of the bread and wine, or the wafer of the communion into the very flesh and blood of Jesus Christ by the word and at the will *of the priest*.

Nor is any of this mere captious criticism or prejudiced statement. It is all the straight truth. And that all may see that it is so, we herewith give the authoritative proof. First, as to the real presence of Christ being in the eucharist. Here is the statement:—

Among the various dogmas of the Christian church there is none which rests on stronger scriptural authority than the doctrine of the real presence of Jesus Christ in the holy eucharist. The fathers of the church, without an exception, reecho the language of the apostle to the Gentiles, by proclaiming the real presence of our Lord in the eucharist. . . . I have counted the names of sixty-three fathers and eminent ecclesiastical writers flourishing between the first and the sixth century, all of whom proclaim the real presence—some by explaining the mystery, others by thanking God for this inestimable gift; and others by exhorting the faithful to its worthy reception.—*Faith of Our Fathers*, by Cardinal Gibbons.

And that it is in the eucharist instead of "in you" is shown by the following words:—

Every one knows that example loses much of its efficacy in passing through the medium of history, and that virtues perceived at a distance of eighteen centuries are not sufficiently eloquent to move our hearts. It was then very necessary that the divine model of the elect should dwell in the midst of us full of grace and truth, and that he should offer to each one the living picture of the same virtues which charmed the witnesses of his mortal life and attached

to him so powerfully the hearts of his disciples. This need Jesus Christ satisfies *in his eucharistic life*. Could Jesus Christ manifest more strikingly his unspeakable tenderness for sinners, and his ardent zeal for their salvation, than he does *in the adorable sacrament* in which he condemns himself to remain on the earth so long as there is one soul to save?—*Religion in Society, by Abbe Mariani.*

And that it is at the word and will of the priest that this is all done, is shown plainly enough and strongly enough to satisfy anybody, in the following words:—

To obtain from us this abnegation of self it was not enough that the Son of God obeyed Mary and Joseph for thirty years, made himself, during his public life, the servant of all, and delivered himself, without resistance, to his executioners. For eighteen hundred years that he has reigned at the right hand of the Father, he never has ceased to give to men the example of the most universal and humiliating obedience. Every day multitudes of priests, be they fervent, lukewarm, or vicious—it is the same—summon him where it pleases them, give him to whom they will, confine him under lock and key, and dispose of him at their will.—*Religion in Society.*

And that by the words or ceremony of consecration pronounced by the priest there is what is called an "inward change or conversion" of the bread and wine, or the wafer, into the very flesh and blood of Christ, is shown in these words:—

The holy eucharist is the true body and blood of Jesus Christ under the outward appearances of bread and wine. . . . This most blessed sacrament contains *truly, really, and substantially*, tho not perceptibly to our senses, nor with their natural accidents. . . . the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity; which can never be separated from his body and blood. . . . The Catholic Church teaches that before consecration, that which on the altar appears to be bread and wine, is simply bread and wine; and that after the consecration of that bread and wine, what appears to be bread and wine is no longer bread and wine, but the body and blood of Jesus Christ. Something remains, namely, the outward qualities or *species* of bread and wine, and something is changed, namely, the inward, invisible *substance* of that bread and wine, into the body and blood of Christ; this *inward change or conversion* is what is called *transubstantiation*.—*Catholic Belief.*

The Christian truth of the real presence of Christ converts the soul of the believer; the papal dogma pretends to convert the bread and wine. The Christian truth of the real presence of Christ believed, makes man subject to God in everything; the papal dogma makes God subject to man in everything. The preaching of the Christian truth of the real presence of Christ in the believer, is the revelation of the mystery of God; the preaching of the papal dogma of the real presence is the proclamation of the mystery of iniquity. A. T. JONES.

March 25, 1897

"The Headship of the Church. Jesus Himself, or a Papal Regent?"
The Signs of the Times 23, 11 , p. 6 .

Jesus Himself, or a Papal Regent?

IN the Scriptures the church of Christ is described under the figure of the human body as God made it. The relationship between Christ and his church is shown and illustrated by the relationship that exists between the human body and its head: and the relationship between Christ and the members of his church is illustrated by the relationship between the members of the human body and the head of that body as God has placed it.

The church is his body. Eph. 1:22. "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." 1 Cor. 12:27. The members of his church are "members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." Eph. 5:30. Christ is, the head of this body, which is his church. For "he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead." Col. 1:18. "God raised him from the dead. . . . and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body." Eph. 1:19-23. And it is Christ *himself*, too, who is head of this church. Not Christ by a representative; not Christ by a substitute, a vicar, or a regent; but Christ himself, in his own proper person. This is certainly true, because in stating this same thought under the figure of a *building*, the Word declares that Christ "*himself*" is the chief corner-stone, "the *head-stone* of the corner." And here are the words: "Ye are God's building." 1 Cor. 3:9; Eph. 2:21, 22, 10, 20.

Yet the claim of the Papacy is that *a man* is head of the church of Christ. The claim of the Catholic Church is that the head of *that* church is the head of the church of Christ. The claim of the Church of Rome is that the Bishop of Rome is head of the church of Christ—in the place of Christ—as the "representative," the "substitute," the "vicar," the "regent," of Christ. Here is the authoritative statement:—

Says the Council of Florence (1430), at which also were present the bishops of the Greek and the Latin Church: "We define that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole church, the father and doctor of all Christians; and we declare that to him, in the person of blessed Peter, was given him by Jesus Christ our Saviour, full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal church."

The pope is here called the *true vicar* or representative of Christ in this lower kingdom of his church militant; that is, the pope is the organ of our Saviour, and speaks his sentiments in faith and morals.—*Cardinal Gibbons, in The Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 154, 155.*

It was the Council of Chalcedon 451, that first addressed the bishop of Rome as "the head, of whom we are the members."

Let us look at this claim of the Catholic Church in view of the statements made in the Scriptures on this point. As we have seen, the church of Christ is his body in this world, and he is its head. God is the builder of this body, the church of Christ, as he was the builder of the human body in the beginning; for "God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him." Now, take a human body as God made it, with the head in its place as God set it. In the place of that head, which God gave to that body, you put a "representative" head—a substitute head. In the place of the true head, which God set to that body, you put a "regency" head—another head to occupy the place in the absence of the true head—then what have you? Take away the head from a human body, and you have left only *a dead body*. This is the very first and only result of taking away the head. And even tho you set another head on this headless body, it is still only a dead body.

Now this is precisely the case of the Church of Rome. It was once the church of Christ; its members were members of the body of Christ; and Christ was its head. It had life from Christ, its living head, the life which is by faith, so that its "faith was spoken of throughout the whole world." Rom. 1:8. But there came "a falling away." 2 Thess. 2:3. The bishops and councils of the church put away Christ, the true head whom God had set, and put another, *a man*, in his place, as head of that church. The putting away of Christ, its living head, left it only a lifeless body; and the putting of another head in his place did not, and could not, give life to that lifeless body. So far as spiritual life is concerned—the real life of the church of Christ—the Church of Rome is as destitute of it as is a human body with its own head cut off and another head put on in its place. Thus the Church of Rome is destitute of the life that vivifies the church of Christ, and partakes only of the elements of death. The only hope for it, or for those who are connected with it, is to recognize that it is indeed spiritually dead, and have Christ, the Life-giver, raise them from the dead, and connect them with himself as their living head, that thus they may live indeed.

Warning was given against this very course of that church in the first days of the church of Christ, and the same warning is yet given. In the second chapter of Colossians it is written: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, *which is the head* of all principality and power. . . . Let no man beguile you of your reward in a *voluntary* humility and worshiping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and *not holding the head*, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, *why*, as though living in the world, *are ye subject to ordinances after the commandments and doctrines of men?* Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting [punishing, margin] of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh." Verses 7-23.

This is the divine warning against the spirit that made the Papacy, against the Papacy itself, against all its workings, and against its very nature. Men, fleshly-

mindful men, ambitious men, in the church, not being dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, holding the rudiments of the world and *not holding the head*—these were the men who put away from the people Christ, the true and living Head, and put a man, one of their own sort, in his place. And to supply the lack of him and his life they imposed upon the people a host of forms and ordinances, and commandments and doctrines of men, and voluntary humilities, and will-worshiping, and punishings of the body in penances and pilgrimages, and worshiping of angels, and saints, and dead people called saints. And this is the body of which Leo XIII., pope is the head. This is the Church of Rome with a man as its head, in the place of Christ. This is the Catholic Church. And this is how the bishop of Rome obtained his "regency of God on earth."

A. T. JONES.

The Signs of the Times, Vol. 25 (1899)

January 5, 1899

"Union of Church and State" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 1 , p. 14.

By Alonzo T. Jones, Author of "Two Republics," "Rights of the People," etc

TWENTY-FIVE years' progress toward the union of Church and State in the United States!

To many into whose hands this paper may fall it may be thought an exceedingly strange thing that there should be any progress at all, much less twenty-five years of it, toward a union of Church and State in the United States.

It is strange that such a thing should be so. But so it is.

The Government of the United States was founded upon the principle of total separation of religion and the State, as certainly as it was founded upon the principles of a republic. Indeed, the total separation of religion and the State is inherent in the principle of a republic; and logic and consistency demand that in every republic there shall be such a separation.

Yet, true as this is, the makers of this American republic did not leave it to logic and consistency to effect this important thing; they positively and continuously, in State papers and organic laws, declared it, from the time that the Declaration of Independence was made to the time when the National Constitution was finally established and ordained. The total separation of religion and the State is a fundamental Christianity principle enunciated in the words of Holy Writ, "Behold, the people [Israel] shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." "If any man hear My words and believe not, I judge him not." "Render, therefore, unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's; and unto God the things which are God's."

It was in positive recognition of this principle *as a Christian principle* that it was made a fundamental feature in the establishment of the American republic. The men who made this nation said:—

"Almighty God hath created the mind free; all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord of both body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in His mighty power to do.—*Rights of the People*, p. 90.

"To judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an inalienable 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."—*ib.* p. 89.

"It is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects professing the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility, which would lead us back to the Church of Rome."—*ib.*, p. 87.

Therefore the supreme law of the land was made to declare that—

"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."—*Constitution*.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.—*First Amendment*.

"The Government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion."—*Treaty with Tripoli*.⁷¹

Thus the constitutionally-declared principle of the total separation of religion and the State in the United States, is explicitly a Christian principle, as it is also "the logical consequence of either of the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation—as well of justification by faith alone as of the equality of all believers."—*Bancroft*.

Who only, then, could be expected to desire the governmental recognition of religion, the union of Church and State, in the United States?—Surely, none who respect either the principles of Christianity or of the Reformation. As the American principle of the total separation of religion and the State is a true principle of Christianity and the Reformation; and as a recognition of religion by the Government of the United States, the union of Church and State *in* the United States, would, on the face of it, be in open disregard of the principles of Christianity and of the Reformation, it follows plainly enough that no one who has any true regard for Christianity or respect for the Reformation can ever engage in any movement or combination to secure governmental recognition of religion, or any union of Church and State in the United States.

Yet we are publishing an article on "Twenty-five Years of Progress toward the Union of Church and State in the United States." Who, then, are they who are aiming at this, that there should be any such progress at all?—Strangely enough, all the leading and active workers and organizations to this antichristian and anti-Protestant end, are loudly professed Christians and just as loudly professed Protestants.

Twenty-five years ago there was but one organization in the land definitely committed to this cause. This was an organization mostly of Reformed Presbyterians, tho including prominent men of other denominations, under the name of the "National Reform Association," whose avowed purpose was to secure an amendment to the national Constitution "recognizing the being and attributes of Almighty God, the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, the law of God as the paramount rule, and Jesus, the Messiah, the Saviour and Lord of all," and "so placing all Christian laws, institutions, and usages upon an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

This organization slowly gained strength and influence, until 1887, when it secured the alliance of the W.C.T.U. and the Prohibition party. In 1888 the American Sabbath Union, receiving its initiative in the Methodist General Conference held that year in New York, and including the leading denominations of the country, was added to the combination.

This combination had sufficient influence to secure, in that year, 1888, the introduction into Congress of a joint resolution and a bill, recognizing the Christian religion and establishing by law the observance of Sunday as the Christian sabbath. And these points have been held before Congress ever since.

In 1889 this combination sought and gained the cooperation of the Catholic Church.

In 1892 the judiciary department of the national government practically joined this combination, through a unanimous declaration of the Supreme Court that "the establishment of the Christian religion" is within the "meaning" of the Constitution, and that consequently "*this is a Christian nation.*"

In 1893 the legislative department of the National Government and in legislating for the World's Fair at Chicago, officially recognized and established Sunday as the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment; in which Congress did do the very thing which the makers of the nation said it was impossible to do without erecting a claim to infallibility,—Congress did adjudge the right of preference between different sects professing the Christian faith, adopted Sunday as the national sabbath, and in so doing did erect a claim to infallibility, which leads back to the Church of Rome.

At the same time the Executive Department of the national government also joined the combination, by the President's official approval of this religious act of Congress; and, further, in 1896, by the declaration that "*this is a Christian nation, and they will have to face the music.*"

As all this was the clear repudiation of the Christian and Protestant principle, and the adoption of the papal principle, the Papacy immediately began to build upon the foundation that had thus been laid. In October, 1893, Archbishop Ireland, in a panegyric at the Jubilee of Cardinal Gibbons, exclaimed:—

"I preach the new, the most glorious crusade Church and Age!
Unite them in the mind and heart, in the name of humanity, in the name of God, Church and Age! . . . Rome is the Church; America is the Age."

In September, 1894, by a papal rescript, the United States was "declared to be a Catholic country," and "was elevated to the first rank as a Catholic *nation.*"

And in 1898 an official representative of the Papacy was received by the United States Government at Washington, upon official credentials from the Secretary of State of the Papacy addressed to the Secretary of State of the United States. And, having been so received by this government, international matters between the United States and Spain were conducted through this papal representative, until all negotiations were broken off by the declaration of war.

Such, briefly sketched, is the twenty-five years of progress toward the union of Church and State in the United States, up to date. And who can say but that this progress has been such as to demand the serious attention of every person in the land who has any regard for true Christianity, for true Protestantism, or for true American principles?

And still this vast combination of National Reform, W. C. T. U., Prohibition, Sabbath Union, B. Y. P. Y., Y. P. S. C. E., Christian Citizenship, and papal elements, is steadily pushing forward the original design,—the union of Church and State in the United States.

"It is high time to awake out of sleep."

ALONZO T. JONES

January 11, 1899

**"Columbus' Wise and Worthy Example" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 2 ,
pp. 1, 2 .**

FOR a good while Cuba has been the chief subject before the minds of the people of the United States. And since President McKinley, Cardinal Gibbons, and Archbishop Ireland, after "numerous conferences," have reached the determination that "sufficient money will be advanced by this government to support the Catholic Church" in Cuba, it is quite certain that Cuba will occupy a place in the experience of the American people that they hadn't expected.

But how comes it that the President of the United States determines that money shall be advanced by this government to support the Catholic Church? Thereby hangs a tale.

It was by believing that the earth is round, against the dogma of the Catholic Church that it is flat, that Columbus ever discovered Cuba and the western continent.

Of course every American schoolboy knows that before Columbus discovered America the Catholic Church insisted that the earth was flat. But it is too sadly true that along with this the impression is left, if not actually inculcated, upon the minds of the school-children that at that time *all the world* supposed the earth to be flat. But that is a great mistake. All *except* the *Catholic* world knew then that the earth is round.

The ancients knew that the earth is round. The Jews knew it always. Aristotle taught it; so did Ptolemy the Geographer. Indeed, this was a familiar truth among the people of those times.

It was the church fathers who, with the many other falsehoods of the great apostasy, brought in the dogma that the earth should be flat. The chief of the church fathers, and the chief author of the dogma that the earth was flat, was Augustine—the father also of the Inquisition—tho in point of time Lactantius preceded him in advocating the dogma.

Lactantius lived in the time of Constantine, and was one of the important factors in forming the union of Church and State, having so much of the favor of Constantine that Constantine gave him a place in the imperial family as tutor to the emperor's eldest son. Augustine lived from 354 to 430. He became a churchman in 386.

Thus the period in which lived Lactantius and Augustine was the very period in which the church of the apostasy got full control of the power of the State, and used that power to compel all, even to the penalty of death, to conform to her dogmas, Augustine consecrating the whole scheme by his final proposition that it is "by the rod of temporal suffering," that dissenting parties "attain the highest grade of religious development."

The apostasy having full control of the imperial power, and compelling all to conform to her teaching, and two of the chief factors in the creation of this Church-and-State combination being the chief authors of the dogma that the earth is flat; thus in that time and onward through the consequent Dark Ages, the truth that the earth is round was forced out of all the realm which the church controlled.

Yet outside of the region of papal influence the truth that the earth is round still prevailed. There, from Central Asia through all North Africa and Spain to the southern border of France, the Mohammedans ruled. In all this vast domain, schools flourished and enlightenment and civilization reigned. And in all this realm it was known that the earth is round. While Constantinople and Rome were "asserting in all its absurdity the flatness of the earth, the Spanish Moors and the Saracens in Africa and Asia were teaching *geography* in their common schools *from globes*."

In spite of all the opposition of the Papacy, some of this knowledge crept into her dark domains. Gerbert, who became pope in 999, when a boy studied in the Mohammedan schools of Spain, and there learned that the earth is round, and afterwards established a school at Rheims, and *used in it* a geographical *globe* which he brought from Cordova, the Mohammedan capital of Spain. And the Moorish State of Grenada, in Spain, continued until the very year that Columbus discovered America.

Columbus had been a sailor from the age of fourteen, and had spent many years especially in the Syrian trade from all parts of the Mediterranean, as well as having made several voyages to Guinea; and as he had thus been in almost daily contact with the Mohammedan nations, from this sketch it is easy to understand how he caught the truth that the earth is round. "Tho the state of public opinion at the time did not permit such doctrine to be openly avowed in Catholic countries, yet Columbus was thoroughly convinced of its truth."

Being so thoroughly convinced, he at last decided to brave public opinion and present his views to those in power who might help him put them to the test.

"After many wearisome delays, his suit was referred to a council at Salamanca, before which, however, his doctrines were confuted" from the saints

34

and fathers of the church; and from "reason," since, even if he should depart from Spain, "the rotundity of the earth would present a kind of mountain up which it was impossible for him to sail, even with the fairest wind, and so he could never get back. The Grand Cardinal of Spain had also indicated their irreligious nature; and Columbus began to fear that instead of receiving aid as a discoverer, he should fall into trouble as a heretic. However, after many years of mortification and procrastination, he at length prevailed with Queen Isabella; and April 17, 1492, in the field before Granada, then just wrenched from the Mohammedans, by the arms of Ferdinand and Isabella, he received his commission."

The island of Cuba was discovered on the first voyage, October 28, 1492. The first settlement of Spaniards was in 1511, and from that year until 1898 the Church of Rome, by means of the Spanish power, has held complete possession of the island. The natives, tho under the complete control of the clergy, have been always "deprived of all political, civil, and religious liberty; have been excluded from all public stations," and yet "have been heavily taxed to maintain their Spanish rulers" and the Church of Rome.

And, tho the Church of Rome has had sole control of the people educationally these three hundred and eighty-eight years, and tho, further, she has there "a vast number of priests and high church dignitaries," yet, true to her original character, she has kept them in densest ignorance.

The Spanish Government has all these years made annual appropriations for the support of the Catholic Church and its clergy in Cuba. As the consequence, of course, "the people of Cuba have never been taught to support their church and clergy by direct voluntary contribution."

Yet at the same time these same people have been obliged to pay to the church such fees as she demanded for christenings, marriages, confirmations, exorcisms, extreme unctions, burials, masses, etc., etc. And now, upon all this, she sets up the plea that "so dire is the poverty on the island that it is doubtful if the Cubans could by any possibility raise sufficient money to keep their churches open and their priests from starving."*⁸ 1 Therefore, since the Spanish Government, with her appropriations to the Catholic Church, is cut off from Cuba, the Catholic Church demands that the United States Government shall take the place of the Spanish Government and make governmental appropriations for the support of the Catholic Church and clergy in Cuba.

And that is not the worst. It would be bad enough for the church only to make such demands; yet not only does she make the demand, but "President McKinley has held numerous conferences with Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland on the subject," with the result that "it is the determination of President McKinley that the Catholic Churches shall be kept open, and that public worship shall be provided for. To this end sufficient money will be advanced by this government to support the Catholic Church."

In thus "determining to support the Catholic priests in Cuba," it is declared that "President McKinley has acted wisely from other points of view than mere humanity."

"*Mere* humanity," indeed! Of course "*mere* humanity" must needs be supplemented by some more important consideration, to make such action entirely worthy of approbation. And so it is. And here is the consideration upon which, as it is published, President McKinley "wisely" supplements that of "mere humanity":—

President McKinley has acted wisely from other points of view than mere humanity. The Cuban priests, as in all countries whose population is densely ignorant, exercise complete control over their parishioners. Apart from the cruelty of withdrawing all aid from these priests, it is easy to believe that the new American Government in Cuba would have at its very inception built up a dangerous set of enemies, if the priesthood of Cuba were given reason to regret the presence of the American flag on the island. The Spanish Government at Madrid could easily give the American Government some dearly-bought information as to the malign influence that is in the power of a hostile clergy to exercise. Ever since the first Carlist uprising in 1833, every movement directed against the government of Spain has found its principal support in the clergy of Spain, who almost to a man are Carlists.

That is to say: The Government of Spain has always supported the Catholic clergy and the Catholic Churches in Cuba. And *now*, the United States having supplanted the Government of Spain in Cuba, if this government does not undertake "the entire responsibility for their support," "the priesthood of Cuba" will be "given reason to regret the presence of the American flag on the island." Then, having *such* "reason to regret the presence of the American flag on the island," and having "complete control" of their "densely ignorant" parishioners, "the new American Government in Cuba would have at its very inception built up a dangerous set of enemies." Therefore, to placate this "dangerous set of enemies," the Government of the United States must undertake the entire responsibility for their support. And if anybody does not believe it wise thus to placate these "dangerous enemies," then the Spanish Government at Madrid could easily give him pointers in "some dearly-bought information as to the malign influence that is in the power of a hostile clergy to exercise."

But when such consideration as that is counted as "wisely" supplemental to that of mere humanity, we are led to query whether the people of the United States are ready to accept either this supplemental or the original consideration as sufficient justification of the President of the United States in advancing the money of all the people of the United States for the support of the Catholic clergy in Cuba.

Yet more than this: Why should the President of the United States follow the counsels of Catholic cardinals and archbishops, any more than did Columbus? If Columbus had conformed to the views of the cardinals and archbishops of his day, he would have agreed that the earth is flat. And if all others had done so, the

world would have perished in just such ignorance and despotism as have ruined Cuba. But by thinking for himself, and following wiser counsels, he repudiated Catholic ignorance, and so was successful in giving to mankind a new world.

Why should not now the President of the United States follow the example of Columbus, in repudiating Catholic ignorance, and the wise counsels of the noble men who made this nation, in the repudiation of the Catholic principles of governmental support of the church? Why should not the President of the United States thus look out and on new worlds of light and liberty, rather than turn back to the principles and practises [*sic.*] of the Dark Ages, and put the United States Government in the lost position of Spain in supporting the Catholic Church and clergy in Cuba, whose record of three hundred and eighty-eight verses is written in the dense ignorance and desolation of Cuba as it was two months ago? Why?
ALONZO T. JONES.

April 5, 1899

"Note" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 14 , p. 2 .

TO EVERY soul of mankind God has given the glorious gift of the Holy Spirit. The promise of the Father is fulfilled,—the promise that the Spirit is to be poured out upon all flesh; all flesh may see the glory of the Lord; all flesh may be saved if they will. "As many as received Him to them gave He power"—not simply to *them* gives He the power, but *the power is given*. There is nothing hypothetical, nothing conjectural. Nothing is left in doubt in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name."—A. T. Jones.

May 31, 1899

"His Coming in Glory" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 22 , pp. 2, 3 .

"HE comes not an infant in Bethlehem born;
He comes not to lie in a manger;
He comes not again to be treated with scorn;
He comes not a shelterless stranger;
He comes not to Gethsemane.
To weep and sweat blood in the garden;
He comes not to die on the tree,
To purchase for rebels a pardon,—
O, no; glory,
Bright glory, environs him now."

The glory of Christ is *light* above the brightness of the sun: for of the New Jerusalem it is written: "The city had no need of the sun, . . . to shine in it: for . . . the Lamb is the light thereof."

But when Jesus comes in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, he comes not alone in his own glory, but also in the glory of "all the holy angels." And when of only one angel it is said that "his countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow" (Matt. 28:3), what must be the glory of the scene where are all the holy angels resplendent—"ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands," "an innumerable company"!

Yet when our Saviour comes in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, he comes not only in his own glory and in the glory of all the holy angels resplendent. Surely that would be "great glory;" but that is not all,—"O, no; glory,"—he comes also "in the glory of his Father." Matt. 16:27. And the glory of his Father is, of course, far above the brightness of the sun; indeed, of the heavenly city, in the same connection as previously quoted, it is said that "the city had not need of the sun, . . . to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it."

Therefore it is written that "the Son of man. . . shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels." Luke 9:26.

What a scene then awaits the eyes of those who are watching and waiting for the coming of the Lord,—the glory of all the holy angels, the glory of Christ above that of all the angels, and the glory of his Father also above all—all combined and intermingled in one heaven-covering scene of indescribable splendor!

And what will it be, to be there that day! And upon those who are prepared to see it, and to behold it, with joy, what can possibly be the effect, other than so to ravish them, so to fill them with perfect ecstasy, that they shall be literally translated?

And, wo worth the day! what can possibly be its effect upon those who are not prepared to see it in that day?—Plainly only that which is described,—so all-searching in its power, so all-terrifying in its splendor, that even a mountain to fall upon them to hide it, will be a relief.

But to all who are waiting and watching for him the scene will be as beautiful and joyous as it will be glorious. Not only will his glory cover the heavens because of his majesty; but the earth will be full of his praise because of his beauty and the joy of all who behold it. Hab. 3:3; 2 Thess. 1:10.

Thus "the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when" this our glorious "Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and

3

in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously."

Then too, and thus, in the light of that all-pervading glory, "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever;" yea, "there shall the righteous" even "shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Dan. 12:3; Matt. 13:43.

So he comes. He comes soon. For "he which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly."

And let every heart respond, "Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."—A. T. Jones, *in Review and Herald*.

July 4, 1899

"Departure from the Basic Principles of the Government in Its Attitude toward Religion" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 27 , pp. 3, 4 .

(By Alonzo T. Jones, Author of "The Rights of the People," "Two Republics," etc.

ON the reverse side of the great seal of the United States are two inscriptions in Latin: on saying, in English, "A New Order of Things;" the other, "God Has Favored the Undertaking."

At the time when this great seal was made, the first of these two inscriptions expressed the exact truth as to what this nation was, and what those who made the nation hoped it would forever remain. And this new order of things being in exact accordance with the order of the Lord, *because* it was the order of the Lord, the second of the inscriptions also expressed the exact truth.

A new order of things was surely needed. For ages an apostate church in union with the State, had held cruel sway over all the States and nations of Christendom; the civil power being only the means by which the ecclesiastical made its despotic sway more fatal. From this system Protestantism had cut loose, promising better things; but here likewise was apostasy from original principles and sincere Christianity, and in every place, except the little spot of Rhode Island and Providence Plantation, the evils and the despotism of the old order of things were perpetuated.

At last there came this new nation, pledged in its organic law, to the perfect civil and religious freedom of all people, and the complete separation of religion and the State, in the express statements of its supreme law, that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;" that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and that "the government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion."

"Vindicating the right of individuality in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained of God in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the federal government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite Spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power."—*Bancroft*.

That a nation was established expressly upon such principles, was a distinct triumph of Christianity, in spite of fourteen hundred years of persistent apostasy. It was likewise a distinct triumph of true Protestantism against false Protestantism, because it was but "the logical consequence of either of the two

great distinguishing principles of the Reformation—as well as of justification by faith alone, as of the equality of all believers.”—*Id.*

Yet, for all this, this triumph of Christian and Protestant principles was not won without a prolonged contest with those professing to be both Christians and Protestants. And even after the triumph was actually won, and the new nation stood out clear and distinct as a light of the world in its own bright "new order of things," reproaches and protests were made by people professing to be leading Christians and Protestants.

Yet even this was not the worst; there was positive deviation from the principle on the part of the government itself in the employment of chaplains in the army and navy, and in Congress. Madison expressed his disapproval of this, in a letter to Edward Livingstone, July 10, 1822, as follows:

"I observe with particular pleasure the view you have taken of the immunity of religion from civil jurisdiction, in every case where it does not trespass on private rights or the public purse. This has always been a favorite principle with me; and it was not with my approbation that the deviation from it took place in Congress when they appointed chaplains, to be paid from the public treasury."

Another departure from fundamental principle in the practice of the government, is in religious proclamations, such as Thanksgiving, and the like. On this also Madison said;—

"There has been another deviation from the strict principle ('of the immunity of religion from civil jurisdiction') in the executive proclamations of fasts and festivals."

And Jefferson wrote of it thus:—

"I consider the government of the United States as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline, or exercises. This results not only from the provision that no law shall be made respecting the establishment or free exercise of religion, but from that, also, which reserves to the States the powers not delegated to the United States. Certainly, no power to prescribe any religious exercise, or to assume authority in religious discipline, has been delegated to the general government. It must, then, rest with the States, as far as it can be in any human authority. But it is only proposed that I should recommend, not prescribe, a day of fasting and prayer. That is, that I should indirectly assume to the United States an authority over religious exercises, which the Constitution has directly precluded them from."

Another of these departures, begun in 1886, is the direct support of the churches by money from the national treasury. This has been carried on over since, and is so even today, though, having begun with the payment of public money to fourteen different churches, both Catholic and Protestant, the Catholic Church is the only one which now receives national support. President Harrison's administration attempted to stop all such appropriations, but was obliged to confess openly in the United States Senate that it "found it impossible to do that."

Effort has been continued ever since; but still it is found impossible to do it. And the impossibility centers solely in the Catholic Church, because all Protestant denominations have withdrawn from the scheme; and the government has been working for years to stop it, but still it goes on in favor of the

436

Catholic Church only. All of which demonstrates that the Catholic Church is, and for years has been, stronger than any administration of the government of the United States, and stronger even than the government itself altogether.

In 1892 a definite plan was adopted by Congress, by which church appropriations should be reduced twenty per cent. each year, until they should vanish; and, according to the sums at that time appropriated, this annual reduction of twenty per cent. was expected to clear the government in five years, which would be in 1898. Accordingly, in 1898, the Appropriation Bill, which must always originate in the House, was framed and put through the House without any appropriation for the Catholic Church; but, when the Appropriation Bill reached the Senate, an amendment was put to it, making this church appropriation as formerly, except in the proviso that the amount appropriated "for the next year should not exceed fifteen per cent. of the amount that was used in 1895."

It was declared by the men who made this nation that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical." Yet, this sinful and tyrannical thing is steadily carried on year after year by the government of the United States, at the command of the Catholic Church. Of course, such a thing is only to be expected from that sinful and tyrannical church, wherever she can have her way; but, that she should have such power in the United States as to compel the government of the United States, through administration after administration that is opposed to it, to follow this sinful and tyrannical course, bears indisputable testimony that the government of the United States, against its fundamental principles, is held to one of the most vicious practises [*sic.*] of the union of Church and State.

Yet, worse than all this, in 1892 the Supreme Court of the United States, so far as its influence could go, definitely committed the nation to the union of religion and the State, to the establishment of "general Christianity" as the national religion, because "this is a Christian nation." This being the case and the Catholic Church being the only phase of "general Christianity" that is directly supported by appropriations of money from the national treasury, the Catholic Church may, with very great reason claim that her Christianity is the Christianity that is established here, and that hers is peculiarly the Christianity of this "Christian nation."

In 1893 the Congress of the United States, the whole, both House and the Senate, decided that Sunday is the Christian sabbath according to the fourth commandment, and prohibited the opening of the gates of the World's Fair on Sunday, because of its being the Christian sabbath. And the President of the United States at that time approved the act, and his successor declared, against all disputers, that "this is a Christian nation, and they might as well face the music."

Thus, not only is the government of the United States, in the way of custom and precedent, committed to the union of religion and State, but by definite and positive acts on the part of the three distinct branches of which the whole government is composed, it has been positively committed to the union of religion and the State and all that it involves, even to the fullest measure. Every principle of the "New Order of Things" has been abandoned by this nation; and every principle of the old order of things has been restored in the nation.

This is apostasy complete, and the way is fully open for the complete fulfilment of prophecy concerning this nation. In the Scriptures it is written of this nation:—

"And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and it spake as a dragon." Rev. 13:11.

The two horns mentioned in this symbol represent the two great characteristic features of the nation; Protestantism, and Republicanism, fitly described it "like a lamb." Yet, tho this is so, the words are immediately added that "he spake as a dragon." This shows a complete change in character,—an entire apostasy from right principle.

Now, let any one candidly consider the fundamental principle of the total separation of religion and the State in this nation as developed in the running of the nation, as fixed in its fundamental and supreme law of the nation, and as signified in the thought expressed in the Great Seal of the nation, then let him consider the attitude and the character of the nation as manifested in the invariable practise of the nation in the present day; and must it not be confessed by every one who will do so, that there has been by this nation a distinct departure from the principles of true Americanism, a complete change of character, and an entire apostasy from right principle?

It is *not* in any sense a New Order of Things. This is exemplified in the course of the United States to-day. And as no nation can be false to its ideals and long survive, so this *national apostasy* can not possibly end in any thing else than *national ruin*. A. T. JONES.

July 12, 1899

"The Separation of Religion and the State. The First Great Commandment" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 28 , p. 1 .

The First Great Commandment

THE separation of religion and the State is one of the most important questions that any people can ever be called upon to consider, as the union of religion and the State has caused more misery than any other thing in history.

The separation of religion and the State is one of the two greatest and most important questions that stand before the people of "the United States of America and Asia" to-day. It is true that not everybody thinks so; nevertheless it *is* so, not only upon general principles, but also because of the daily aspiration and positive

practise [*sic.*] of the great mass of professed Christians of all sorts throughout the whole country. Yet the complete separation of religion and the State is Christian. It is not a mere sentiment or side issue of Christianity; it is one of the fundamental principles and chief characteristics of Christianity.

The Bible, not merely the New Testament, but the whole book, is the Book of Christianity. The New Testament is not a revelation new and distinct from the Old; it is the culmination of the revelation begun in the Old Testament.

The Old Testament and the New are one book—one consistent, harmonious revelation of God through Jesus Christ; because Jesus Christ is the revelation of God before the world was made, when the world was made, and through all the history of the world from beginning to end.

The first chapter of Genesis is Christian as certainly as is the first chapter of John. The book of Genesis is Christian as really as is the book of Revelation or any other book in the Bible. We repeat, therefore, that the whole Bible is the Book of Christianity, the Book of the Christian religion, the revelation of God through Jesus Christ.

And the separation of religion and the State is one of the great thoughts of this great Book. It is one of the leading principles of that Book which for man is the source of all sound principle.

Many people think that the two or three expressions of Christ as recorded in the New Testament are all that the Bible contains on the subject of the separation of Church and State; and many others are disposed even to argue against these passages, and to modify them by other passages from the Old Testament. But separation of religion and the State is one of the original thoughts of the Bible, and reaches from the beginning to the end of the Book; and neither the Book nor this subject can be fairly understood in reference to this matter till this is clearly defined in the mind. We purpose to give a series of studies of the Bible on this subject from beginning to end.

Being one of the great thoughts of the Bible, one of the great thoughts of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, this subject is of vital importance to men everywhere in their relations to God, and not merely in their relations to the State. It is a principle that is involved in the daily experience of the Christian in his relation to God, and not merely an abstract question that man can stand, as it were, apart from and view simply as a speculative question of the relations between religion and the State.

The ways of God are right. His Word is the only certain light, the only sure truth. The principles which He has announced are the only safe principles for the guidance of men. We hope, and shall seriously endeavor, to make each study so plain that every reader can easily see and readily grasp the truth of it. We shall begin and the beginning.

"The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, The Lord our 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.

"And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these."

"On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

These two commandments exist in the very nature, and circumstances of existence, of any two intelligent creatures in the universe. They existed thus in the existence of the first two intelligent creatures that ever has a place in the universe.

When the first intelligence was created and there was no creature but himself, as he owed to his Creator his existence, as he owed to God all that he was or could be, heart, soul, might, mind and strength; it devolved upon him to render to God the tribute of all this, and to love God with all his heart, and all his soul, and all his mind, and all his strength. And this is the first of all the commandments. It is first in the very nature and existence of the first, and of every other intelligent creature.

But the second of these would have no place if there were but one intelligent creature in the universe; for then he would have no neighbor. But when the second one was created, the first of all the commandments was *first* with him equally with the other one; and now the *second* great commandment exists in the very nature and existence of these *two* intelligent creatures, as certainly as the *first* great commandment existed in the nature and existence of the first *one*.

Each of the two created intelligences owes to the Lord all that he is or has, and all that he could ever rightly have. Neither of them has anything that is self-derived. Each owes all to God. There is between them no ground of preference. And this because of the honor which each owes to God; because to each, God is all in all. Therefore the second great commandment exists as certainly as the first; and it exists in the nature and circumstance of the very existence of intelligent creatures. Consequently, "There is none other commandment greater than these."

These two commandments, then, exist in the nature of cherubim, seraphim, angels and men. As soon as the man was created, the first of all the commandments was there, even though there had been no other creature in the universe. And as soon as the woman was created, these two great commandments were there. And there was none other commandment greater than these.

Now, if these two great commandments had been observed by man on the earth, that . . . had man never sinned, there always would have been perfect and supreme religion; *and they never could have been a State*. God would always have been by every one recognized as the only Ruler, His law as the only law, His authority as the only authority. There would have been government, but only the government of God. There would have been society, but only the society of saints. But there would have been, and could have been, no State.

Therefore it is certain that the observance of these two first of all the commandments, at any time and everywhere, means the absolute separation of religion and the State, in all who observe them. And thus the principle of separation of religion and the State inheres in the very existence of intelligent creatures.

But man did sin. And having sinned, having departed from God, mankind did not love God with all the heart nor their neighbor as themselves. Christianity was

introduced to bring man back to the position, and the original relations, which he lost. "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." And Christ hath suffered for us, "the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God."

It being, then, the one great purpose of Christianity to restore man to his original condition and relation to God, its purpose is to restore him to the condition in which he can love God with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the mind, and with all the strength; and his neighbor as himself. It is to restore him to obedience to these two first of all the commandments. It is to restore him to perfect and supreme religion.

We have seen that such a condition maintained from the beginning would have been the absolute separation of religion and State; because, then, there never could have been any State. And now as the one great purpose of Christianity is to restore man completely to that condition, it follows with perfect conclusiveness that Christianity in its very essence, from the beginning to the end, and everywhere, demands the absolute separation of religion and the State in all who profess it.

And it must not be forgotten that the complete separation of religion and the State in those who profess religion, can be maintained only by these persons themselves being separated from the State. For it is so plain as to be indisputable that if the professor of religion is himself a part of the State, then *in him* there is at once a union of religion and the State.

A. T. JONES.

July 19, 1899

"The Separation of Religion and the State. Distinction Between Society and the State. Apostasy—Babylon and Assyria" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 29 , pp. 4, 5 .

Apostasy—Babylon and Assyria

"THE first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is our 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.

"And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these."

"On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

It is certain that if these two commandments had always been observed by all men, there never could have been a State on the earth.

There would have been government, but no State. The government would have been altogether the government of God; He, the only King, the only Governor, on earth even as in heaven.

There would have been society, but no State. Because, men loving God with all the heart, and all the soul, and all the mind, and all the strength, and their neighbors as themselves, the will of God would have been done on earth even as in heaven. All would have been one united, harmonious, happy, holy family.

There is an essential distinction between society and the State.

Society is the union which exists between men, without distinction of frontiers—without exterior restraint—and for the sole reason that they are men.

The *civil* society or State is an assemblage of men subject to a common authority, to common laws,—that is to say, a society whose members may be constrained by public force to respect their reciprocal rights. Two necessary elements enter into the idea of the State: *laws and force.*—*Janct. "Elements of Morals," p. 143.*

This distinction, however, tho clear and easily evident, is seldom recognized. Indeed, it is not recognized at all by those who are anxious to secure the union of religion and the State in the United States.

But men did not observe these two "first of all the commandments." They would not love God with all their heart; they would not love their neighbors as themselves. They rejected God as their only ruler, their only sovereign, and became ambitious to rule over one another. And thus originated politics and the State.

The Scripture outlines the story of this: "When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind." Rom. 1:21-25, 28.

Note, that at the first, men *did know God*. But they chose not to glorify Him, not to honor Him, not to give Him the first place in all their thoughts and actions. Knowing God, they did not like to retain Him in their knowledge.

The next step was that they became vain in their own imaginations. They professed themselves to be wise, of themselves. The consequence was that they became fools; and their foolish heart was darkened.

In their vain imaginations they made gods of their own. And then to assist themselves in their worship, they made images of the gods which they had imagined.

The image was always the outward, tangible, form of the god which they had already conceived in the imagination. Imagining is simply mental *image-ing*. The outward form of the god, whether it be the shining sun in the heavens or a hideously-shaped block of wood or stone, is only the outward form of the image-ing [*sic.*] that has already been performed in the *imagination*.

Thus, from the knowledge of the true God, they went to the worship of false gods. From the light, they went into darkness. From righteousness, they went to wickedness.

This is the truth. And the records of the earliest nations witnessed to it. The earliest records—those of the plain of Shinar—witness that the people at first had a knowledge of the true God. The records of the next two of the earliest nations, Egypt and Assyria, bear witness to this same thing.

In all these places the earliest records testify that the gods were their first rulers and the real kings; while men, in the places of authority, were but the servants, the viceroys, of the gods who were held to be the real kings.

For instance, one of the earliest records from Shinar runs thus: "To [the god] Ninridu, his King, for the preservation of Idadu, *viceroys of Ridu*, the servant, the delight of Ninridu." Another: "To [the god] Ninip the King, *his King*, Gudea, *viceroys of [the god] Zirgulla*, his house built." Another: "To Nana, the lady, lady splendid, his lady, Gudea, *viceroys of Virgulla*. . . . raised.—*Empire of the Bible*, p. 50.

These are not only the earliest of the records that have been *found* in that land, but they themselves show that they are of the earliest records that were *made* in that land. And they clearly testify of a time when there were no kings amongst men. The gods were the kings; and the men in authority claimed only to be the viceroys of the gods who were held to be the real kings.

And all this testifies of a time further back, when the people knew and recognized God as the only king and rightful ruler of men. They show also that this knowledge of God was so recent, and still so strong upon the minds of the people, that men who stood in places of authority had not the boldness to assume the title of king, even tho they held the power.

The records of Egypt and Assyria testify precisely to these same things. And at that time also, *there was no State*. There was society.

There came a time, however, when even this lingering knowledge of God as king and the only rightful ruler, was cast off; and the man assumed the full title and prerogatives of king, himself.

The first man to do this was Nimrod. Nimrod was the first man in the world who had the boldness to take to himself the title and prerogative of king, in the face of the yet lingering idea of God as king. And the name which he bears, itself testifies to the fact that his action in this, was considered by men and also by the Lord, as precisely the bold thing which is here indicated. The word "Nimrod" "signifies rebellion, supercilious contempt, and is equivalent to 'the extremely impious rebel.'"

The Bible record of Nimrod is that "he began to be a mighty one in the earth." Another translation reads: "Cush begat Nimrod, who was the first to be a despot on the earth. He was an overbearing tyrant in Jehovah's sight; wherefore the saying, Even as Nimrod, the overbearing tyrant in Jehovah's sight." Gen. 10:8, 9.

That is, Nimrod was the first one to establish the might, the power, the authority, of human government, in the form of an organized State. He was the first man to assert the power and prerogatives, and assume the title, of king over men. "And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar."

Consequently: "With the setting up of Nimrod's kingdom, the entire ancient world entered a new historical phase. The oriental

tradition which makes that warrior the first man who wore a kingly crown, points to a fact more significant than the assumption of a new ornament of dress, or even the conquest of a province. His reign introduced to the world a new system of relations between the governor and the governed. The authority of former rulers rested upon the feeling of kindred; and the ascendancy of the chief was an image of parental control. Nimrod, on the contrary, was a *sovereign of territory*, and of men just so far as they were its inhabitants, and irrespective of personal ties. Hitherto there had been tribes—enlarged families—*society*; *now* there was a nation, a political community—THE STATE. The political and social history of the world henceforth are distinct, if not divergent."—*Empires of the Bible*, p. 51.

Such was the true origin of the State. The State was, and is, the result of the apostasy of men from God. Such only could possibly be its origin; for if all men had always observed the two "first of all the commandments," it would have been impossible for there ever to be any State. There could have been no human authority exercised. All would have been equally subject to God; He would have been the only Sovereign.

Before Nimrod there was society. Respect of the rights of persons and of their property was maintained. It was only when the apostasy grew, and men got farther and farther from God, that the monarchical idea was established and personified in Nimrod.

Let no one misunderstand. This is not to say, nor even to imply, that there should now be no human government, that there should be no State, nor even that there should be no monarchy. It is simply to say that which is the truth, that if there never had been any apostasy from God, there never could have been on earth a State, nor any human government.

It is true that these things are the consequences of the apostasy from God. But men having apostatised from God, these things all, even to such monarchy as that of Nimrod or of Nero, became necessary, just in proportion to the degree of apostasy.

It is better that there should be a government, bad as it may be, than that there should be no government at all. Even such a government as Nimrod's or Nero's is better than none at all; and without the apostasy having gone to a fearful

469

length, there never could have been any *such* government as Nimrod's or Nero's.

Nimrod's example was eagerly followed by all the nations around, until they were all absorbed in it. Society had passed away, and only States remained; and these universally idolatrous. In all that region, only Abraham believed God; even his own parents being idolaters. "They served other gods."

God chose Abraham then to be the father of all them that believe God; the father of all who will have God alone to be their God. Abraham represented then the religion of God, the beginning of the church of God.

And from that State God separated Abraham. He said to Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, into a land that I will show thee."

And in thus separating Abraham from that State, from his country, God taught the people then, and through all time, the separation of religion and the State, the separation of Church and State.

And it must not be forgotten that in the case of Abraham, this universal example, the separation of religion and the State, was the separation of the *individual believer* from the State. And as Abraham was at that time the church, and he was separated from the State, in this it is plainly taught that the true separation of Church and State is in the separation of the individual church-member from the State. Besides, it is perfectly plain in itself that where the same individual is a member of the Church and of the State at the same time, there is at once *in him* a union of Church and State.

A. T. JONES.

July 26, 1899

"The Separation of Religion and the State. The Lesson in the 'Father of the Faithful'" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 30 , p. 4 .

WHEN God said to Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee," Abraham "went out, not knowing whither he went."

God had not yet showed to him the land or country into which he was to go, and which was to be his. So far, the Lord had only promised to show it to him.

There were three things, however, which Abraham must do before he could fairly expect God to show him the country which He had promised, and which was to be his. First, he was to get out of his country; secondly, from his kindred; thirdly, from his father's house.

He left his country; but when he did so, his father and his kindred went with him to Haran, and dwelt there. There his father died; and now, separated from his father's house, he went on to the land of Canaan.

But there accompanied him yet one of his kindred—Lot, his brother's son. While Lot was with him, and he was thus not separated from his kindred, though separated from his country and his father's house, the time could come for God to show to him the land, nor the country which He would give him.

But there came a day when Lot should be separated from him. Lot chose all the plain of the Jordan, and journeyed east, and "they separated thus, one from the other."

And just then it was that God showed to Abraham the land which He had promised to show him, the country which should be his.

"And the Lord said unto Abraham, *after that Lot was separated from him*, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and

southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever." Gen. 13:14, 15.

And the country which the Lord then showed to Abraham, and which He there promised him should be his for an everlasting possession—that country embraced the world; for "the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Rom. 4:13.

Therefore, when at the word of the Lord Abraham lifted up his eyes to see what the Lord would show him, he saw "the world to come," which is to be the everlasting possession of all them which be of faith. For "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3:29.

And from that day forward Abraham "sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country," looking for "a better country, that is, an heavenly," and looking "for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Heb. 11:9, 16, 8. For tho God promised that He would give to Abraham that land, and to his seed after him, yet as long as he was in this world God really "gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on." Acts 7:5.

Now note: God had called Abraham out of his original country, and thus had separated him from that. Then He gave him not even so much as to set his foot on in any other country in this world.

Abraham at that time represented the religion of God. The Lord in His dealing thus with Abraham and in recording it, has shown, for all time and to all people, that it is His will that there should be an absolute separation of His religion from any State. And in thus showing the complete separation of His religion from any State, He shows that this separation consists in the separation of the individual believer of His religion, from any State. Are you walking "in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham," the friend of God?

Abraham, representing at that time the church of Christ, being thus totally separated by the Lord from every State and country on the earth, there is thus shown to all people, as an original truth of the Gospel of Christ, that there should be total separation of Church and State, and that the church of Christ can never have any country in the world. And in thus showing that the church of Christ can never have any country in this world, He shows that the individual members of the church of Christ can never have any country in this world; for that which composes the church of Christ is the individual membership.

So also dwelt Isaac and Jacob, heirs with Abraham of the same promise, accepting with Abraham separation from every earthly State and country, confessing "that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth," looking for the country which God had prepared for them, and the city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

And that they accepted this freely of their own choice, by faith in God, is shown by the fact, as recorded: "Truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for He hath prepared for them a city." Heb. 11:15, 16.

This dealing of God with Abraham, and the record of it, were for the instruction of all the people who would believe God, from that time to the world's end. For Abraham was the called, the chosen, the friend, of God, the father of all them that believe. And all they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. And not the least element of instruction in this account of God's dealings with Abraham, is the great lesson it teaches that the religion of God means separation of religion and the State. Are you walking in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham?—have you gotten out of your country? Or have you still a country in this world? Is there *in you* a union of religion and the State?

Further: "Now to Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy Seed, which is Christ." Gal. 3:16. Therefore the promises recorded and referred to in the scripture, "To Abraham and his seed," are always to Abraham and Christ, and to Abraham in Christ. And, therefore, "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

And when Christ, that promised Seed, came into the world a man amongst men, then in Him, as formerly in Abraham, there was represented the religion of God and the church of Christ. And as such He ever maintained the same principle of separation of religion and the State which He Himself had set before the world in the life and record of Abraham.

He refused to recognize, even by a sign, the wish of the people to make Him king. John 6:15. He refused, when requested, to act the part of a judge or a divider over men as to the rights of property. Luke 12:13-15. He refused to recognize the national lines of distinction, the wall of partition, which Israel in their exclusiveness had built up between themselves and other nations. He refused to judge, or to allow any others to judge, any one for not believing on Him. John 12:47, 48. He distinctly declared that, though He is a king, yet His kingdom is not of this world, and that it is not in any way connected with this world. John 18:36. He distinctly declared the separation of His religion from the State. "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." Mark 12:17. And when He sent forth His disciples with His heavenly commission to preach the Gospel of His kingdom, He sent them not to one particular nation, but to "teach *all nations*, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost." He sent them to preach the Gospel; not to one particular, favored, exclusive people, but "to every creature."

Thus it is seen again that in every phase of the fundamental principle of the religion of God and the church of Christ, from the beginning to the end of the world, there is required the absolute separation of religion and the State—the total disconnection of His church from every State and country in the world, and from the world itself.

And this total disconnection of His church from every State and country in this world, and from the world itself, is, and can be, accomplished only by the total disconnection of the individual members of His church from every State and country in the world, and from the world itself. "Ye are not of the world; for I have chosen you out of the world." "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the

world." John 15:19; 17:16. Are you?
ALONZO T. JONES.

August 9, 1899

"Separation of Religion and the State. The Lesson of Egypt" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 32 , p. 1 .

IN the beginnings of Egypt the same course was followed as in the beginnings of Babylon and Assyria.

At first they knew the one true God; and He was their only King, their only Ruler.

But they did not like to retain God in their knowledge; and therefore they went into idolatry, and from idolatry into monarchy.

The Egyptian records state that the first rulers of Egypt were the gods; after them the demigods; and after these the kings.

In Egypt, however, the king was not content, as in Assyria, to call himself the viceroy of his god; he claimed to be the very embodiment of the god itself—the god was personated in the king; from him, it was declared, the people "received the breath of their nostrils;" he was "the giver of life."—*Empires of the Bible, chap. VII, p. 207.*

And thus, tho Nimrod was the first man to establish monarchical authority and assume the kingly title and crown, yet in Egypt his example was followed to the greatest lengths, as Egypt was undoubtedly the most idolatrous nation that ever was on the earth. There apostasy of every kind culminated, so that throughout the Bible the one word "Egypt" symbolizes everything that is contrary to God.

When the power of monarchy had filled the Mesopotamian plain, God called Abraham out of that country into the land of Canaan, where he could be free, and thus made a separation of Church and State, and preached the same to all people.

But in process of time, and by Egypt, the power of monarchy was spread over all countries, from Ethiopia to Ararat and central Asia. Then, as His people were obliged to live under the power of monarchy anyhow, the Lord put them where they could do the most possible good—He placed them at the very seat of the world's empire, in Egypt itself.

And there, through all the time of the supremacy of the Egyptian Empire, with Joseph and Moses beside the throne, and Israel amongst the people, of Egypt, God held before all nations the knowledge of Himself. And as soon as the time came when the Egyptian Empire must fall, God would place His people once more in Canaan, the pivot of the highways of the nations.

To this end there must be again taught to the world the separation of religion and the State, the separation of Church and State. God's people must be called out of Egypt, in order that they and all the nations might be instructed in the great

principles of the Gospel, of supreme allegiance to God, of the separation of religion and the State, of church and country.

Moses understood this, and therefore he "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter." Heb. 11:24. Moses was the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter. Pharaoh's daughter was Pharaoh's chief wife, and queen. Moses, therefore, by the most complete claim, was heir apparent to the throne of Egypt. And as the king was then more than eighty years old, it could be but a little while till Moses would possess and throne of Egypt. The throne of Egypt was at that time the throne of the world; for the power of Egypt then ruled the world. It was the supreme State, the governing empire over all. See "Empires of the Bible," chap. VII.

For Moses to refuse to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter was therefore to renounce the throne of Egypt. To renounce the throne of Egypt was to renounce the power of empire. It was definitely to disconnect from the State.

At that time Moses was called to have charge over "the house of God, which is the church of the living God." Heb. 3:2, 5; 1 Tim. 3:15. It was in obedience to this call that he renounced the throne of Egypt and the power of empire. It was because of this that he definitely disconnected himself from the State. And in recording it, God designed to teach all people that conformity to His will means the separation of Church and State; that it means the renunciation of the throne and the power of earthly empire—the total separation of religion and the State. In recording it God designs to teach, and does teach, that union with His church means separation from the State.

And it was through the faith of Christ that Moses did all this. It was "through faith" that "Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." Heb. 11:24-26.

Therefore, from that day to this, it has been made plain to all people that faith in God, the faith of Jesus Christ, the original principle of the Gospel and of the church, means the absolute separation of Church and State; the renunciation of the throne and power of earthly dominion; the total separation of religion and the State; and that uniting with the church of Christ means separation from the State and countries of this world.

And this is what faith in God, the faith of Jesus Christ, the fundamental principle of the Gospel and of the church, means to all people in the world to-day.
ALONZO T. JONES.

August 16, 1899

"Separation of Religion and the State. Out of Egypt. The Singular Nation—Choosing a King" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 33 , p. 4 .

FORTY years the Lord led and fed His people in the wilderness.

All this time He was teaching them the way of allegiance to Himself—the way of faith.

This He did in order that His purpose might be fulfilled through them in the land whither they were going to possess it.

At the end of the forty years they were encamped in the plain of Moab, opposite Jericho, preparatory to entering the land of their possession.

While there encamped, the will of God concerning them was declared by an irresistible inspiration upon the prophet Balaam, and in words of instruction to His people for all time.

And the words are these: "Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." Num. 23:9.

At that time the Lord's people composed "the church in the wilderness" (Acts 7:38); and in thus declaring that they should dwell alone and not be reckoned among the nations, He plainly declared His will that His church should be forever separated from every State and nation on the earth.

God never intended that His people should be formed into a kingdom, or State, or government, like the people of this world; nor that they should in any way be connected with any kingdom, or State, or government, of this world.

They were not to be like the nations or the people around them. They were to be separated unto God "from all the people that are upon the face of the earth." Ex. 33:16. The people were to dwell alone, and were not to be reckoned among the nations.

Their government was to be a theocracy pure and simple—God their only King, their only Ruler, their only Lawgiver. It was indeed to be a church organization, beginning with the organization of "the church in the wilderness," and was to be separated from every idea of a State. The system formed in the wilderness through Moses, was to continue in Canaan; and was intended to be perpetual.

"The government of Israel was administered in the name and by the authority of Jehovah. The work of Moses, of the seventy elders, of the rulers and judges, was simply to enforce the laws that God had given. They had no authority to legislate for the nation." For God had declared plainly, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it." Deut. 4:2.

Thus the principles of their government were solely those of a pure theocracy. And such "was and continued to be the condition of Israel's existence as a nation." In any government it is only loyalty to the principles of the government, on the part of its citizens, that can make it a success. Consequently, on the part of Israel, it was only loyalty to the principles of a pure theocracy—God their only King, their only Ruler, their only Lawgiver—that could possibly make that government a success.

But loyalty to these principles demanded that each one of the people should constantly recognize, and court, the abiding presence of God with him as the sole King, Ruler, and Lawgiver, in all the conduct of his daily life. Yet it is "by faith" that God dwells in the heart and rules in the life. And "without faith it is impossible to please Him." Therefore the existence of the original government of

Israel, and the existence of Israel as a nation, depended upon a living, abiding faith in God, on the part of each individual of the people of Israel.

And just here, the only point where Israel could fail, Israel failed. The people did not abide in faith. They did not remain loyal to God as their King. And "Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died, being an hundred and ten years old. . . . And also all that generation were gathered unto their fathers; and there arose another generation after them, which knew not the Lord, nor yet the works which He had done for Israel."

"And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim; and they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them, and bowed themselves unto them, and provoked the Lord to anger. And they forsook the Lord, and served Baal and Ashtaroth." Judges 2:8-13.

Then all the evils that came upon them only as the result of their apostasy and idolatry, they charged back upon the government of God. In their unbelief and apostasy, they could see in the continued raids of the heathen, by which their country was sacked, and themselves were oppressed, only evidence that for all practical purposes the government of God had failed.

They therefore reached the conclusion "that in order to maintain their standing among the nations, the tribes must be united under a strong central government. As they departed from obedience to God's law, they desired to be freed from the rule of their divine Sovereign; and thus the demand for a *monarchy* became widespread throughout Israel." Accordingly, they said to Samuel, "Make us a king to judge us like all the nations." 1 Sam. 8:5.

As their hearts were fully set on having a king like all the nations, and as practically they were much like all the nations anyhow, the best thing the Lord could do for them was to let them have their king. Nevertheless, He said to Samuel, "Protest solemnly unto them." 1 Sam. 8:9.

Samuel did so, but still they insisted: "Nay; but we will have a king over us; that we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles." 1 Sam. 8:19, 20.

And of it all the Lord said to Samuel, "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them." And Samuel said unto them, "Ye have this day rejected your God," and "have said unto Him, Nay; but set a king over us." 1 Sam. 8:7; 10:19.

It was the same story of Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt, over again. When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God. And as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, the arch-deceiver seduced them into idolatry, and from idolatry into monarchy, in order that he might gain supremacy over them, and by worldly influence entice them, or by force prohibit them, from the service of God.

It was to save them from all this that the Lord had said of them, "The people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations."

If they had remained faithful to this principle, there never would have been amongst Israel a State or a kingdom.

Therefore, in announcing this principle, God intended forever that they should be completely separated from any such thing as a State or kingdom on the earth.

And as when that word was spoken they were "the church," it is absolutely certain that in announcing that principle, God intended to teach them and all people forever that His plainly-declared will is that there shall be a complete separation between His church and every State or kingdom on the earth; that there shall never be any connection between His religion and any State or kingdom in the world.

And, further: As that people were then the church, and as the Lord said they rejected Him when they formed that State and kingdom, it is perfectly plain by the Word of the Lord that whenever the church forms any connection with any State or kingdom on the earth, in the very doing of it she rejects God.

But it is impossible for the church ever to form any connection with any State except by the *individual members* of the church forming a connection with the State. Therefore, as the church in forming such connection rejects God, and as it is impossible to do this except by the individual members of the church, it is perfectly plain that the teaching of the Word of God is that for members of the church to form connection with the State is to reject God.

And from ancient time all this was written for the admonition of those upon whom the ends of the world are come. Will the people to-day be admonished by it?

ALONZO T. JONES.

August 23, 1899

"Separation of Religion and the State. 'Like All the Nations'" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 34 , p. 4 .

GOD had said of Israel, "Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations."

But, contrary to His expressed will, and against His solemn protest, Israel set up a kingdom and established a State.

They did this, they plainly said, that they might be "like all the nations." Contrary to all the Lord's wishes, the people would "be reckoned among the nations."

But Israel was the church, while all the nations were States. Israel, therefore, could not be like the nations without forming themselves into a State.

But Israel, being the church, could not possibly form themselves into a State without at the same time, and in the very doing of it, forming a union of Church and State.

They did form themselves into a State, and did thus unite Church and State. But as this was contrary to the Lord's plain Word, and against His solemn protest, it certainly stands as the truth that any union of Church and State is against the plain Word and the solemn protest of God.

Israel as "the church," which is "the pillar and ground of the truth," was the depository and the representative of the true religion in the world. Then when Israel formed themselves into a State, this was nothing else than a union of

religion and the State. And as their forming of a State was contrary to the expressed will and the solemn protest of the Lord, it is clearly the truth that any connection between religion—and above all the true religion—and the State is positively against the expressed will and the solemn protest of God.

And as Israel, the depository and representative of the true religion, in order to form a union of religion and the State, had to reject God, it is certainly true that every other people, in forming a union of religion and the State, do, in the very doing of it, reject God.

Nothing can be plainer, therefore, than that the God of heaven and earth, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is eternally opposed to a union of religion and the State. He will never be a party to any such transaction.

This is why He desired that "the people should dwell alone." This is why He would have it that they should "not be reckoned among the nations." He desired that they should abide with Him, and have Him their only God, their only King, their only Ruler, their only Lawgiver—their "all in all."

God wanted not only that Israel, but that all people on the earth, should know that He is better than all other gods, that He is a better King than all other kings, that He is a better Ruler than all other rulers, that He is a better Lawgiver than all other lawgivers, that His law is better than all other laws, and that His government is better than all other governments.

For this reason He would station Israel in Palestine, at the pivot of the highways of the nations; with the God of heaven as their only King, Ruler, and Lawgiver; with His law their only law, and His government their only government; the people dwelling alone and not reckoned among the nations—a holy, happy people; a glorious church.

Dwelling thus in the sight of all the nations that had forgotten God, those nations would be constantly taught the goodness of God and would be once more drawn to Him. Accordingly He told them: "Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments, . . . that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." Deut. 4:5, 6.

But Israel would not have it so. Israel would "be reckoned among the nations." Israel would be "like all the nations." And so it has been, from that day to this. God has never been allowed by His professed people to reveal Himself to the world as He really is. His church has always been too willing to "be reckoned among the nations," too willing to be "like all the nations." She has always been too willing to be joined to the State, to be a part of the State, to have religion a matter of State and government, "like all the nations." And so it is with the church in all the world to-day.

"'Like all the nations.' The Israelites did not realize that to be in this respect *unlike* other nations was a special privilege and blessing. God had separated the Israelites from every other people, to make them His own peculiar treasure. But they, disregarding this high honor, eagerly desired to imitate the example of the heathen.

"And still the longing to conform to worldly customs and practices exists among the professed people of God. As they *depart from the Lord* they become ambitious for the gains and honors of the world. Christians are constantly seeking to imitate the practices of those who worship the god of this world. Many urge that by uniting with worldlings and conforming to their customs, they might exert a stronger influence over the ungodly.

"But all who pursue this course thereby separate from the Source of their strength. Becoming the friends of the world, they are the enemies of God. For the sake of earthly distinction they sacrifice the unspeakable honor to which God has called them, of showing forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvelous light.

"The days of Israel's greatest prosperity were those in which they acknowledged Jehovah as their King—when the laws and government which He established were regarded as superior to those of all other nations."—*Patriarchs and Prophets, chap. lix, par. 8-13*. And such will be the days of any people's greatest prosperity.

God's laws, just as they stand, without any re-enactment, without any adding to or diminishing from, are superior to all other laws. His government, administered by Himself through the operation of His own eternal Spirit in each individual heart, is superior to every other government.

But how shall the people know this, who know not God, so long as His own people will not have it so? How shall the nations know this, when His own professed church will not recognize it nor have it so?

Instead of holding fast God's laws and government as superior to those of all States and nations, the professed people of God consider that they must enter the politics and shape the policies, that they must tinker the laws and manipulate the governments, of the States and nations of the world.

Instead of magnifying God's laws and government before all the world, as superior to the laws and governments of all the nations, and showing unswerving allegiance to them as such, the people of the professed churches of God seek to mingle heavenly citizenship with earthly citizenship; and to bring down from their superior place the laws and government of God, and mix them up with the laws and government of all the nations in an unseemly and ungodly union of religion and the State.

And thus the people of the professed churches of God, of the young people's societies and leagues professing Christianity—of all the combined church elements of the land—are following directly in the track of the church of ancient Israel; they will not dwell alone; they will be reckoned among the nations; they will be like all the nations; they will join themselves to the State; they will form a union of religion and the State; they will reject God, that He should not reign over them.

ALONZO T. JONES.

August 30, 1899

"Separation of Religion and the State. Result of Being 'Like the Nations'" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 35 , p. 3 (563).

ISRAEL would form a State, and have a king, that they might be "like all the nations."

All the nations were heathen. To be "like all the nations," then, was only to be like the heathen.

All the nations became heathen by rejecting God. Then when Israel would be "like all the nations"—like all the heathen,—they could do so only by rejecting God.

It was therefore but the simple statement of a fact when the Lord said, "They have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them."

When Israel formed a State, they thereby created a union of religion and the State. But they had to reject God in order to form a State. Therefore they had to reject God in order to form a union of religion and the State.

It follows, therefore, plainly, that no people can ever form a union of religion and the State without rejecting God.

But though Israel had rejected God, yet He did not reject them. He still cared for them; and, through His prophets, still sought to teach and guide them, ever doing His best to save them from the evil consequences which were inevitable in the course which they had taken.

Long before the days of Samuel and Saul, Israel had been taught what would be the outcome of forming themselves into a State and choosing a king; for the formation of a kingdom in the days of Saul was but the culmination of a long-cherished desire in that direction.

After the great victories of Gideon, a hundred years before the day of Saul, "the men of Israel said unto Gideon, Rule thou over us, both thou, and thy son, and thy son's son also; for thou hast delivered us from the hand of Midian." Judges 8:22.

This was nothing else than a proposition to establish at that time a kingdom, with Gideon as the first king, and the kingship to be hereditary in his family. But Gideon refused the offer, and "said unto them, I will not rule over you; neither shall my son rule over you; the Lord shall rule over you."

Gideon knew that such a proposition meant the rejection of God; and he would have no part in any such thing. But the desire still lurked among the people; and forty years afterward, upon the death of Gideon, it was manifested openly in the men of Shechem making Abimelech, a son of Gideon, king in Shechem.

But in a parable, Jotham, the only son of Gideon who had survived the slaughter wrought by Abimelech, mapped out plainly to the people what would be the sure result of their venture.

Jotham stood on the top of Gerizim and called to the people of Shechem, and said:—

"The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them; and they said unto the olive tree, Reign thou over us. But the olive tree said unto them, Should I leave my fatness, wherewith by me they honor God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? And the trees said to the fig tree, Come thou, and reign

over us. But the fig tree said unto them, Should I forsake my sweetness, and my good fruit, and go to be promoted over the trees? Then said the trees unto the vine, Come thou, and reign over us. And the vine said unto them, Should I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? Then said all the trees unto the bramble, Come thou, and reign over us. And the bramble said unto the trees, If in truth you anoint me king over you, then come and put your trust in my shadow; and if not, let fire come out of the bramble, and devour the cedars of Lebanon. Now therefore, if ye have done truly and sincerely, in that ye have made Abimelech king, . . . then rejoice ye in Abimelech, and let him also rejoice in you; but if not, let fire come out from Abimelech, and devour the men of Shechem, and the house of Millo; and let fire come out from the men of Shechem, and from the house of Millo, and devour Abimelech." Judges 9:8-20.

And so it came to pass; for in three years the distrust and dissension had so grown between the parties to the transaction respecting the kingship, that open war broke out, which ended only with the death of Abimelech; and, with that, the end of their experiment at setting up a kingdom.

Now all this was held up before all Israel who should come after, as a solemn warning and a forcible admonition of what would inevitably be the result of any attempt at setting up a kingdom. And when, in disregard of all this, and against the Lord's open protest, they did at last again set up a kingdom, this very result, though longer delayed, did inevitably come.

Almost all the reign of Saul, their first king, was spent by him in envy and jealousy of David and a steady seeking to kill him. The reign of David was marred by his own great sin, which he never could have carried out if he had not been king; and was also disturbed by the treason of his chief counselor, and the insurrection of his son Absalom. The latter half of the reign of Solomon was marked by his great apostasy, and was cursed by the abominable idolatries that came in with his heathen wives—all "princesses," the daughters of kings—and which in turn brought heavy burdens and oppression upon the people.

At the end of the reign of these three kings, the nation had been brought to a condition in which it was not well that they should continue as one; and they were therefore divided into two—the Ten Tribes forming the kingdom of Israel, and the two other tribes forming the kingdom of Judah.

And from that day, with the Ten Tribes there was continuous course of apostasy, of contention, and of regicide, till at last, from the terrors of anarchy, they were compelled to cry out, "We have no king." Hosea 10:3. Then the Lord offered Himself to them again, saying: "Thou hast fled from Me." "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself." "Return unto Me." "I will be thy King." Hosea 7:13; 13:9, 10. But they would not return, and consequently were carried captive to Assyria, and were scattered and lost forever.

When this happened to the kingdom of Israel, it could yet be said of Judah, "Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints." Hosea 11:12. But this was only for a little while. Judah, too, went steadily step by step downward in the course of apostasy, until of her too the word had to be given: "Remove the diadem, take off the crown; . . . exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I

will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until He come whose right it is, and I will give it Him." Eze. 21:25-27.

Thus Judah too was obliged to say, We have no king. And Judah had to go captive to Babylon, with her city and temple destroyed, and the land left desolate. Thereafter the Lord was obliged to govern His people by the heathen powers, until He Himself should come. And even when He came, because He would not at once set Himself up as a worldly king and sanction their political aspirations, they refused to recognize Him at all. And when at last even Pilate appealed to them, "Shall I crucify your King?" they still, as in the days of Samuel, insisted on rejecting God, and cried out, "We have no king but Cesar." John 19:15.

And this was but the direct outcome, and the inevitable logic, of the step that they took in the days of Samuel. When they rejected God and chose Saul, in that was wrapped up the rejection of the Lord and their choosing of Cesar. In rejecting God that they might be like all the nations, they became like all the nations that rejected God.

And such was the clear result of the union of Church and State among the people of Israel. And it is all written precisely as it was worked out in detail, for the instruction and warning of all people who should come after, and for the admonition of those upon whom the ends of the world are come.

Will the professed people of God to-day in the churches, societies, leagues, unions, and associations of all sorts, everywhere, learn the lesson taught thus in the Word of God of the experience of the people of God of old who would have a State, and so rejected God?

ALONZO T. JONES.

September 6, 1899

"Separation of Religion and the State. Taught to Babylon" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 36 , pp. 4, 5 .

GOD had delivered His people from Egypt, and had united them to Himself in order that they might be separated from all the nations. And having brought them out of Egypt, and joined them to Himself, He said of them, "The people shall dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations." Num. 23:9. It was only by remaining faithful to their union with God that they could be separated from all the nations. Ex. 33:16.

Israel was then the church,—"the church in the wilderness." Acts 7:38. That church was united to God in solemn covenant, upon which the Lord said, "I am married unto you," and, "I was an husband unto them." Thus was that church united to God. And in this there was the complete separation of Church and State.

But Israel was unfaithful to God. She rejected Him and set up a State, and thus formed a union of Church and State. The result was the complete ruin of the State which they had formed; the scattering of the people in captivity among the nations; and the desolation of their land. In their captivity and their trouble they

sought the Lord in contrition; and joined themselves again in faithfulness to Him. And this brought them back to their original position of being the church only, and so to their original condition of total separation of Church and State.

God had planted Israel—His church—in Canaan to be the light of the world, to give the knowledge of the true God; as at that time and for ages afterward Palestine was the pivot of the known world. By their being faithful to Him and having Him abide with them, He intended that they should influence all the nations for good. But they revolted and became not only "like all the nations," but even "worse than the heathen." Therefore the land became sick of them, and spewed them out, as it had spewed out the heathen before them.

As by their apostasy and union of Church and State, Israel had frustrated God's purpose to enlighten all nations by them in the land where He had planted them, He would fulfill His purpose, nevertheless; and, separating them again entirely from the State, would enlighten all the nations by them in the lands where He had scattered them. Israel, by becoming like all the nations, had lost the power to arrest and command the attention of all the nations, that the nations might know God, and be taught of Him. Nevertheless, God would now use them to enlighten those who, under Him, had *acquired* the power to arrest and command the attention of all the nations. Thus *by them* still He would bring to all the nations the knowledge of the true God, and teach them that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will." This is the whole philosophy of the captivity and subjection of Israel and Judah to Assyria, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome.

God conveyed to the kings and people of these mighty empires, the knowledge of Himself and of His truth for people and kings. And, as we have found over and over in these studies that the separation of religion and the State is one of the fundamental principles of the truth of God for kings and nations, this is one of the great truths taught to the kings and people of these great empires. And this instruction was written out in the Word of God for the instruction of all kings and people until the world's end.

In the second year of his reign alone, to King Nebuchadnezzar there was shown in a dream a great image, whose head was of gold, his breast and arms of silver, his sides of brass, his legs of iron, and his feet and toes part of iron and part of clay. By the word of the Lord through Daniel this was explained to Nebuchadnezzar as signifying the course of empire from that time until the end of the world.

This dream was given to Nebuchadnezzar because that, while upon his bed, thoughts had come into his mind as to "what should come to pass hereafter." From what came to pass afterward *with him*, it is evident that his thoughts upon that question were to the effect that the mighty kingdom of Babylon, which he ruled—the head of gold—would in its greatness and glory continue on and on indefinitely. To correct this view, and to show him the truth, was the purpose of the dream.

The instruction in the dream, through the divine interpretation, was that the golden glory of his kingdom would continue but a little while, and then another would arise, inferior to his, and another, and another, and then there would be

division, with all these descending in a regular scale of inferiority; and then, at last, "the God of heaven" would "set up a kingdom," and *this alone* would be the kingdom that should stand forever, and not be given to other people.

But Nebuchadnezzar would not accept this view of the subject. Accordingly, he formulated his own idea in a great image, about a hundred feet tall, *all* of gold from head to feet. This image he set up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon, to be worshiped, and called all his princes, governors, sheriffs, captains, rulers of the provinces, and people generally, to worship it.

This was a positive setting up of his own idea against that of God. This was to declare to all people that *his* golden kingdom was to endure forever; that there was to be no such thing as another kingdom arising separate from his and inferior to it, and after that others, descending so low as iron mixed with miry clay. No! there should be only his golden kingdom of Babylon, and it should never be broken nor interrupted; but should stand forever.

In a number of points this was an open challenge to the Lord. It was the assertion that Nebuchadnezzar's idea of the kingdoms of men should be accepted as the true and divine idea, as against that of God's, which had been given. It was the assertion that the embodiment of this opposing idea should be worshiped as God. As the idea and the embodiment of it was altogether Nebuchadnezzar's, this was simply the putting of Nebuchadnezzar himself in the place of God, as the ruler in the kingdom of men, the head of all religion, and the director of all worship.

A great day was set for the dedication of Nebuchadnezzar's idea, and the inauguration of the universal worship of it. A great multitude was assembled of many peoples, nations, and languages of his wide realm. When all were assembled, a herald proclaimed: "To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages, That at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up; and whose falleth not down and worshipeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace."

In the great assembly were three young Jews—Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. And when all the others fell down and worshiped, these stood bolt upright, paying no attention to the law that had just then been proclaimed, nor to the image. They were at once reported and accused to the king. Then the king "in his rage and fury" commanded them to be brought before him. It was done. He asked them if it was true and of purpose that they had not worshiped. He then repeated his decree and the dreadful penalty. But they answered: "O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver us out of thine hands, O king. But if not, *be it known unto thee*, O king, that *we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.*"

The furnace was heated seven times hotter than usual, and they were bound and cast into it. But suddenly the king rose up in astonishment from his throne and cried to his counselors, "Did not we cast *three* men *bound* into the midst of

the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O king." But he exclaimed, "Lo, I see *four men loose*, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God."

Then the king called them forth, and said in the presence of all: "Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent His angel, and delivered His servants that trusted in Him, and *have changed the king's word*, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, except their own God."

God had commanded all nations to serve King Nebuchadnezzar, and that whatsoever nation would not serve him, that nation the Lord would punish. Yet here He wrought a wondrous miracle to deliver the men who had openly and directly refused to obey a plain and direct command of the king. How could this consistently be? Easily enough. This command, this law, of the king was wrong. He was demanding a service which he had no right to require. In making him king of the nations, the Lord had not made him king *in the religion* of the nations. In making him the head of all the nations. God had not made him the head *of religion*.

But being an idolater, and having grown up amid idolatrous systems, Nebuchadnezzar did not know this. With idolaters, religion always has been, and still is, a part of the government. In heathen systems, religion and the governments are always united; while in the true system, the genuine Christian system, they are always separate.

And this was the lesson which God there taught to Nebuchadnezzar. In a way in which it was impossible not to understand, the Lord showed to that king that he had nothing whatever to do with the religion, nor with the directing of the worship, of the people. The Lord had brought all nations into subjection to King Nebuchadnezzar as to their bodily service; but now, by an unmistakable evidence, this same Lord showed to King Nebuchadnezzar that He had

581

given him no power nor jurisdiction whatever in their souls' service.

The Lord thus showed to King Nebuchadnezzar that, while in all things between nation and nation, or man and man, all people, nations, and languages had been given to him to serve him, and he had been made ruler over them all; yet in things between men and God, the king was plainly and forcibly given to understand that he had nothing whatever to do. The God of heaven there taught to that king, and through him to all kings, rulers, and people forever, that in all matters of religion and worship, in the presence of the rights of conscience of *the individual*, the word of the king *must change*, the decree of the ruler *is naught*.

And this was written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come. This is important instruction and present truth *to-day*. For throughout the whole English-speaking world to-day King Nebuchadnezzar's example of arrogance is being followed—and that even by those who profess to know God and to be guided by the Bible. Nebuchadnezzar's offense was in setting up his own idea and forming it into a decree and then enforcing it as the law. And throughout these nations to-day, there are people who profess to know God and to be guided by the Bible, who have set up their own or some other one's

altogether human idea of the Sabbath against God's idea of the Sabbath—Sunday against the Sabbath of the Lord—and have secured the framing of it into a decree, and are having it enforced as the law. But it is all wrong, just as Nebuchadnezzar's assumption was wrong. And every one who will be faithful to God must say, We will not serve thy gods nor worship the image of the Sabbath which thou hast set up. And in the presence of the rights of conscience of the individual to-day, the word of the ruler must change; such laws are simply naught.

Nebuchadnezzar learned his lesson. And this truth was spread to all the nations and languages in that day; and it must be spread to all in *this* day. Will all who to-day are following his wrong course, learn this lesson and correct their ways, as did he?

ALONZO T. JONES.

September 13, 1899

"Separation of Religion and the State. Taught to Medo-Persia" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 37 , p. 4 .

THE night in which Babylon fell Daniel had been appointed by King Belshazzar "the third ruler in the kingdom," because of his interpretation of the terrible handwriting on the wall. The reason that the highest honor that could be bestowed on him was that of *third* ruler was that Belshazzar was only associate king with his father. This gave two kings, and so a first and second ruler; and another could not be higher than *third* ruler.

Thus it was with Daniel; and when that same night Babylon fell, Belshazzar was slain, and his father was a prisoner, and no longer king; this left Daniel the chief official, with whom the conquerors could communicate in rearranging the affairs of the Babylonian State. Because of this, and more particularly "because an excellent spirit was in him," the king of conquering Media and Persia thought to set him over "the whole realm." Thus "this Daniel was preferred above the presidents and princes."

When all the other presidents, princes, governors, and captains saw that Daniel, a captive Jew, was preferred before themselves, who were high and mighty Medes and Persians, they were much dissatisfied. And when they discovered that he was likely to be yet further promoted, they determined to break him down utterly. Therefore they formed a conspiracy, and diligently "sought to find occasion against Daniel concerning the kingdom."

But with all their diligence, and with all their suspicions and prejudiced care, "they could find none occasion nor fault; forasmuch as he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him." There was, however, one last resource, which, by a trick, they might employ. They knew that he feared God. They knew that his service to the Lord was actuated by such firm principle that, in rendering that service, he would not dodge, nor compromise, nor swerve a hair's breadth, upon any issue that might be raised.

"Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God." But even in this there was nothing upon which they might "find" an "occasion." In order to find it they must create it; and create it they did. Pretending to be great lovers of their king and country, and to have much and sincere concern for the honor of the king and the preservation of the State, "they assembled together to the king," and proposed "to establish a royal statute, and to make a firm decree," that whosoever should ask any petition of any god or man for thirty days, save of King Darius, should be cast into the den of lions. They presented the case in such a plausible way, and with such evident care for the public good, that Darius was completely hoodwinked, and "signed the writing and the decree." Thus the invention of the conspirators became "the law of the land."

Daniel knew that the writing was signed. He knew that it was now the law—the law of the Medes and Persians too, which could not be altered. Yet, knowing this, "he went into his house" and "kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, *as he did aforetime*." He knew perfectly that no law of the Medes and Persians, nor of any other earthly power, could ever, of right, have anything to say or do with any man's service to God. He went on just as aforetime, because, practically, and in principle, all things were just as aforetime; so far as concerned the conduct of the man who feared God, any law on that subject was no more than no law at all on that subject.

In the Medes and Persians a new set of men had come upon the world's stage; the power of empire had passed into new hands. And these new rulers, as well as Nebuchadnezzar, must be taught the truth of the separation of religion and the State. And in order that they should have opportunity to learn this, Daniel, who was the possessor and representative of this great truth, must stand, unswervingly, to the principle. And so he did.

"Then these men assembled, and found Daniel praying and making supplication before his God." They expected to find him praying that was exactly what they "assembled" for. And Daniel *was not afraid* that they would find him doing so. They immediately hurried away to the king, and asked him, "Hast thou not signed a decree, that every man that shall ask a petition of any god or man within thirty days, save of thee, O king, shall be cast into the den of lions? The king answered and said. The thing is true, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not. Then answered they and said before the king, That Daniel, which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast signed, but maketh his petition three times a day."

Then the king suddenly awoke to the fact that he had been duped. And "he was sore displeased with himself, and set his heart on Daniel to deliver him; and he labored till the going down of the sun to deliver him." But it was all of no avail; the conspirators were persistent to frustrate every effort which the king could make. And they had a ready and conclusive argument against everything that might be proposed. That argument was the law: "Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, That no decree nor statute which the king establisheth may be changed." There was no remedy; the law must be enforced.

Accordingly, though most reluctantly, "the king commanded, and they brought Daniel, and cast him into the den of lions."

The king passed the night in fasting and sleeplessness, and very early in the morning went in haste to the den of lions, and "cried with a lamentable voice, . . . O Daniel, servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest continually, able to deliver thee from the lions?" To the infinite delight of the king, Daniel answered: "O king, live forever. My God hath sent His angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as *before Him INNOCENCY* was found in me; and also *before thee*, O king, have I done *no hurt*."

That is divine testimony, published to all the world, that innocence before God is found in the man who disregards any human law that interferes with his service to God. It is also divine testimony that the man who disregards such laws, in so doing does "no hurt" to the king, to the State, nor to society.

Thus God taught to the rulers of the Medo-Persian Empire the separation of religion and the State; that with men's relationship to God, rulers and States can have nothing whatever to do. And it was written for the instruction of all rulers and States unto the world's end.

In these two experiences recorded in the book of Daniel—the one of Nebuchadnezzar and the worship of his great golden image, the other of the conspirators against Daniel's service to God—all people are taught in the most impressive way, that the God of heaven forbids any ruler to require His subjects to conform to His ideas in religion, and forbids all people to frame any law on any subject touching men's relation to God. In these two experiences the God of heaven, in the strongest possible way, teaches all people, and particularly *His own people*, that in the presence of the rights of conscience, in the presence of men's relationship to God, and in all matters of religion, the word and authority of every king or ruler must give way; that all laws framed, which touch in any manner men's relationship to God, which touch any matter of religious observance, are simply *naught*—are no more than no law at all on such subject. In it all, the God of heaven also teaches to all that He vindicates and *declares innocent* all who refuse obedience to such decrees of kings and rulers, all who utterly disregard all such laws; and also certifies to all kings, rulers, and people that those who do disregard all such laws do "*no hurt*" to either king, ruler, or people.

And these lessons need to be perseveringly taught everywhere to-day. In almost every country in the world, and especially in the English-speaking countries, the schemes and inventions of men in matters religious, and particularly as to the observance of Sunday, are crowded into the law and so forced upon all the people. These men profess to be jealous guardians of religious liberty and the rights of conscience. They "do not believe in enforcing religion upon anybody." Yet all the time they are steadily working to get religious dogmas and institutions recognized and fixed in the law, and then demand obedience to the law, and throw upon the dissenter the odium of "lawlessness, and disrespect for constituted authority," while they pose as the champions of

"law and order," the "conservators of the State, and the stay of society;" exactly as did the conspirators against Daniel.

Sunday, not only according to their own showing, but by every other fair showing that can be made, is a religious institution, a church affair, only. This they all know. And yet, in almost every land, those people are 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 the enforcement of such laws, they all cry out: "It is not a question of religion at all; religion hasn't anything to do with it; it is simply a question of regard for law. The law! The law! It is the law of the land! We are not asking any religious observance by anybody; all that we ask is *respect for the law!*"

But the lessons in the book of Daniel teach to all people that no religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite has *any right to any place in the law*. And that when against right it is put into the law, it gains no force whatever from that, and is to receive no respect nor recognition whatever.

And thus by the word and work of God in the book of Daniel, there is taught to all kings and all people unto the end of the world, the total separation of religion and the State.

ALONZO T. JONES.

October 4, 1899

"Separation of Religion and the State. Christ the Example" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 39 , p. 3 .

JESUS CHRIST came into the world to bring to men the true knowledge of God; for "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." He came to reveal to men the kingdom of God,—to enunciate its principles, to manifest its spirit, to reveal its character. Of it He said: "My kingdom is not of this world." "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." And His apostles declared: "The kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

"My kingdom is not of this world." Every kingdom, every State, every government of men, is altogether of this world and of this world alone. How then can anybody be of any earthly kingdom or State and of the kingdom of God at the same time?—Those who are of the church are of the kingdom of God, because the church is the church of God, and not of this world,—it is composed of those who are "chosen out of the world." Those who are of the State are of this world, because the State is altogether and only of this world. Thus in the Word of Christ, in the very principles of the cause of Christ, there is taught the separation of Church and State as complete and as wide as is the separation between the kingdom of God and the kingdoms of this world, and that is as complete and as wide as is the separation between God and this world.

Accordingly, Christ says in another place, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's and unto God the things that are God's." In that time the head of the Roman Empire, the personification of the world's power, was Cesar. And in that Roman world-system it was claimed that whatsoever was Cesar's was God's; because to all the people of that world-system Cesar was God. He was set before the people as God; the people were required to worship him as God; incense was offered to his image as to God. In that system the State was divine, and Cesar was the State. Therefore that system was essentially a union of religion and the State.

In view of this, when Jesus said, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's," He denied to Cesar, and so to the State, every attribute, or even claim, of divinity. He showed that another than Cesar is God. Thus He entirely separated Cesar and God. He entirely separated between the things which are due to Cesar and those which are due to God. The things that are due to Cesar are not to be rendered to God. The things due to God are not to be rendered to Cesar. These are two distinct realms, two distinct personages, and two distinct fields of duty. Therefore, in these words Jesus taught as plainly as it is possible to do, the complete separation of religion and the State; that no State can ever rightly require anything that is due to God; and that when it is required by the State, it is not to be rendered.

Christ Our Example.

Again: Jesus is the Example whom God has set to be the Guide to every person in this world in every step that can be taken in the right way. Any step taken by anybody in a way in which the Lord Jesus did not go is taken in the wrong way. He hath left us "an example, that ye should follow His steps." Whosoever saith that he "abideth in Him ought himself also so to walk, even as He walked." And Jesus never, in any manner nor to any degree, took any part in political matters nor in any affairs of the State. Jesus was then, and is forever, the embodiment of true religion. Therefore, in His whole life's conduct of absolute separation from everything political, from all affairs of the State, there is taught to all the world, and especially to all believers in Him, the complete separation of the religion of Christ, and of all who hold it, from everything political and from all affairs of the State.

So faithfully did He hold to that principle that when a man asked Him only, "Speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me," He refused, with the words, "Man, who made Me a judge or a divider over you?" and then said to them all, "Take heed and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." O, if only all who have professed to be His followers had held aloof from all affairs of politics and the State, how vastly different would have been the history of the Christian era! What a blessing it would have been to the world! What floods of misery and woe mankind would have been spared!

And why was it that Jesus thus persistently kept aloof from all affairs of politics and the State? Was it because all things political, judicial, and governmental were conducted with such perfect propriety, and with such evident justice, that there was no place for anything better, no room for improvement such as even He might suggest?—Not by any means. Never was there more political corruption,—greater perversion of justice,—and essential all-pervasive evil of administration, than at that time. Why, then, did not Jesus call for "municipal reform"? Why did He not organize a "Law and Order League"? Why did He not disguise Himself and make tours of the dives and the gambling-dens, and entrap victims into violation of the law? And why did He not employ other spies to do the same, in order to get against the representatives of the law evidence of maladministration by which to arraign them and to compel them to enforce the law, and thus reform the city, regenerate society, and save the State, and so establish the kingdom of God? Why? The people were ready to do anything of that kind that might be suggested. They were ready to cooperate with Him in any such work of reform. Indeed, the people were so forward and so earnest in the matter that they would have actually taken Him by force and made Him King, had He not withdrawn Himself from them. Why, then, did He refuse?

The answer to all this is, Because He was Christ, the Saviour of the world, and had come to help men, not to oppress them; had come to save men, not to destroy them. The government under which Jesus lived was corrupt and oppressive; on every hand were crying abuses—extortion, intolerance, and grinding cruelty. Yet the Saviour attempted no civil reforms. He attacked no national abuses, nor condemned the national enemies. He did not interfere with the authority or administration of those in power. He who was our Example kept aloof from earthly governments—not because He was indifferent to the woes of men, but because the remedy did not lie in merely human and external measures. To be efficient, the cure must reach men individually and must regenerate the heart.

"Not by the decisions of courts, or councils, or legislative assemblies, not by the patronage of worldly great men, is the kingdom of Christ established; but by the implanting of Christ's nature in humanity through the work of the Holy Spirit. 'As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' Here is the only power that can work the uplifting of mankind. And the human agency for the accomplishment of this work is the teaching and practising of the Word of God."

Now Christ is the true Example set by God for every soul in this world to follow. The conduct of Christ is Christianity. Conformity to that Example in the conduct of the individual believer—this and this alone is Christianity in the world. The conduct of Christ, the Example, was totally separate in all things from politics and the affairs of the State. Christianity, therefore, is the total separation of the believer in Christ from politics and all the affairs of the State, the total separation of religion and the State *in the individual believer*.

Accordingly, Jesus said to His disciples forever, "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world." And to His Father He said of His disciples

forever, "They are not of the world, *even as I* am not of the world." Every Christian in this world, then, must be in the world as Christ was in the world. "As He is, so are we in this world." "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master." The Master was always, and in all things, and by fixed design, completely separated from all affairs of politics and the State. And it is forever enough "that the disciple be as his Master."

This is the Christianity of Jesus Christ, as respects the great question of religion and the State. And, as in all the instruction from God from the beginning of creation down, it calls always for the complete separation of religion and the State in all things and in all people.

ALONZO T. JONES.

October 18, 1899

"Separation of Religion and the State. 'The Powers that Be'" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 42 , pp. 3, 4 .

The Limitation

IN the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of Romans is one of the strongest of the many strong treatises that there are in the Bible upon the total separation of religion and the State—the separation between that which is due to God and that which is due to Cesar.

First is a recognition of the right of the State to be, and to require subjection and tribute: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." "The powers that be are ordained of God." "For this cause pay ye tribute also." "Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."

Next is marked the sphere of men's relation to the State: "Owe no man anything, 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."

Now everybody knows, and Paul knew as well as anybody ever knew, that there are other commandments—other commandments of the very law from which he quoted these. There is the commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image; . . . thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me, and keep My commandments. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." "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; . . . 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."

With these commandments standing as a part, and, indeed, the *first part*, of the very law which he was citing, why did he leave these entirely out and say, "If there be *any other commandment*, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"? Why?—For the simple reason that he was writing of men's relationship and responsibility to *the powers that be*, to *the State*; and he was laying down the principle that when men have recognized the right of the State to be, have paid the required tribute, and have fulfilled all obligations to their neighbors, there is nothing more for them to render to the State; there is no other commandment in that sphere, and therefore no other duty to be performed toward the powers that be.

This is made certain by the next verse: "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law;" which shows conclusively that it is only the relation of man with man—of man to his neighbor—that is considered in the passage under consideration. The passage is simply an enlargement, an exposition, indeed, of the principle announced by Jesus, "Render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's." When men have recognized the authority of the State, have paid their tribute, and work no ill to their fellow-men, the only relationship or obligation after that is *to God*. The only commandments outside of that sphere are those which mark men's duty towards God.

Thus the Scripture distinctly sets the limit of the jurisdiction or the requirements of the State, at recognition of right to be, tribute, and the relationship of man to man in working no ill to his neighbor. Beyond this the State has no right to go. Outside of this there is nothing for any man to render to the powers that be.

But the Word of the Lord does not stop here; it positively prohibits the powers that be from touching the relationship or obligation of men *to God*. "Every one of us shall give account of *himself* to God." Rom. 14:12. And that the emphasis is upon the word "*himself*" and not upon the word "account," is certain from the context in the whole chapter. It is not that "every one of us shall give *account* of himself to God," nor is it "every one of us shall give account of himself *to God*." That is all true enough; but that is not the thought expressed in the text. The one thought particularly expressed is that "every one of us shall give account of himself to God." And thus, by the Word of God, all powers that be, all men, and all combinations of men, are positively prohibited from touching, in any way, any man's relationship to God. That rests with man alone; and for his responsibility there, he is to give account *himself* to God.

Duty to God, Not Men.

Again: "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day to the Lord he doth not regard it." Rom. 14:5, 6. The matter of the observance of

a day, the duty to esteem one day above another, is not comprehended in that part of the law which relates to neighbors; nor is it comprised in the duties designated as marking the sphere of the powers that be. It is in that part of the law which, by the words "if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is definitely excluded from all cognizance of the powers that be.

The observance of a day, the duty to esteem one day above another, is due solely to God. For "he that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord," not to men. It is comprehended in that part of the law which details man's relationship to God alone, and concerning which to God alone every one is to give account *himself*. Therefore, the powers that be, all men, and all combinations of men, are definitely commanded by the Lord to let every man alone in the matter of the observance of a day. On that subject all are commanded to "let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." And this because that is an obligation due solely to God, and "every one of us shall give account of *himself* to God."

How different are the ways of professed Christians to-day from the Christianity of the New Testament! The vast mass of professed Christians to-day, in hunting for another commandment in the sphere of the powers that be, would inevitably write it thus: If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt do no work on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday. But the Christianity of the New Testament, in defining the sphere of the powers that be, says, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" and then, as to the observance of a day, commands the powers that be, and all men, and all combinations of men: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day to the Lord he doth not regard it." And "every one of us shall give account of himself to God." "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?" The day to be esteemed above others is the Sabbath of *the Lord*.

"Render therefore . . . to God the things that are God's." And any man who does not esteem that day above others, who does not regard it unto the Lord, but esteems every day alike, is responsible to God alone and must render account of it himself to God, and not to man. While the thing that he does is wrong, it is a kind of wrong for which he is responsible to God, and not to the powers that be.

All this also conclusively shows that any movement on the part of the powers that be, or of men or combinations of men through the powers that be, to require the observance of a day or to cause men to esteem one day above another, is a plain joining together of what is God's and what is Cesar's, is a positive union of religion and the State. It is written, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." And by the same token it can be authoritatively written, What God hath put asunder, let no man, nor any combination of men, join together.

Not of Faith Is Sin.

Again: This treatise in Romans 13 and 14, on the separation of religion and the State, the separation of what is due to God from what is due to the powers that be, closes with the mighty sentence, "*Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.*"

Whatsoever is of the Word of God is of faith; for faith comes by the Word of God; and "without faith it is impossible to please Him."

Religion is due solely to God; it is "the duty we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it."

Therefore, for the powers that be, or any men by the powers that be, to require anything that is due to God, is only to subvert faith and require men to sin.

For the powers that be, or any men through the powers that be, to require of any man anything that is due to God, is, in the very act, to unite religion and the State. And as thus to require of men anything that is due to God, is to subvert faith and to require men to sin, it is certain that any connection whatever between religion and the State *is sin*. And, therefore, the greatest example of it that has ever been in the world is aptly and justly designated "the man *of sin*."

And since to "love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself"—the keeping of the first two of all the commandments—is complete separation from sin, our subject ends just

676

where it began,—with the truth that the first two of all the commandments, and the keeping of them, are the basis and the surety of the universal and eternal truth of the separation of religion and the State.

ALONZO T. JONES.

October 25, 1899

"The Spirit of Holiness" *The Signs of the Times* 25, 43 , p. 3 .

THE Lord is coming.

And without holiness, no man can see Him in peace.

Have you holiness?

How can anybody have holiness without "the Spirit of holiness"?

And how can anybody have the Spirit of holiness without the Holy Spirit?

Have you the Holy Spirit?

"Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy?"

Then, surely, with such a spirit as that, no man can see the Lord in peace.

But He says, "A *new* Spirit will I put within you," and, "*He shall . . . abide with you forever*"

He does not want the spirit that lusteth to envy to abide with you forever. Do you?

Having thus the Spirit of holiness *abiding* with you *forever*, you will have holiness.

And, having holiness, you can see the Lord in peace when He comes.

And He is coming *soon*. Get ready, get ready, get ready!
"Ask, and it shall be given you." "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."
A. T. JONES.

December 6, 1899

**"The Harvest of Imperialism and Expansion" *The Signs of the Times*
25, 49 , pp. 13-15 .**

By Alonzo T. Jones, author of "Two Republics," Battle Creek, Mich

THAT history repeats itself is a truth so familiar as to have become a proverb. Upon this principle, history in its vital points and its great principles, is in itself prophecy.

What, then, does history speak in prophecy of instruction or admonition to the United States on the subject of imperialism, that now, by the very force of events, is crowded upon the attention of the people of the United States and even of the world? Is there any likelihood that history might repeat itself on the subject of imperialism and its harvest? This thought is worthy of inquiry.

The United States was founded, and has continued, a republic—the one great and exemplary republic of modern times.

This republic has also stood before the world, and has been recognized by the world, as the lover, the conservator, and the champion, of the liberty of mankind.

In ancient times there was a great and exemplary republic.

That republic also stood before the world as the lover, the conservator, and the champion, of the liberty of mankind.

In that ancient great republic the love of liberty was so great, national freedom was so prized, that she assumed it to be her prerogative to extend by her power the blessings of liberty to foreign peoples.

In order to do this that ancient great republic sent over the seas her fleets and armies, sacrificed treasure and the lives of her citizens, fought battles, gained victories, and established peace, for other peoples might have the privilege of enjoying assured liberty in governments of their own, free from the oppression, or even the interference, of monarchies.

That ancient great republic was the republic of Rome. And no one can deny that so far as we have here sketched, history has repeated itself in this modern great republic of the United States up to this very year 1899.

That it may be plainly seen that this sketch of that ancient great republic has not been manufactured to fit the late order of things in this modern great republic, we shall here set down some of the particulars.

A Bit of Ancient History That Is Altogether Modern.

Italy was the home soil, the proper territorial possession, of the Roman republic. Over the narrow Adriatic Sea lay the little States of Greece. These little States of Greece were very desirous of liberty, and, to gain it, had long struggled against the power of the neighboring monarchies. At the point of time when Rome championed their cause, 200 B.C., they were struggling almost hopelessly against the aggressions of Philip V., of Macedonia. After several times defeating Philip, the Roman commander, Titus Quintius Flamininus, concluded with him a peace, 196 B.C., in behalf of the Greek States, and at once publicly proclaimed the full liberty of the States of Greece.

This part of the story we will let the ancient history itself tell; and here are the words:—

"It was now the time in which the Isthmian games were to be solemnized, and the expectation of what was there to be transacted had drawn thither an incredible multitude of people, and persons of the highest rank. The conditions of the treaty of peace, which were not yet entirely made public, formed the topic of all conversation, and various opinions were entertained concerning them; but very few could be persuaded that the Romans would evacuate all the cities they had taken. All Greece was in this uncertainty, when, the multitude being assembled in the stadium to see the games, a herald comes forward and publishes with a loud voice:—

"The senate and people of Rome and Titus Quintius the general, having overcome Philip and the Macedonians, set at liberty from all garrisons, and taxes, and imposts, the Corinthians, the Locrians, the Phocians, the Eubœans, the Phthiot Achæans, the Magnesians, the Thessalians, and the Perrhebian, declare them free, and ordain that they shall be governed by their respective laws and usages.'

"At these words, which many heard but imperfectly because of the noise that interrupted them, all the spectators were filled with excess of joy. They gazed upon and questioned one another with astonishment, and could not believe either their eyes or ears, so like a dream was what they then saw and heard. It was thought necessary for the herald to repeat the proclamation, which was now listened to with the most profound silence, so that not a single word of the decree was lost. And now, fully assured of their happiness, they abandoned themselves again to the highest transports of joy, and broke into such loud and repeated acclamations that the sea resounded with them at a great distance. . . . The games and sports were hurried over, without any attention being paid to them; for so great was the general joy upon this occasion, that it extinguished all other sentiments. . . .

"The remembrance of so delightful a day, and of the valuable blessings then bestowed, was continually renewed, and for a long time formed the only subject of conversation at all times and in all places. Every one cried in the highest transports of admiration, and

a kind of enthusiasm, 'that there was a people in the world who, at their own expense and the hazard of their lives, engaged in a war for the liberty of other nations; and that *not* for their neighbors or people situated on the same continent; but who crossed seas and sailed to distant climes to destroy and extirpate unjust power from the earth, and to establish universally law, equity, and justice. That by a single word, and the voice of a herald, liberty had been restored to all the cities of Greece and Asia. That a great soul only could have formed such a design; but that to execute it was the effect at once of the highest good fortune and the most consummate virtue.'

'They called to mind all the great battles which Greece had fought for the sake of liberty. 'After sustaining so many wars,' said they, 'never was its valor crowned with so blessed a reward as when strangers came and took up arms in its defense. It was then that almost without shedding a drop of blood, or losing scarce one man, it acquired the greatest and noblest of all prizes for which mankind can content. Valor and prudence are rare at all times; but of all virtues, justice is most rare. Agesilaus, Lysander, Nicias, and Alcibiades had great abilities for carrying on war, and gaining battles both by sea and land; but then it was for *themselves* and *their country*, not for strangers and foreigners, they fought. That height of glory was reserved for the Romans.'"—*Rollin's Ancient History, book 19, chap. 1, sec. 3, paragraphs 44-53. Also Great Empires of Prophecy, pp. 226, 227.*

If ever there was conducted "a war for humanity," surely that could be claimed as the one. And did not this history repeat itself only last year, when the people of this modern great republic of the United States entered upon "a war for humanity," and, "at their own expense and the hazard of their lives, engaged in a war for the liberty of other nations; and that not for their neighbors or people situated on the same continent, but who crossed seas and sailed to distant climes to destroy and extirpate unjust power from the earth, and to establish universally law, equity, and justice"? Was not "*that* height of glory" in these modern times reserved for the Americans of this great republic of the United States?

There is one item, however, in which the history of that ancient republic has not been allowed to repeat itself, that is, in the setting at "liberty from all garrisons and taxes and imposts," the people whose cause they had espoused and whose liberty they had gained, the declaring of them "free," and the ordaining that they should be "governed by their respective laws and usages." This has not yet been done by this modern great republic. It is true that at *the beginning* this modern great republic did declare that "the people of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent;" but *since the victories* there has been no such proclamation, declaration, or ordinance, establishing the freedom of these peoples, as was made by that ancient great republic in behalf of those peoples, at the Isthmian games in Greece. In this respect the formal example of that

ancient great republic, holds decidedly the advantage over the course of this modern great republic.

Yet of the ancient great republic we are obliged to use the expression, "the *formal* example;" because the procedure was indeed no more than a form. For when Rome had secured for those peoples the freedom which she bestowed, those peoples were never allowed to forget that Rome had bestowed it, that to Rome they owed it all, and that they were under unfailing obligation to Rome, not only as their liberator, but also as their guardian and preserver. Consequently, "under pretense of offering them their good offices, of entering into their interests, and of reconciling them, the Romans rendered themselves the *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 weight 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. Afterward they used, with plenary authority, to *summon*

782

those who refused to come to an agreement, oblige them to plead their cause before the Senate, and even to appear in person there. From arbiters and mediators, being 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."—*Rollin's Ancient History, book 19, chap. 1, sec. 7, "Reflections," at end of chapter*. Also, *Great Empires of Prophecy, pp. 246, 247*. And so far this history, point by point, and almost in the very letter, has repeated itself in the dealings of this modern great republic with the peoples whom in her "war for humanity," she "freed" from the oppressions of monarchical Spain, as can be verified day by day from the columns of the administration journals, such as the *New York Tribune*, *Chicago Times-Herald*, *New York Sun*, etc., etc. So entirely is this so that, in order to justify her course, the Declaration of Independence is repudiated, and the Constitution of the United States is ignored or explained away.

What was the harvest from this same sowing by that ancient great republic? So far, the course of the modern great republic has been exactly that of the ancient great republic. So much of the history of the ancient great republic, therefore, has been prophetic of that of the modern great republic. But the history of the ancient great republic did not cease at that point. Did, then, the history of that great republic cease at that point to be prophetic, when the history itself did not cease at that point?—No; the history of that republic is prophetic all the way through.

When the republic of Rome had by her power secured to foreign peoples freedom from other masters, she asserted over them her own mastery. And whereas formerly for these peoples there had been *some* hope of freedom because of the weakness of those kings who designed to rule over them, now that Rome had gained the position to claim and assert mastery over them, their

prospect of liberty was rendered absolutely hopeless by reason of the strength of the new master.

In this, open despotism was established and practised *abroad* by that ancient great republic. And this practise of despotism *abroad* soon reacted and brought about the practise of despotism *at home*. First, it was a despotism of the majority, next it was a despotism of a *few*, then a despotism of three—the first and second triumvirates—and at last a despotism of one—Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, etc., etc. And from a republic, a government of the people, and the exemplar of liberty, she was become a monarchy, a government of one, and the extreme of despotism.

Nor did the history of the ancient great republic stop at that point. After reigning in the extreme of despotism for a season and a time, a *union* was formed between *this monarchy*—this apostate republic—and *an apostate church*. And the multiplied evils of increased despotism and of every other sort speedily brought *irretrievable ruin* of government and even of society itself, in the wave after wave of the mighty flood of barbarians which poured down from the North.

Such was the course and such is the history of that ancient great republic *from* the point *unto which* that history is plainly prophetic of the course of this modern great republic. And, viewing conditions and procedure as they actually are to-day, what single indication is there that *from* this point to the full end, the history of the ancient great republic is anything else than prophetic of the course and destiny of the modern great republic?

Two Apostasies.

Who does not know of the powerful and universal efforts that for years have been made, and are constantly being made, in the United States, even by the professed Protestant denominations, to secure here a firm union of Church and State, to have the church power dominate the civil, and use it for her own ends? Who does not know of the dangerous progress that has been already made in this direction? Who does not know that all the branches of the national government—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive—have been officially committed to the union of religion and the State in this nation? At the great biennial assembly of the Epworth League, held at Indianapolis last July, representative and official speakers with evident satisfaction recognized that there is even now a union of Church and State in this nation.

Now, for professed Protestants anywhere to favor a union of Church and State, or any recognition of religion by the State, is in itself a confession of apostasy. And for professed Protestants to do such a thing in the United States, where by every principle of its fundamental law the nation is pledged to the complete separation of religion, and particularly the Christian religion, and the State, is even double apostasy.

And what of the republic itself? Is there not apostasy there also? Can the principles and the plain statements of the Declaration of Independence be repudiated and declared to be "falsehood palmed off by the devil upon a credulous world," as was publicly done in an imperialistic mass-meeting in

Chicago, May 7, 1899,—can this be done without apostasy? Can the fundamental principles and precepts of a nation be disregarded and even repudiated by that nation, and those who steadfastly maintain those principles be denounced as traitors, without there being an apostasy of that nation? How could complete national apostasy be more plainly shown than in a nation's holding as traitors those who steadfastly maintain the fundamental principles of the nation? Yea, how could national apostasy be more plainly shown than in a nation's taking such a course that those who maintain the fundamental principles of the nation must, in so doing, "antagonize the government" and incur the charge of treason?

Here, then, there is in this nation, as there was in the Roman nation, an apostasy in religion and church, and an apostasy from republicanism to imperialism in the State. And there is being steadily formed and fixed a union of these two apostasies, precisely as there was in the Roman nation. That union in the Roman nation made the Papacy; and this union in this American nation will make the image of the Papacy. And so history does repeat itself after every feature of that ancient great republic, and will so repeat itself unto the end.

All this is told not only in the history, which is itself prophecy, but also in the prophecies of the direct Word of God.

One of the symbols in the prophecies of the Bible that refers to the United States is that beast in Rev. 13:11-17, having "two horns like a lamb," yet which speaks "as a dragon." In spite of the lamblike representations, he requires of the people that they shall make "an image to the beast,"—"the first beast (Revelation 13),—and requires that all shall worship the beast and receive his mark, or else have all rights taken away, and at last even be killed. This itself betokens national apostasy.

"The first beast" is the Papacy. The image to the beast is an image of the Papacy. The Papacy is the union of Church and State. The two horns like a lamb represent the two great characteristics of this nation,—Protestantism and republicanism—both of which are directly antagonistic to a union of Church and State. And for the union of Church and State to be made in this nation is just as incongruous with the fundamental principles of the nation, as the speaking as a dragon is incongruous with the characteristics of a lamb. Thus, the whole idea is suggestive of national apostasy from characteristic principles.

The image of the beast is the image of the Papacy. The Papacy is the union of Church and State. And when, in the prophecy, the image of the beast is to be made, it is said "to them *that dwell on the earth*, that *they* should make an image to the beast." This shows that it is a government *of the people*, where the image is made. And it is said *to them* that *they shall make* a union of Church and State. This shows that this is all done in a place where at first there was *no union of Church and State*. In the United States, from its very formation, there was no union of Church and State; and this is not true of any other nation that was ever on the earth.

These things show that the nation where these things are done is first a republic, and that *this nation* is the one where these things are at last done. But these things can not be done in a true republic. These things are positively antagonistic to the principles of a true republic. For these things to be done in a

country professing to be a republic, there must be an apostasy from the principles of a true republic.

Now that all this is the truth, and not speculation, is confirmed by the book of Daniel. In Daniel 7 there are four great beasts, which represent four great successive kingdoms, or powers, in the earth. The fourth one was "diverse from all kingdoms." These four were Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome. And Rome was diverse from all kingdoms, in that it was a republic. It was while it was a republic that Rome "devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet." And in Dan. 8:24, 25, of this same power, even *while it was a republic*, it is written that "his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power," that "through *his policy* also he shall cause *craft to prosper* in his hand," and "by peace shall destroy many."

Now a point particularly to be considered is that this history of the republic of Rome was sketched in the book of Daniel three hundred and forty years before it occurred; and then that sketch was closed up and sealed, *not* for three hundred and forty years, *not* till 198 B.C. and onward, BUT for *twenty-four hundred years*, till "the time of the end." Dan. 8:17, 26.

Why was that sketch of the Roman republic written and then closed up and sealed until a time *two thousand years after that republic had failed* as a republic, and had become imperial?—It was because at *this* time, "the time of the end," there would be another republic that would go over the same course as did that republic,—would apostatise from republicanism into imperialism, and then would become the tool of an apostate church in a union in the very image of the Papacy, which was made by such a union with that apostate republic. And as that union hastened, and actually wrought, the ruin of that apostate republic, so will this union hasten and cause the ruin of this now so far apostate republic. And this sketch of the *former* great republic was written *then*, and closed up and sealed until *now*, so that they that be wise may understand what to do to escape the evil and the ruin that will come upon this latter great republic, and even now hastens,—a ruin that will come as surely as came the ruin of that former one.

Accordingly, fifteen years ago, by the Spirit of prophecy it was written that this nation would yet "repudiate every principle of its Constitution as a Protestant and republican government," and that this "national apostasy will be followed by national ruin."

This national apostasy is proceeding daily before the eyes of all the people; and as national apostasy progresses, national ruin hastens. And with this national ruin comes complete and final ruin of all.

It may be asked, Where can be found new peoples, whence can they come, to sweep away in ruin the modern great republic at its culmination in iniquity and oppression, according to the prophetic course of the ancient great republic? The answer is that they can not be found *on the earth*. But they are found, and they are appointed unto that very work. And here they are, also whence they come, and the work that is before them:—

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and He that sat upon Him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness He doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and

He had a name written, that no man knew, but He Himself. And He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and His name is called The Word of God. *And the armies which were in heaven* followed Him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of His mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it He should smite the nations; and He shall rule them with a rod of iron; and He treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against Him that sat on the horse, and against His army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with

783

which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of Him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of His mouth; and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." Rev. 19:11-21.

This harvest of the last apostasy to Imperialism; and there can be no other. No other State now in the world, or that ever was in the world, was founded as was this modern great republic of the United States. This nation was founded upon self-evident truth and inalienable natural right; and its appeal in the beginning was solely to the principle and the Author of *justice*. One of the objects of the founding of the government is declared in the preamble to the fundamental law to be "to establish justice." By this the influence which the example of the United States has exerted upon the nations has been a restraint for good; it has held the nations face to face with the divine principles of truth, of right, and of justice in governments. And when this restraint is not only taken away, but that which caused it is actually turned back into an open confirmation of the old course of force and conquest, regardless of right, liberty, or justice, the last state of those nations will be worse than the first. If it were so that the restraint were merely *removed*, the result could not but be bad; but when the restraint is not only removed, but is *charged into an active confirmation of the opposite*, oh, then, what but infinite evil can possibly be the result? And, in these times, when everything goes at the swiftest, it can, in the nature of things, be but a little while until the nations shall be completely engulfed in the floods of their own making, and these destructive floods not only let loose, but urged on and increased by this mighty example, set originally to infinitely better things, but now perverted to the evil course that has been the ruin of all former nations.

Everything in the tide of present-day affairs speaks with a loud voice that the end of all things is at hand, and that the day of the Lord is near. And so it is written: "I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto

the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap; for the time is come for thee to reap; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped." Rev. 14:14-16.

And "*the harvest is the end of the world.*" Matt. 13:39. And who is ready? Who is blowing the trumpet and sounding the alarm? Are *you* ready? "Get ready, get ready, get ready." *This is "present truth."*

ALONZO T. JONES.

The Signs of the Times, Vol. 26 (1900)

January 10, 1900

"A Serious Mistake" *The Signs of the Times* 26, 2 , p. 3 .

(By A. T. Jones in *Review and Herald*.)

THERE is a serious and very bothersome mistake, which is made by many persons.

That mistake is made in thinking that when they are converted, their old sinful flesh is blotted out.

In other words, they make the mistake of thinking that they are to be delivered from the flesh by having it taken away from them altogether.

Then, when they find that this is not so, when they find that the same old flesh, with its inclinations, its besetments, and its enticements, is still there, they are not prepared for it, and so become discouraged, and are ready to think that they never were converted at all.

And yet, if they would think a little, they ought to be able to see that that *is* all a mistake. Did you not have exactly the same body after you were converted that you had before? Was not that body composed of exactly the same material—the same flesh and bones and blood—after you were converted as that of which it was composed before? To these questions everybody will promptly say Yes. And plainly that is the truth.

And now there are further questions: Was not that flesh also of exactly the same *quality* as before? Was it not still human flesh, natural flesh, as certainly as it was before?—To this also everybody will say Yes.

Then also a still further question: It being the same flesh, and of the same quality,—it still being human flesh, natural flesh,—is it not also still just as certainly *sinful* flesh as it was before?

Just here is where creeps in the mistake of these many persons. To this last question they are inclined to think that the answer should be "No," when it must be only a decided "Yes." And this decided "Yes" must be maintained so long as we continue in this natural body.

And when it is decided and constantly maintained that the flesh of the converted person is still sinful flesh, and only sinful flesh, he is so thoroughly convinced that in his flesh dwells no good thing that he will never allow a shadow of confidence in the flesh. And this being so, his sole dependence is upon something other than the flesh, even upon the Holy Spirit of God; his source of strength and hope is altogether exclusive of the flesh, even in Jesus Christ only. And being everlastingly watchful, suspicious, and thoroughly distrustful of the flesh, he never can expect any good thing from that source, and so is prepared by the power of God to beat back and crush down without mercy every impulse or suggestion that may arise from it; and so does not fail, does not become discouraged, but goes on from victory to victory and from strength to strength.

Conversion, then, you see, does not put new flesh upon the old spirit; but a new Spirit within the old flesh. It does not propose to bring new flesh to the old mind; but a new mind to the old flesh. Deliverance and victory are not gained by having the human nature taken away; but by receiving *the divine nature* to subdue and have dominion over the human,—not by the taking away of the sinful flesh, but by the sending in of the *sinless Spirit* to conquer and condemn sin in the flesh.

The scripture does not say, Let this *flesh* be upon you, which was also upon Christ; but it *does* say, "Let this *mind* be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." Phil. 2:5.

The scripture does not say, Be ye transformed by the renewing of your *flesh*; but it does say, "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your *mind*." Rom. 12:2. We shall be *translated* by the renewing of our *flesh*; but we must be *transformed* by the renewing of our *minds*.

The Lord Jesus took the same flesh and blood, the same human nature, that we have,—flesh just like our sinful flesh,—and because of sin, and by the power of the Spirit of God through the divine mind that was in him, "condemned sin in the flesh." Rom. 8:3. And therein is our deliverance (Rom. 7:25), therein is our victory. "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." "A new heart will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you."

Do not be discouraged at sight of sinfulness in the flesh. It is only in the light of the Spirit of God, and by the discernment of the mind of Christ, that you can see so much sinfulness in your flesh; and the more sinfulness you see in your flesh, the more of the Spirit of God you certainly have. This is a sure test. Then when you see sinfulness abundant in you, thank the Lord that you have so much of the Spirit of God that you can see so much of the sinfulness; and know of a surety that when sinfulness abounds, grace much more abounds in order that "as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

March 14, 1900

"Wanted—An Education that Will Truly Educate" *The Signs of the Times* 26, 11 , p. 1, 2 .

BY ALONZO TREVIER JONES

IT can not be denied that there is, even among leading educators, quite a general dissatisfaction with the education and the educational system in vogue in the United States. Any one having access to the channels of public expression can not escape the conviction that this is so. To thoughtful observers this is so plain that it is difficult to suppose that any one at all acquainted with the situation, would deny it. It seems to have become almost a conviction that modern education does not truly educate. Now there is a cause for this and that cause is neglect of opportunity and ignoring of principle.

1. *As to the State.* No State ever had better opportunity to apply principle, nor better principle to apply in education, than had this nation. In every other nation, State education has inevitably blended with religion; and, as in any case State religion is powerless for good because of its essential lack of the vital spirit of Christianity, the education given was necessarily impotent. In the United States, however, one fundamental principle was the complete separation of religion and the State; and the educational system, professedly, was to be conducted according to this principle. And, as the one great object of education by the State is to secure good citizens, this nation had in the Declaration of Independence and the national Constitution its greatest opportunity and best foundation for the building of an education which would, in very best measure, accomplish the desired end of securing good citizens.

The Declaration of Independence, the charter of American institutions, and the foundation of the United States Government, sets forth the principle that "all men are created equal," and 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. Therein is the basis of the best State education that ever could be. It is the perfect principle of civil government; and if every youth taught by the State had been so taught this principle that he would recognize it and actually practise accordingly, the citizenship of this nation to-day would be another thing altogether from what it is. If that had been done, then each one would have understood that when he acts in anything in such a way as to interfere with the free exercise by any other person of the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, in such measure he denies the principle upon which the government itself rests, and thereby undermines his own civil safety, and in effect forfeits his own right to the free exercise of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Thus, since rights are equal, what one has the right to do, every other has the equal right to do. If one can claim the right to act in such a way as to interfere with another's exercise of the right of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," then all have an equal right to do the same thing; and if all

should do so, then all government would be gone, and only anarchy reign. Therefore, as government is established to secure the equal inalienable rights

162

of men, no one can act in such a way that in anything he shall infringe the rights of another to any degree, without at once striking at the foundation of government itself.

But, instead of these things being inculcated in all the schools of the State, they were almost wholly neglected, and were wholly neglected in the very years when it was most essential that they should have been inculcated; so that, practically, the neglect was complete. And instead of teaching what thus should have been taught, to accomplish the only purpose of State schools, resort was had for that purpose to other things, that is, chiefly to a so-called "morality without religion." And as the so-called "morality without religion" had its first exponents and examples among the ancient pagans, this called in the use of the literature, philosophy, etc., of those persons, with the result that, as one educational writer has stated it:—

It is one of the curiosities of our civilization that we are content to go for our liberal education to literatures which, morality, are at an opposite pole from ourselves. . . . Our hardest social problem being temperance, we study in Greek the glorification of intoxication, while in mature life we are occupied in tracing law to the remotest corner of the universe, we go to school for literary impulse to the poetry that dramatizes the burden of hopeless fate.

The result could not possibly be anything else than that a nation so educated should go the same course as did those nations whose literature was the pabulum in the school provender.

This dangerous tendency was at last discerned, but instead of getting down to national fundamental principles as to State education, a remedy was proposed,—that the Christian religion—"general Christianity"—"unsectarian religion"—should be a recognized part of the teaching. And as this inevitably involved a recognition of the Christian religion, it was actually proposed that the Christian religion should be recognized by the State, and its Book be made the standard in State education. But this was simply lowering the nation to the level of all the nations which were before it, and to the repeating of their impotent methods in education. It inevitably involved the abandonment by this nation of its own fundamental principles, and the adoption of the essential principles of the union of Church and State, which it was the glory of this nation to abandon.

Thus the State in education ignored its sure foundation in its own fundamental principle, missed its grand opportunity to inculcate a true State education, and, "in wandering mazes lost," in the education which it did give, is brought at last to where it is acknowledged that modern education does not educate. And the cry comes up:—

There must be in this country a better system of education, a system that is in closer touch with life, and that fits rather than unfits for life. There must be something in our common schools that will make for self-respect, and for that respect for others that is a part of

true self-respect; something that will develop faithfulness and intelligence, and pride in work; something that will link head and hands by indissoluble bands.

This is a vain cry, too, so far as the State is concerned. For now that, as to principles, the Declaration of Independence is repudiated, and the Constitution is abandoned, there is no possibility of the State ever regaining its lost opportunity. That opportunity is gone forever, and with it has gone all possibility of the State ever giving an education that will truly educate, even in that which pertains to State education.

2. *As to the Church.* The Church proposes to be Christian. By her very profession, therefore, the only education which the church can ever employ, or even recognize, must be Christian education, that is, that all who profess to be Christians must see to it that their children have a distinctly Christian education; and, in order to this, the Bible must necessarily be the text-book in every line of education and in every phase of study. Thus, then, the children of the church, being so taught, would, by being Christians, certainly be the most quiet, peaceable, even model citizens; being strictly moral, in the nature of things they would be supremely civil. Then, with the State on her part faithfully inculcating the perfect principles of civility in all who were not of the church and of Christianity, there would have been secured in these that which is the object of the State education, good citizens. Thus there would have been secured all-around quietness, peaceableness, and that true civility which is becoming to the grandest of civil governments.

But, instead of the church taking this course, the only true or becoming one for the church to take, she on her part, also missed her opportunity, and ignored the vital principle which belonged to her; she sent her children to the State schools in their earliest years; and when from these her children came into her own academies and seminaries, she likewise had them taught in the literatures of pagan Greece and Rome. And in her care there was presented, even more emphatically, the curiosity that she was content, for the liberal education of her children, to go "to literatures which, morally, are at an opposite pole from" all her principles and profession. Temperance being one of the fundamental virtues of Christianity, the church, in the education of her children, was content to have them "study in Greek the glorification of intoxication," and, proposing to recognize a personal, omniscient, omnipresent, loving, merciful God, was content that her children should receive literary impulse from "the poetry that dramatizes the burden of hopeless fate."

And now the church likewise is reaping her sure reward in the fact that in her own schools, theological seminaries, or what not, the education there inculcated does not truly educate, but educates only in the doubting, the questioning, and the rejection of the book of Christian truth, "in the wandering mazes lost "of the "higher criticism" and evolution; this until even from a master in theology the plaint has actually gone forth that there is no school on the American continent where a young man can go and learn the Bible as a whole, under the direction of deeply pious and thoroughly-learned teachers. There are schools where a young man fitting for the ministry can go and spend three years, and have himself

stuffed with speculative philosophy under the name of theology, and with infidelity under the name of "higher criticism." This is a positive and a burning shame. The writer cherishes the hope, that some pious man or woman of means will found a school in this country where men can be trained who will not only know the Bible from first to last, but teach it from first to last. That would be something new under the sun.

This, too, is a vain cry, so far as the popular recognized church is concerned; for she has not only lost true respect for the book of Christian truth, but has lost the key of knowledge. And now she can not give an education which will truly educate.

Therefore, the situation as it is to-day, in the schools of both Church and State, calls for an education that will truly educate. And, as "morality without religion," is only paganism, and has been demonstrated over and over to be a dismal and ruinous failure, the only education which will supply the need is an education which inculcates morality only by means of religion. And, as there is no true religion but Christianity, it must be an education which inculcates morality only by Christianity,—the morality *of* Christianity.

And as it has likewise been demonstrated over and over that a professed Christianity, inculcating education that is drawn from classical and so-called philosophical sources instead of the Bible only, is also a dismal and ruinous failure, it follows that the education now called for, the only education that will meet the demand, is a Christian education, drawn wholly from the Source of Christianity, which is Jesus Christ, and from the Book of Christianity, which is the Bible.

And here there is hope, high hope. For the third angel's message, which is represented in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES and its sister journals, and which is committed to the people who publish these journals—this third angel's message is, in this time, to establish Christianity on an eternal basis. This organization, in its families, its churches, its colleges, will give a distinctly Christian education, and so will give an education that will truly educate.

The schools in which this education will be given, whether they be family schools, church schools, academies, or colleges, will be schools "where a young man can go and learn the Bible as a whole under the direction of deeply pious and thoroughly learned teachers," while a youth "can be trained who will not only know the Bible from first to last, but teach it from first to last." In these schools God will be sought and found for that which He is, the Fountain of Knowledge. In these schools Jesus Christ Himself, by His Holy Spirit, will be the great Teacher. In these schools, the Word of God, the Bible, will be the text-book, in every phase of education and every book of study.

And with the Bible, as the text-book in Christian education, declaring that if any man will not work he shall not eat (2 Thess. 3:10), and with Jesus Christ, the embodiment of Christianity, as the Great Teacher, and the one Example, showing in that example that he spent nearly six times as much time working at a trade as he did in preaching in his official ministry, thus ennobling manual labor by bringing God into daily work, and making the service of God just as certainly as he made preaching the service of God; this true Christian education will develop

genuine faithfulness as true intelligence, and laudable pride in work. This will "link heads and hands" and heart in "indissoluble bonds," by an education that will make Christian, all-around, manly work and womanly women in this world, who will delight, as did the Author of Christianity in going about doing good.

October 3, 1900

"Lessons from Matthew 24. 'The End of the World'" *The Signs of the Times* 26, 40 , p. 3 .

"THE end of the world!" How often it is spoken of in the Bible! How often it is spoken of by the people,—so often that the expression is almost a proverb! And how few people really believe in any such thing!

Indeed, if it were left for the people of the world to say whether there should be any end of the world, it is certain that there never would be any, because no generation of people would ever have the world end in their own day. Besides, if it were left for the people to say whether there should be any end of the world, there never would be any; because of themselves the people of the world never can certainly know of the beginning of the world; and how could they know of any end?

Knowledge of either the beginning or the end of the world is altogether a matter of revelation. Therefore it is that only "through faith we understand that the worlds were formed." The worlds *were* formed, made, *created*. It was done by the word of God. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth." "For He spake, and it was." Ps. 55:6, 9. And so entirely were the worlds formed by *the word of God* "that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11:3.

The world having been created, it is only from the Creator that the purpose and course of its existence can be known, and whether there shall be any end. The world having been produced by the word of God, it is only by the word of God that it can ever be known that there shall be any end of the world. And when the word of God is spoken on that subject, as well as on any other, whatsoever in that word is said, that is final, and must be accepted, because that is the sole source of knowledge, and He is the sole authority qualified to speak on the subject.

What, then, says the Word as to the end of the world? Twice in the parable of the tares, Jesus used definitely the expression "the end of the world." "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous

shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear." Matt. 13:38-43.

Again, in the parable of the net which was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind, Jesus says: "Which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Verses 48-50.

Again, when Jesus commissioned His disciples to preach the Gospel, He said, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:20.

Therefore, so certainly as Jesus has spoken, there is to be the end of the world. This is so certain because "the world was made by Him" (John 1:10), and because it is at His coming that the end of the world is to be.

From the words already quoted it is evident that the end of the world comes in fire—in the judgment and destruction of wicked men. This is further shown in another place: "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; whereby [by the word of God] the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished; but the heavens and the earth, *which are now*, by the *same word* are *kept in store*, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Peter 3:5-7.

Thus by the word of God, which made the world, it is certain that the world will end; for "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." "The heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." Verses 10, 12.

The heavens shall depart as a scroll when it is rolled together, and every mountain and island shall be moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman will hide themselves in the dens and rocks of the mountains, and will cry to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of His wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" Rev. 6:14-17.

"In the day a man shall cast his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which they made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats; to go into the clefts of the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of His majesty, when He ariseth to shake the terrible the earth." "The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day." Isa. 2:20, 21 11.

When Jesus spoke repeatedly of "the end of the world," He uttered no new saying; for all the prophets had spoken of it, and He was only speaking of a thing the mention of which was familiar to all who were acquainted with the Scriptures. Besides this, it is His own coming that brings the end of the world; and all the prophets from "Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these" two

simultaneous things. Enoch had said, "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of His saints, to execute judgment upon all;" and all the other prophets had followed with the same announcement and warning, so that time and space would fail to recall the words of all.

That the second coming of the Lord and the end of the world are simultaneous events was so well understood by the disciples from the Scriptures, that when they asked Jesus concerning the end of the world, their question was, "What shall be the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the world?" The sign of either is the sign of the other; the same sign betokens both.

From the day that sin entered the world, it has been settled by God, and has been spoken to men in the Word of God, that there shall be an end to this world. For God "hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts 17:31.

The resurrection of Christ itself is assurance to all men that there shall be an end of the world. For the resurrection of Christ is assurance to all men that they shall all be judged; and it is assurance of this, in that His resurrection is the assurance of the resurrection of every man, from "the first man Adam" unto the last man that shall ever live on the earth. And the resurrection of the dead is at the second coming of the Lord; and the second coming of the Lord brings the end of the world. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming. *Then cometh the end.*" 1 Cor. 15:22-24.

Seeing, then, that there is certainly to be "the end of the world," and *such* an end, seeing "that all these things shall be dissolved; what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God?" 2 Peter 3:11, 12.

What, then, of the time? When shall these things be? What says the Creator and Preserver of the world as to the time when properly the end of the world shall be really looked for and expected? Next week we shall begin a series of six studies of the Lord's answer to the direct question as to the sign of His "coming and *the end of the world.*"

Who can there be who should not study the Lord's answer to that question?
ALONZO T. JONES.

October 10, 1900

"Lessons from Matthew 24. 'Let No Man Deceive You'" *The Signs of the Times* 26, 41 , p. 4 .

"AND Jesus went out, and departed from the temple; and His disciples came to Him for to show Him the buildings of the temple. And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.

"And as He sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto Him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

"And Jesus answered." He answered fully. His answer covers all the time from that time until His coming and the end of the world.

A number of important matters are touched, and others are quite fully considered. But the first of all things said in the Lord's answer to the question of His disciples, is, "*Take heed that no man deceive you.*" This, then, is the most important of all considerations in connection with the coming of the Lord and the end of the world.

This thought is repeated and emphasized by Paul, when he writes of the same subject: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto Him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. *Let no man deceive you by any means.*" 2 Thess. 2:1-3.

To be deceived with respect to the coming of the Lord and the end of the world is the worst possible deception; for to be so deceived is to be unprepared for that wonderful and all-decisive event, and so is to be taken unawares, and to be destroyed. For "the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." And "when they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them; and they shall not escape" (1 Thess. 5:3); "for as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth" (Luke 21:35).

To be deceived into thinking that the Lord is *not* coming when He *is* coming, is to be unprepared, and so taken unawares and destroyed. To be deceived into thinking that He *is* coming when He is *not* coming, is only to be disappointed, and so by the deception and disappointment to be caused *not* to believe in His coming when He is really coming, and thus, also, to be not ready, and therefore to be taken unawares, and, as a consequence, destroyed. And just because to be thus deceived involves the most fatal of all consequences, Jesus begins His instruction on this all-important question with that which is the most important of all considerations. "Take heed that no man deceive you."

Further, this is the most important of all instruction in connection with the subject, because in this very matter more effort is made to deceive than in any other. Jesus Himself says that "many shall come in My name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." Matt. 24:5.

And again, "Many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many." Verse 11.

And yet again, "There shall arise false christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before." Verses 24, 25.

Having taken such precaution as this, and having shown such care to guard all against being deceived, it must needs be that He would make the whole matter so plain that all may escape deception. This, indeed, He has done. He has done it so thoroughly that any one who will believe His Word, can entirely

escape all deception as to His coming, whether as to the personality, the time, or the manner of His coming.

First, as to the personality and manner of His coming. Note again His word in verse 5: "Many shall come in My name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." It is therefore perfectly plain that any one who comes anywhere, at any time, or in any manner, saying, "I am Christ," is a deceiver; and no one is ever to believe any such representation.

Again He says, "If any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not." Verse 25. From this it is perfectly plain that whenever or wherever one person shall say to another, "Christ is come here, or He has come there, come and see Him," that person is a deceiver, and, if he believes it himself, is himself deceived. And no person in the world is ever to believe that any such thing as that is the coming of the Lord. Jesus further emphasizes this: "Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, He is in the desert; go not forth; behold, He is in the secret chambers, believe it not." Verse 26.

Surely, then, no one need ever be deceived in any of these ways as to the coming of the Lord; it is exceedingly easy to escape all deception in any of these ways. The way is made perfectly plain; the tests are all simple, and easily applied; and the word concerning them is brief and easily remembered. All that any one needs to do is simply to believe this simple word of Jesus.

Yet He does not stop even here. He goes on and states the case so clearly as absolutely to preclude any possibility of deception as to His coming, on the part of anybody who will pay any attention whatever to His word. He not only tells, as in the words already quoted, that any person coming and saying, "I am Christ," or saying, "Lo, He is here, in the secret chamber," or, "Lo, He is there, in the desert," is a deceiver, but He tells why all such ideas are deception.

And here is the reason: "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Verse 27. As stated in another place, "For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in His day." Luke 17:24.

That is a reason so simple, so easily remembered, and yet so conclusive, it annihilates every possibility of deception as to His coming on the part of anybody who has any disposition whatever to believe the Word of Jesus as to His own coming again to the world. There is no possibility of any one counterfeiting His coming, and when that coming is in its brightness as the lightning that brilliantly lightens up the whole heavens and earth, there is neither chance nor need for one person to say to others, "Lo, here He is, or there." Is it not even written, "Behold, He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see Him." Rev. 1:7. How, then, could it be possible to counterfeit it? and how can anybody be deceived with regard to it, who will but believe the Word?

A word farther as to the heavenly-shining brightness in which the Lord's coming is displayed; the cause of this is not in some particular display that is made to grace the occasion; it is simply the nature of His coming itself. For He Himself comes in His own proper glory; He comes also in the glory of the Father, and with the holy angels.

Now of Jesus Himself in His glory it is written, "His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace. . . . and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength." Rev. 1:14-16.

Of the Father it is written that He dwells in "the light which no man can approach unto"—a light so far above the brightness of the sun that in that day the sun shall be ashamed (Isa. 24:23), and the city of God has no need of the sun to shine in it, for the glory of God lightens it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.

This is the glory of the Father and of Christ, in which Jesus appears at His second coming.

Yet even this is not all; the holy angels come with Him. And of but one of these it is written that "His countenance was like lightning, and His raiment was white as snow." Matt. 28:3. This of only one; and yet when Jesus comes there come with Him of these "ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands," "an innumerable company"—such a mighty host that the heavens are so filled with them and their glory that the whole seems like vast billows of clouds. The whole heavens are perfectly "wrapped in a blaze of boundless glory."

And such as this is the coming of the Lord. This, and this only, is the manner of His coming.

Yet more: the accompaniments of that coming:—

First, the tearing asunder of the heavens with a great noise, when the heaven departs as a scroll when it is rolled together. 2 Peter 3:10; Rev. 6:14.

Secondly, uttered from the temple of heaven, from the throne, that voice that shakes both earth and heaven, so that they are completely broken up and removed. Heb. 12:26; Rev. 16:17-20.

Thirdly, the resurrection of the dead and the translation of the righteous living: "for the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and]remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.

The coming of the Lord is all this, and not an iota less; yea, it is even much more. And in view of it all, or in view of only so much of it as we have been able here to set down, now is it possible for anybody to be deceived as to His coming?—It is not possible, except as people refuse to believe His Word.

"Take heed that no man deceive you." "Let no man deceive you by any means." And that is only to say in other words, Believe the Word, receive the Word, hold fast to the Word, as it is spoken by Jesus, and as it is in Jesus. So shall you be safe from all deception, and so shall you be saved.

ALONZO T. JONES.

October 17, 1900

"Lessons from Matthew 24. 'Let No Man Deceive You'—As to the Time of His Coming" *The Signs of the Times* 26, 42 , pp. 3, 4 .

AFTER having given the counsel to guard His disciples against being deceived as to the personality and manner of His coming, Jesus next gives counsel to guard them from being deceived as to the *time* of His coming and of the end of the world.

He not only says that "many shall come saying, I am Christ," but that these same ones would say, "*The time is at hand,*" or "draweth near." But He says, "Go ye not after them."

This was not to say nor to imply that no time could ever come when it would be proper for *anybody* to say, "The time is at hand," or "draweth near."

It was only to say, first, that no time could ever come when anybody could come, saying, "I am Christ, and the time is at hand," because, as has been abundantly shown, anybody who ever comes anywhere or at any time saying, "I am Christ," is a deceiver. And this being false as to the personality and manner of His coming, it would, in the nature of things, be false as to the saying that "the time is at hand."

Secondly, it was to say, as is abundantly shown, not only in His own words that follow, but also in other places in the Bible, that there was a long period of time and a remarkable series of events that must intervene before it could be truly said by anybody that "the time is at hand," or "draweth near," of His coming and of the end of the world.

Therefore for any one to say, "The time is at hand," before this long period of time had passed, and these remarkable events had all occurred, would be only to deceive. Under these circumstances, any one so saying would be only a deceiver; because he would be speaking only from the imagination of his own heart, and not by the word of the Lord.

Accordingly, on this very thought it is written in another place: "Now we beseech you, brethren, *by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and by our gathering together unto Him, that ye be *not soon* shaken in mind, nor be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as *the day of Christ IS AT HAND*. Let no man deceive you by any means; for *that day shall not come*, EXCEPT THERE COME A FALLING AWAY FIRST, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.

Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, *I told you these things?* And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only He who now letteth [hindereth] will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, *whom the Lord shall consume* with the Spirit of His mouth, and shall *destroy with the brightness* OF HIS COMING. Even Him, *whose coming* is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." 2 Thess. 2:1-10.

Thus all these things must come to pass before any one can truly say of the coming of the Lord and the end of the world, that "the time is at hand," or "draweth near." And the answer of Jesus to the question of His disciples covers the same time and contemplates the same course of events.

Remember that the question of the disciples as to His coming and the end was, "What shall be the sign of Thy coming and of the end of the world?" And in reply Jesus does not in any sense intimate that there would be no signs, nor that nothing could be known on the subject. But, first of all, He gives full counsel against anybody's being deceived as to the times, and which will effectually guard against being deceived all who believe His Word.

Thus He says: "Many shall come in My name, saying, I am Christ, and the time is at hand; and shall lead many astray, go ye not after them. And when ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, and tumults, see that ye be not troubled or terrified; for these things must come to pass first, but *the end is not yet*. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be great earthquakes, and in divers places famines and pestilences; and there shall be terrors and great signs from heaven. But all these things are the beginning of travail.

"But take ye heed to yourselves; for *before all these things*, they shall lay their hands on you, and shall persecute you, delivering you up unto tribulation, to councils, and prisons; and in synagogs shall ye be beaten; and before governors and kings shall ye stand for My name's sake. Ye shall be delivered up even by parents, and children, and brethren, and kinsfolk, and friends; and some of you shall they cause to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for My name's sake. For in those days shall be great tribulations, such as there hath not been the like from the beginning of the creation which God created until now, no, nor ever shall be. And except the Lord had shortened the days, no flesh should be saved; but for the elect's sake whom He hath chosen, He hath shortened the days.

"Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ; or, Lo, He is there; believe him not. For false christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall show great signs and wonders, to seduce if it were possible even the elect. But take ye heed; behold, I have told you all things beforehand. If therefore they shall say unto you, Behold, He is in the wilderness, go not forth; Behold, He is in the inner chamber, believe it not. For as the lightning that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven and shineth unto the other part under heaven, so shall also the Son of man be in His day.

"And then shall many stumble, and shall deliver up one another, and shall hate one another. And not a hair of your head shall perish. In your patience possess ye your souls. And many false prophets shall arise, and shall lead many astray. And because iniquity shall be multiplied the love of many shall wax cold. But he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved. And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in *the whole world* for a testimony unto *all the nations; and THEN SHALL THE END COME.*"

That is the true order of things as to *the time* of the coming of the Lord and of the end of the world, and as to the events that should precede His coming and

the end of the world. And the Gospel—glad tidings—of His coming, "this Gospel of the kingdom," preached in all the world for a testimony to all nations, is the final event that precedes His coming and the end; for "*then* shall the end come." For, note, it is not only the commonly-accepted Gospel of salvation of sinners from their sins, which must be preached in the whole world, but it is definitely the glad tidings of *His coming*, this Gospel of *the kingdom*, that is thus to be preached.

This is certain, because that is the great subject of His discourse, and that discourse given in answer to the direct question as to His coming and the end of the world. And, speaking on this subject in answer to the direct question on this subject, He has dwelt on His coming, on the manner of His coming, and on the events which should precede His coming; and then, having reached the ultimate point of the answer to the inquiry, He says, "THIS Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached," etc. That word "*this* Gospel of the kingdom" fixes it to the preaching in all the world of the glad tidings of His coming in the clouds of heaven with power and glory—the glad tidings of His coming and kingdom. And when "*this* Gospel of the kingdom" shall have been preached in the whole world, to all nations, *then* THE END WILL COME.

And in the great threefold message of Rev. 14:6-12 there is the very complement of this word of Jesus as to the preaching of this Gospel of the kingdom in all the world to all nations; and in Rev. 14:14-16 there is the very complement of this word of Jesus as to His coming and the coming of the end, following the preaching of this Gospel of the kingdom.

Thus we read: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having *the everlasting Gospel* to *preach* unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to Him; for *the hour of His* judgment is come; and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. And *there followed* another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication. And the *third angel followed them*, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation. . . . Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

"And I looked, and behold a white cloud; and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap; for *the time is come for thee to reap*; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And He that sat on the cloud thrust in His sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped." And Jesus Himself said in another place, "The harvest is *the end of the world*." Thus certain it is that in these scriptures then is shown the message and the time of the preaching of "*this* Gospel" of the coming and kingdom of the Lord, which is to be followed by the very coming of the Lord and of the end of the world, about which the disciples asked.

Thus as to the *manner* and the *time* of His coming, and of the end of the world. What, then, as to "the sign" of His coming and of the end of the world? That will be considered next. ALONZO T. JONES.

October 24, 1900

"Lessons from Matthew 24. The Signs of the Lord's Coming and of the End of the World" *The Signs of the Times* 26, 43 , p. 4 .

"What shall be the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

THIS question the disciples asked Jesus. And Jesus answered the question directly, and even more fully than they had asked. They asked, "What shall be the *sign*?" and Jesus answered, "There shall be *signs*"—not one only, but a number of them; and these in different places.

But first He tells definitely *the time* when the signs would begin to appear, so that those who would intelligently look for His coming could know when to expect the signs, and as a consequence know that His coming and the end were near. Thus He says, "Immediately after the tribulation of those days, there shall be signs."

In the stretch of time that would elapse, and the course of events which would occur between the day of His discourse and the day of His coming and of the end of the world, He had said, as noted in the preceding study, that upon the elect "there shall be great tribulation, such as there hath not been the like, from the beginning of the creation which God created until now, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened."

These are the "one thousand two hundred and threescore days," each day for a year, in which the church of God—the elect—was "nourished from the face of the serpent," and protected from the flood of wrath, which the dragon through his earthly instrument cast out of his mouth "after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood." Rev. 12:17; 14, 15. They are the days during which the power symbolized by the "little horn" of Dan. 7:8, 20-22, 25, "made war with the saints, and prevailed against them," and wore them out. They are the days in which death, on his "pale horse," rode prosperously, with hell following with him, while he killed "with sword, and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth" those who must be "slain for the Word of God and the testimony which they held." Rev. 6:8, 9. They are the days in which "that woman Jezebel," "Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth," used her terrible power so astonishingly that she was "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. 2:19; 17:3-6. They are the days in which this "abomination that astonisheth" (Dan. 11:21, margin) caused many to "fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days." Dan. 11:31-33.

Thus "*those days*" are the twelve hundred and sixty years of papal supremacy, which began in A.D. 538, at the rooting up of the last of the "three"

kingdoms mentioned in Dan. 7:8, 20, 24, and ended in A.D. 1798, when the papal government was abolished in Rome, when a Roman republic was again declared there, and "the old foundations of the capital were made again to resound with the cries, if not the spirit, of freedom; and the venerable ensign, S.P.Q.R., after the lapse of fourteen hundred years, again floated in the winds," and when the pope was made a prisoner and was carried into captivity in France, where he died at Valence, Aug. 29, 1799. And "the *tribulation* of those days" is the terrible persecution inflicted by the Papacy, as shown by the scriptures referred to in the preceding paragraph, and certified in the history of the Dark Ages.

But Jesus said "those days should be shortened," and "for the elect's sake." "They shall be holpen with a little help," said the angel to David. Dan. 11:34. "The earth helped the woman" in the wilderness, wrote John. Rev. 12:16. The tribulation was shortened; the elect were relieved before the days ended, else there would have been none left. The *tribulation* ended in the suppression of the Jesuits in 1773. The days ended A.D. 1798. And "immediately after the tribulation" ended, yet before the days ended, the signs of His coming would begin to appear; for said Jesus, "In those days, after that tribulation," the signs should begin.

And where would be the signs? Read: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days" (in the days) "there shall be signs

(a) "In the sun, and

(b) "In the moon, and

(c) "In the stars, and

(d) "Upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity;

(e) "The sea and the waves roaring;

(f) "Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." Luke 21:25, 26.

Thus the signs of the coming of the Lord and of the end of the world are to be abundant, and in so many places that it is impossible for anybody to fail to see, at the very least, some of them. The signs are to be in the heavens and on the earth, amongst the nations, upon the sea, and among men as individuals.

The signs in the heavens are to be in the sun, in the moon, and in the stars. And these are the first signs mentioned. Not only are they the first mentioned, but they are definitely specified as the ones which would begin in the days, and after the tribulation: "immediately after the tribulation of those days [in the days] the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light." "The sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood." Mark 13:24; Matt. 24:29; Rev. 6:12; Joel 2:31.

As already stated, the *tribulation* ended in 1773. The *days* ended in 1798. And May 19, 1780, just seven years after the tribulation ended and eighteen years before the days ended, the sun was darkened from about 10 o'clock in the morning all the rest of the day, and till past midnight; and in that night of darkness such as "doubtless had not been since the Almighty first gave birth to light," the moon, which had *fulled* the day before, appeared as *red as blood*. Of the

darkening of the sun, and, consequently, of the moon, one of the best accounts is the following:—

Almost if not altogether alone, as the most mysterious and as yet unexplained phenomenon of its kind in nature's diversified range of events, during the last century, stands the *dark day of May* 19, 1780—a most unaccountable darkening of the whole visible heavens and atmosphere in New England—which brought intense alarm and distress to multitudes of minds, as well as dismay to the brute creation, and fowls fleeing bewildered to their roosts, and the birds to their nests, and the cattle returning to their stalls. Indeed, thousands of the good people of that day became fully convinced that the end of all things terrestrial had come, and gave up, for the time, their secular pursuits, and he betook themselves to religious devotions; while many others regarded the darkness as not only a token of God's indignation against the various iniquities and abominations of the age, but also as an omen of some future destruction that might overwhelm the land—as in the case of the countries mentioned in Biblical history—unless speedy repentance and reformation took place. The ignorant indulged in vagaries and wild conjectures as to the cause of the phenomenon; and those profounder minds, even, that could gauge the heavens and tell the stars," were about usually at loss for any rational explanation of the event. It is related that the Connecticut Legislature has a session at this time, and that so great was the darkness the members became terrified, and thought that the day of judgment had come; a motion was consequently made to adjourn. At this Mr. Davenport arose and said: "Mr. Speaker, it is either the day of judgment or it is not. If it is not, there is no need of adjourning. If it is, I desire to be bound doing my duty. I move that candles be brought, and that we proceed to business."

The time of the commencement of this extraordinary darkness was between the hours of 10 and 11 in the forenoon of Friday of the date already named; and it continued until the middle of the following night, but with different appearances at different places. As to the manner of its appearance, it seemed to appear, first of all, in the southwest. The wind came from that quarter, and the darkness appeared to come on with the clouds that came in that direction. The degree to which the darkness arose varied in different localities. In most part it became so dark, that people were unable to read common print distinctly, or accurately determined the time of day by their clocks or watches, or dim, or manage their domestic affairs conveniently without the light of candles. In some places the degree of darkness was just about equal to preventing persons seeing to read ordinary print in the open air for several hours together.

The extent of this darkness was also very remarkable. It was observed at the most easterly regions of New England; westward to the farthest parts of Connecticut, and at Albany; to the southward it was observed all along the seacoasts; and to the north as far as the American settlements extended. It probably far exceeded these boundaries, but the exact limits were never positively known.

With regard to its duration, it continued in the neighborhood of Boston for at least fourteen or fifteen hours; but it was doubtless longer or shorter in some other places. The appearance and effects were such as tended to make the prospect extremely dull, gloomy, and unnatural. Candles were lighted up in the houses; the birds, in the midst of their blithesome forenoon enjoyments, stopped suddenly, and, singing their evening songs, disappeared and became silent; the fowls retired to their roosts, the cocks were crowing in their accustomed manner at the break of day; objects could not be distinguished at a comparatively slight distance; and everything bore the aspect and gloom of night,—to say nothing of the effect upon the minds of the people, which, indeed, was quite indescribable.

The above general facts concerning this strange phenomenon were ascertained, after much painstaking inquiry, soon after its occurrence, by Roger Williams, of Harvard College, who also collected together some of the more particular observations made in different parts of the country, relative to the remarkable event.

At 8 in the evening the darkness was so impenetrably thick as to render traveling positively impracticable; and, altho the moon rose nearly . . . about 9 o'clock, yet it did not give light enough to enable a person to distinguish between the heavens and the earth.

That this darkness was not caused by an eclipse is manifest by the various positions of the planetary bodies at that time; for the moon was more than one hundred and fifty degrees from the sun all that day, and according to accurate calculations made by the most celebrated astronomers, there could not, in the order of nature, be any transit of the planet Venus or Mercury upon the disc of the sun that year; nor could it be a blazing star—much as is a mountain—that darkened the atmosphere; for that would still leave unexplained the deep darkness of the following night. Nor would such excessive nocturnal darkness follow an eclipse of the sun; and as to the moon, she was at that time more than forty hours' motion past her opposition.—*"Our First Century," pp. 89, 90, 93, 95, Great and Memorable Events.*

A. T. JONES.

(To be continued.)

October 31, 1900

"Lessons from Matthew 24. The Signs of the Lord's Coming and of the End of the World. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 26, 44 , p.

3 .

(Concluded).

THE sign "*in the stars*" is that "the stars shall fall from heaven" (Matt. 24:29; Mark 13:25), and that they shall fall "as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs when she is shaken of a mighty wind" (Rev. 6:13). And so, in 1833, it came to pass.

Extensive and magnificent showers of shooting stars have been known to occur at various places in modern times, but the most universal and wonderful which has ever been recorded is that of the thirteenth of November, 1833, *the whole firmament, over all the United States, being then, for hours, in fiery commotion!* No celestial phenomenon has ever occurred in this country since its first settlement, which was viewed with such intense admiration by one class in the community, or with so much dread and alarm by another. It was the all-engrossing noise of conversation and of scientific disquisition for weeks and months. Indeed, it could not be otherwise than that such a rare phenomenon,—next in grandeur and sublimity to that of a total solar eclipse, or a great comet stretched athwart the starry heavens in full view of a wonder struck universe—should awaken the deepest interest among all beholding it. Nor is the memory of this marvelous scene yet extinct: its sublimity and awful beauty still linger in many minds, who also remember well the terror with which the demonstration was regarded, and the mortal fear excited among the ignorant that the end of the world had come. During the three hours of its continuance, the day of judgment was believed to be only waiting for sunrise, and long after the shower had ceased, the morbid and superstitious were still impressed with the idea that the final day was at least only a week ahead, impromptu meetings for prayer were held in many places, and many other scenes of religious devotion, or terror, or abandonment of worldly affairs, transpired, under the influence of fear, occasioned by so sudden and awful a display.

But, tho in many districts the mass of the population were thus panic-stricken, through fear as well as want of familiarity with the history of such appearances, the more enlightened were profoundly awed at contemplating so vivid a picture of the apocalyptic image—that of "the stars of heaven falling to the earth, even as a fig-tree casting her untimely figs, after she is shaken of a mighty wind." In describing the effect of this phenomenon upon the black population, a southern planter says:—

"I was suddenly awakened by the most distressing cries that ever fell on my ears. Shrieks of horror and cries for mercy could be heard from most of the negroes of three plantations, amounting in all to some six or eight hundred. While earnestly and breathlessly listening for the cause, I heard a faint voice near the door calling my name. I arose, and, taking my sword, stood at the door. At this moment I heard the same voice still beseeching me to rise, and saying, '*O my God, the world is on fire!*' Then opened the door, and it is difficult to say which excited me most—the awfulness of the scene, or the distressed cries of the negroes. Upwards of one hundred lay prostrate on the ground, some speechless, and others uttering the bitterest moans, and with their hands raised, imploring God to save the world and them. The scene was truly awful, for

never did rain fall much thicker than the meteors fell towards the earth; east, west, north, and south it was the same." In a word, *the whole heavens seemed in motion*.

The display, as described in Professor Silliman's journal, was seen all over North America. The chief scene of the exhibition was within the limits of the longitude of 61° in the Atlantic Ocean, and that of 100° in Central Mexico, and from the North American lakes to the southern side of the island of Jamaica.

Over this vast area, an appearance presented itself by surpassing in grandeur and magnificence the loftiest reach of the human imagination. From two o'clock until broad daylight, the sky being perfectly serene and cloudless, an incessant play of dazzlingly brilliant luminosities was kept up in the whole heavens. Some of these were of great magnitude and most peculiar form. One of large size remained for some time almost stationary in the zenith, over the falls of Niagara, emitting streams of light which radiated in all directions. The wild dash of the waters, as contrasted with the fiery commotion above them, formed a scene of unequalled and amazing sublimity. Arago computes that not less than *two hundred and forty thousand meteors were at the same time visible above the horizon of Boston!* To form some idea of such a spectacle, one must imagine a constant succession of fire-balls, resembling sky-rockets, radiating in all directions, from a point in the heavens near the zenith, and following the arch of the sky towards the horizon. They proceeded to various distances from the radiating point, leaving after them a vivid streak of light, and usually exploding before they disappeared. The balls were of various sizes and degrees of splendor; some were mere points, but others were larger and brighter than Jupiter or Venus; and one, in particular, appeared to be nearly of the moon's size. But at Niagara no spectacle so terribly grand and sublime was ever before beheld by man as that of *the firmament descending in fiery torrents over the dark and roaring cataract*.

The point from which the meteors seemed to issue was observed, by those who fixed the position of the display among the stars, to be in the constellation Leo. At New Haven it appeared in the bend of the "sickle"—a collection of stars in the breast of Leo—a little to the westward of the star Gamma Leonis. By observers at other places remote from each other, it was seen in the same constellation [*sic.*], altho in different parts of it. An interesting and important fact in this connection is, that this radiating point was *stationary* among the fixed stars, that is, that it did not move along with the earth in its diurnal revolution eastward, but accompanied the stars in their apparent progress westward.—"*Our First Century*," pp. 329, 330, 332.

In all of these extracts the italics are those of the book itself.

"And upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity." This is so to-day in all the nations; for years it has been so, and it only grows worse. Note that it is not simply distress of nations; this might be, and it might be borne with comparative equanimity, because they might see a way of escape. But it is not so in this word, nor in the time of the fulfilment of that Word; for this is "distress of nations *with perplexity*." They do not know which way to turn to find assured relief from the distress, and ways that they do take deepen rather than relieve the distress and perplexity.

And everywhere to-day men's hearts are failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth. Among all classes of people there is this fear because of what is already before them, and wondering what can be the worse which they certainly fear is coming.

Then said Jesus, "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." Luke 21:28. They began to come to pass in 1780, and then this redemption was drawing nigh.

And next He says, "When ye shall see all these things, then know that it [His coming] is near, even at the doors." Matt. 24:33. All people can now see all these things. All the signs mentioned as coming "upon the earth," and among the nations and among men, can be seen in the events of the times in which we live to-day; and the signs that were to be in the heavens, and which were the beginning ones, all can see in the authentic records of the events. And to-day being the time when all can "see all these things," it is settled by the Word of the Lord that *now* is the time when He would have all to "*know* that He is near, even at the doors."

"But of that *day* and *hour* knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but My Father only." Matt. 24:36. The definite time, the day and the hour, the times and the seasons, of His coming "the Father hath put in His own power" (Acts 1:7); and no one, neither man nor angel, can ever make it known. And every one who ever attempts to know it is deceived; and every one who ever attempts to make it known, is both deceived and a deceiver.

But, tho no one can ever make known the *day and hour* of the Lord's coming, this in no wise affects the truth that all may know when His coming "is *near*, even at the doors;" for He said, "When ye shall see all these things *know* that it is near, even at the doors."

And *now* is the time.

ALONZO T. JONES.

[The title of the next article is, "Get Ready, Get Ready, Get Ready."]

November 7, 1900

"Lessons from Matthew 24. 'Get Ready, Get Ready, Get Ready!'" *The Signs of the Times* 26, 45 , p. 4 .

THE world is now in the time when "all these things" which Jesus mentioned as signs of His coming and of the end of the world, can be seen, and when all

may "know that it is near, even at the doors." Accordingly it should be expected that all would be most interestedly observing all these things, and getting ready to meet Him "in peace without spot and blameless," and with the joyful greeting, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for Him, we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation." Isa. 25:9.

It is in order that all may be thus ready and waiting to meet Him and greet Him, that the Lord has given all this instruction about His coming. He would not have a single soul taken unawares. The more forcibly to impress this upon all, he spake a parable, saying, "Behold, the fig tree and all the trees; when her branch is now become tender, and putting forth its leaves, *ye see it*, and *know of your own selves* that the summer is now nigh. *Even so ye also*, when ye see all these things coming to pass, *know ye* that the kingdom of God is nigh, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, until all these things shall be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall pass away; but My words shall not pass away." As certainly and as easily as the people of the world know that summer is nigh when the trees put forth leaves, so certainly and so easily may the people of this world know that the coming of the Lord and the end of the world is *now* nigh, and that this generation shall not pass away till these joint events shall be accomplished, and the kingdom of God be come in all its glory.

Accordingly Jesus urges upon all people in this time, "*Watch therefore*; for ye know not on what day your Lord cometh." "Therefore *be ye also ready*; for in an hour that ye think not, the Son of man cometh." "*Take heed to yourselves*, lest haply your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and cares of this life and that day come on you suddenly as a snare." "But *watch ye at every season*, making supplication, that ye may prevail to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man."

"*Take ye heed, WATCH and pray*; for ye know not when the time is. It is as when a man, sojourning in another country, having left his house, and given authority to his servants, to each one his work, commanded also the porter to watch. WATCH THEREFORE; for ye know not when the lord of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cock-crowing, or in the morning; lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, WATCH."

And yet for all this instruction, all this warning, and all this exhortation, to know, to be ready, and to watch, only a few will do so. The great mass of the world's people will refuse the instruction, despise the warning, and resist the exhortation, and will follow the way of the world, even to ruin. So fully is this true that only the days of Noah and the days of Lot can supply a fitting parallel.

And thus the Lord says: "As were the days of Noah, so shall be the coming of the Son of man. For as in those days which were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and they knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; *so shall be the coming of the Son of man.*"

"Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out

of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. *Even thus* shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed."

Both in the days of Noah and in the days of Lot, all the people could have known as really as Noah and Lot knew what was coming, and so could all have escaped instead of all being destroyed. They *did* not know, simply because they *would* not know. They were instructed, they were warned, they were exhorted concerning the coming flood, and also concerning the impending destruction of Sodom; but they would not believe the word. They could have known all, simply by believing the word; but they would not believe, and therefore did not and could not know.

Even so it is now. The word is ample; the message is distinct; the instruction is definite; the warning is faithful; the exhortation is sufficient; but the great mass of the people will not *believe*, and therefore can not know. Every soul can know all, and so can be delivered from the coming destruction, and saved with the Lord's full salvation, if he will only simply believe the Word.

But they will not believe. Instead, they actually turn "scoffers, walking after their own lusts; and saying, Where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that *by the word of God* the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished; but the heavens and the earth, which are now, *by the same word* are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Peter 3:3-7.

Indeed, these scoffers are found even among the professed servants of the true Master. But they are evil servants; as saith the Master Himself. "If that evil servant shall say in his heart. My Lord delayeth His coming; and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken, the Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for Him, and in an hour that he is not aware of; and shall cut him asunder, and shall appoint him his portion with the hypocrites."

From this it is evident that in these times there will be found among the professed servants of the Lord, unfaithfulness to Christian truth, and only pretensions to piety. Even so it is written: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; *having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof*; from such turn away." 2 Tim. 3:1-5. So much is this so that Jesus was forced to exclaim, "When the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?"

Nevertheless, there are some who will believe, who, like Noah, in spite of the evil tide drawing away from God, will set themselves to walk with God. These also, as Noah, will cease not to proclaim the truth of God for the time, and will warn the world that the Lord is coming that the end is near, that destruction hastens and that men must escape for their lives.

Therefore, and of these, the Lord says: "Who then is the faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord hath set over His household, to give them their food in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord when He cometh, shall find so *doing*. Verily I say unto you, that He will set him over all that He hath."

All these will gladly see the Lord come. And they will see Him coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. For soon "the powers of the heavens shall be shaken and *there* shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And He shall send His angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." "For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be *caught up together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and *SO shall we ever be with the Lord*. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

"In the resurrection morning we shall see the Saviour coming.
And the sons of God *a*-shouting in the kingdom of the Lord.

CHORUS.

"We shall rise, we shall rise, When the mighty trumpet rends the
azure skies We shall rise, we shall rise, In the resurrection morning
we shall rise.

"We feel the advent glory; while the vision seems to tarry. We
will comfort one another with the words of Holy Writ.

"The faith . . . discover that . . . warfare . . . be over, "We will tell
the pleasing story, when we meet our friends in glory, And we'll
keep ourselves all ready for to hail the heavenly King."

ALONZO T. JONES.

November 14, 1900

"Lessons from Matthew 24. The Destruction of Jerusalem—Its Meaning To-day" *The Signs of the Times* 26, 46 , pp. 4, 5 .

THERE is yet one important part of the Lord's discourse concerning the sign of His coming and the end of the world, which must be noticed—that is, the part relating to the destruction of Jerusalem.

It must be remembered that it was the disciples showing to Jesus the wonderful structure of the temple that was the occasion which called forth this whole grand discourse upon the subject of the signs of His coming and of the end of the world.

The whole story is as follows: "And Jesus went out from the temple, and was going on His way. And as He went forth, His disciples came to Him to show Him

the buildings of the temple; and one of His disciples saith unto Him, Master, behold, what manner of stones and what manner of buildings! And some spoke of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and offerings. And Jesus answered and said unto them, Seest thou these great buildings? As for these things which ye behold, verily I say unto you, The days will come, in which there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.

"And as He sat on the Mount of Olives, over against the temple, the disciples, Peter and James and John and Andrew, came unto Him, and asked Him privately, saying, Master, tell us, when therefore shall these be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished? and what shall be the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

Now in this whole discourse in answer to these questions, the only reference that Jesus made to the destruction of Jerusalem is less than two dozen lines, in the midst of His discourse, after He had sketched the events between that time and the end of the world, and just at the beginning of that part of His discourse in which He proceeds to give the signs of His coming and the *time* when the signs would begin to appear. From this fact, as well as from the causes and character of the destruction of Jerusalem, it is evident that the destruction of Jerusalem is itself a sign by which can be known the times of the Lord's coming and of the end of the world, just as the fall of ancient Babylon is likewise such a sign. It is in the light of this suggestion that we shall here study that part of the Lord's discourse relating to the destruction of Jerusalem.

That part of the Lord's discourse is as follows: "When therefore ye see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of through Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, where he ought not (let him that readeth understand); and when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand. Then let them that are in Judea flee unto the mountains; and let them that are in the midst of her depart out and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. Let him that is on the housetop not come down, nor enter in, to take out the things that are in his house; and let him that is in the field not return back to take his cloak. For these are the days of vengeance, that all things that are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child and them that give suck in those days! And pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath. For there shall be great distress upon the land and wrath upon this people."

The Center of Controversy

Why did all this come upon that people? *Why* was Jerusalem destroyed?—Because they rejected the Lord, of course. But *why* did they reject the Lord? What was the particular issue in which centered and culminated their opposition to the Lord and their rejection of Him? The answer to these questions is, That issue was the Sabbath,—the distinction between *His* principles as to what is true Sabbath-keeping and their views upon the same point.

In nothing had the selfishness of the Pharisees and doctors of the law taken a more perverse turn than in the matter of the Sabbath and its true meaning and purpose. So far as the Lord's meaning and purpose in His Sabbath are concerned, they had utterly lost sight of it themselves, and by their traditions, and exactions had completely hidden it from the minds and hearts of the people. This was the crowning result of their perverse-minded course. And as Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath, and as to bring to mind what He is to mankind, is the true intent of the Sabbath,—in other words, He Himself, as He lived among them, being the manifestation of the true intent of the Sabbath, it is evident that in nothing could His course arouse more or more bitter antagonism from these men than in His words and actions with relation to the Sabbath.

It was with reference to this that they began their persecution of Him; it was regarding this that they first entertained the thought of killing Him; and it was upon this issue that their opposition culminated in the actual crucifying of Him. This issue became clearly defined at His second Passover, at the pool of Bethesda, when Jesus healed the impotent man. Thus we read:—

"A certain man was there, which had an infirmity thirty and eight years. When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case. He saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole? The impotent man answered Him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool; but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me. Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked; *and on the same day was the Sabbath*. The Jews therefore said unto him that was cured. *It is the Sabbath day; it is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed*. He answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed and walk. Then asked they him, *What man is that* which said unto thee, Take up thy bed, and walk? And he that was healed wist not who it was; for Jesus had conveyed Himself away, a multitude being in that place. Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple, and said unto him, Behold, thou art made whole; sin no more lest a worse thing come unto thee. The man departed, and *told the Jews that it was Jesus*, which had made him whole." John 5:1-15.

Of course they then knew who it was who had told him to do this "unlawful" thing,—to take up his bed and walk on the Sabbath day.

"And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay Him, because He had done these things on the Sabbath day." Verse 16.

Now think of this: Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath. The Sabbath is the sign of what He is to mankind. He then was in His life the living expression of the Sabbath. Therefore it was impossible for Him to do anything on the Sabbath that was not Sabbath-keeping; because the very doing of it was in itself the expression of the meaning of the Sabbath.

But his Sabbath-keeping did not suit the Sabbath ideas of the Pharisees and the doctors of the law and the scribes. They, therefore, called it Sabbath-breaking. Now Christ's ideas of the Sabbath are God's ideas of the Sabbath. The Pharisees' ideas of the Sabbath and of Sabbath-keeping, being directly the opposite of the Lord Jesus' ideas, were wrong. Therefore the controversy in that day between Christ and the Pharisees and the doctors of the law, was simply

whether God's ideas of the Sabbath should prevail, or whether man's ideas of it should prevail.

"Therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay Him, because He had done these things on the Sabbath day. But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. *Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him*, because He not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was His Father, making Himself equal with God." John 5:16-18.

By this we further see that the very first open steps that the Pharisees and the doctors of the law ever took against Jesus Christ to do Him harm in any way, were taken because He had not kept the Sabbath to suit them. That was the controversy between Christ and them; and upon this point everything else turned.

Shortly after this we have the record in the second chapter of Mark, twenty-third verse, to the third chapter, sixth verse; it is also in the twelfth chapter of Matthew, and the sixth of Luke, verses 1-12; but Mark's record gives a point that is not in either of the others, and it is all-important:—

"And it came to pass, that He went through the corn-fields on the Sabbath day; and His disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn. And the Pharisees said unto Him, *Behold, why do they on the Sabbath day, that which is not lawful?* And He said unto them, Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungered; he, and they that were with him? How he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar the high priest, and did eat the showbread, which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to them that were with Him? And He said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath."

"And He entered again into the synagog; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. *And they watched Him*, whether He would heal him on the Sabbath day; *that they might accuse Him.*"

He knew that their attention was all on Him. And that they might have the fullest evidence possible, He called to the man who had the withered hand, and said to him, "Stand forth in the midst." The man stepped out into the midst of the synagog. This drew everybody's attention to Jesus and the man standing there waiting. Then He asked the Pharisees and those who were accusing Him, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill?" They could not say it was lawful to do evil, for that would be contrary to all their own teaching, and they did not dare to say it was lawful to do good, because then they would sanction His healing this man on the Sabbath. "Is it lawful to save life, or to kill?" They did not dare to say it was lawful to kill, and they did not dare to say it was lawful to save life; for He told them, and they knew that it was so, that if one of them had a sheep that fell into a ditch on the Sabbath day, he would pull it out to save its life. Whether they would do this out of mercy to the sheep, or for fear of losing the price of it, matters not. They knew it was so. Therefore "they held their peace."

"And when He had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, He saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And

he stretched it out, and his hand was restored whole as the other. And the Pharisees

725

went forth, *and straightway took counsel with the Herodians* against Him, *how they might destroy Him.*"

Confederation against Christ

The Herodians were a sect of the Jews, who stood at the extreme opposite pole from the Pharisees. They derived their title—Herodians—from being the friends, the supporters, and the rigid partisans of Herod and his house in their rule over the nation of Israel. The Pharisees were the "godly" of the nation, especially in their own estimation. They held themselves to be the righteous ones of the nation, the ones who stood the closest to God; and therefore they stood farthest from Herod and from Rome. They despised Herod; they hated Rome. The Herodians were the political supporters of Herod, and consequently the friends of Rome and Roman power. Therefore, as denominations, as sects, the Pharisees and the Herodians were just as far apart as they could be.

Now when the Pharisees saw that Christ would not yield to their ideas of Sabbath-keeping, they, in order to carry out their purpose to kill Him—it was a far-reaching purpose—joined themselves, not only to their sectarian enemies, but to these *particular religio-political* sectarian enemies, so that they could secure the influence of Herod, so that they might have the government on their side, that they might have the civil power under their control, and thus make effectual their purpose to destroy Jesus. Thus they entered politics.

After this we read:—

"After these things Jesus walked in Galilee; for He would not talk in Jewry, because the Jews sought to kill Him." John 7:1.

However, when the annual Feast of Tabernacle came, "about the midst of the feast Jesus went up into the temple, and taught." As He was teaching, He said to them:—

"Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? *Why go ye about to kill Me?* The people answered and said, Thou hast a devil; who goeth about to kill Thee? Jesus answered and said unto them, I have done one work, and ye all marvel. Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers); and ye on the Sabbath day circumcise a man. If a man on the Sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken; *are ye angry at Me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath day?* Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." John 7:19-24.

Even at that time, these, His enemies, "sought to take Him," yet "no man laid hands on Him." And later in the same day "the Pharisees and the chief priests sent officers to take Him;" yet neither did the officers lay hands on Him. And when the officers returned without bringing Him, the chief priests and the Pharisees were so enraged that they were on the point of officially condemning

Him anyhow, and were checked only by the word of Nicodemus, "Doth our law judge any man before it hear him, and know what he doeth?"

The next instance in this controversy is recorded in the ninth chapter of John—the case of the giving of sight to the man born blind.

"*And it was the Sabbath day* when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes; . . . therefore said some of the Pharisees, *This man is not of God, because He keepeth not the Sabbath day.*" Verses 14-16.

The next instance is in Luke 13:10-17:—

"And He was teaching in one of the synagogues *on the Sabbath*. And, behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in nowise lift up herself. And *when Jesus saw her, He called her to Him*, and said unto her, *Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity*. And He laid His hands on her; and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. *And the ruler of the synagog answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the Sabbath day*, and said unto the people. There are six days in which men ought to work; in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day. *The Lord then answered him, and said, Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?*"

Increasing Antagonism

As they continued to watch Him to see whether He would heal people, and otherwise do good on the Sabbath day. He continued to heal on the Sabbath day, another instance in point being recorded in Luke 14:1-6. Thus He continued to grow in favor with the people, and the more to incur the antagonism of the chief priests, the Pharisees, and the Herodians. When at last He had gone so far as to raise from the dead a man who had been dead four days, and when, as a consequence, "many of the Jews believed on Him," this so aroused His enemies that "some of them went their ways to the Pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done." And then and there the chief priests and the Pharisees in council said:

"What do we? for this Man doeth many miracles. If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him; and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation." John 11:47, 48.

Note the argument that was in their hearts, and in their *words*, in fact. They were accusing Jesus all the time of Sabbath-breaking; and now they say, "If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him," and that will make all men Sabbath-breakers. The nation will be a nation of Sabbath-breakers. And when the whole nation becomes a nation of Sabbath-breakers, the judgments of God will be visited upon us; and the Lord will bring the Romans, and sweep away the whole nation. *Then*, in that same meeting—

"One of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that *it is expedient for us, that*

one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." "Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put Him to death." Verses 49, 30, 53.

And a few days afterward they accomplished to the full their purpose, and did put Him to death. And when that was done, the doom of the nation was fixed; and it was only a question of time when would come the destruction of the temple, the city, and the people. They said, "If we let this man thus alone, all men will believe on Him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and nation." They did *not* let Him alone, *and the Romans came and took away both their place and nation forevermore*. Their efforts to save the nation *destroyed* the nation.

And let it never be forgotten that the one great issue, above all others, on which they rejected Him, and persecuted Him, and sought to kill Him, was the Sabbath of the Lord as against a sabbath of men, the true Sabbath as against a false one, the Lord's idea of the Sabbath as against man's idea of the Sabbath. And in all the time of the impending destruction, and even in the very crisis of their experience in connection therewith—when they should see the given sign, in Jerusalem being encompassed with armies—the Sabbath was still an issue, and of vital consideration. For in all their thoughts as to their flight from the sure coming destruction, this word of Jesus must ever be remembered, "*Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on THE SABBATH DAY.*"

ALONZO T. JONES.

November 21, 1900

"Lessons from Matthew 24. The Destruction of Jerusalem—Its Meaning To-day" *The Signs of the Times* 26, 47 , pp. 4, 5 .

AS to the destruction of Jerusalem, we have seen that it was false ideas of the Sabbath, set against the true, that caused the nation of the Jews to reject, to persecute, and to seek to kill Jesus, and that it was this rejection of Him that caused that destruction. They rejected and slew Him, lest the Romans should come and take away both their place and nation; and their rejection and slaying of Him resulted in the Romans coming and taking away both their place and nation. Their rejection of the Sabbath of the Lord, and in that rejection, the rejection of Him who was and is the Lord of the Sabbath, caused the ruin of that nation.

It is not necessary here to enter into the details of the destruction of Jerusalem and that nation; that is well know; and, besides, our study here is to discover what bearing that has on the great subject of the second coming of the Lord and the end of the world. Let us follow *this* subject to its conclusion.

An Instrument of Destruction.

The instrument of the destruction of Jerusalem and the nation of the Jews, was the Roman armies: "When ye therefore shall see Jerusalem *encompassed with armies*, then know that the desolation is nigh." The only armies that there were at that time were the Roman armies; for "the empire of the Romans filled the world."

And the Roman armies encompassing Jerusalem in fulfilment of the words of Jesus recorded by Luke (Luke 21:20), was "the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place," in fulfilment of the words of Jesus recorded by Matthew. Matt. 24:15.

Now the abomination of desolation—the Roman power—spoken of by Daniel the prophet, when once it enters upon the scene of history and prophecy, continues *unto the coming of the Lord and the end of the world*.

Notice that in Dan. 7:7-11 he beheld in the vision a fourth beast, a fourth kingdom, which is Rome, "dreadful and terrible;" "the beast had also ten horns." As Daniel considered the horns, there came up "another *little horn*, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things."

Daniel beheld this "little horn" in its working and its speaking, "until the Ancient of Days come," and "the judgment was set, and the books were opened." And at the time of the judgment says he, "I beheld *then* because of the great words which the HORN SPAKE: I beheld even till the BEAST was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame."

Note that he was beholding the "little horn." He was considering the "little horn." At the time of the judgment he beheld especially because of the great words which the "horn spake." And he beheld even till—the horn was destroyed?—No, but till "the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." This makes it perfectly plain that the "little horn" is but the continuation of the beast, in another form; so fully is the "little horn" a continuation of the spirit and characteristics and power of "the beast," that when comes the time of the destruction of the horn, instead of saying that *the horn* was destroyed, he says THE BEAST was slain and destroyed. And this makes it perfectly plain that when the beast enters upon the scene, he continues, only under another phase, until the coming of the Lord and the end of the world.

Again: In Dan. 8:9-12, 23-25, this same power is again symbolized by a "*little horn* which waxed exceeding great;" and it continues clear through till the end of the world, when it is "broken without hand" in the setting up of the kingdom of God, when the stone cut out *without hand* breaks in pieces and consumes all kingdoms of earth, and it stands forever. And in this prophecy of Daniel 8 this power is directly referred to as "the transgression of desolation;" while in Dan. 11:31; 12:11 the same power is definitely called "the abomination that maketh desolate." And in all these places the connection shows that it continues unto "the time of the end," and even unto the end.

And again: In Dan. 11:4 there is marked the concurrence of events which calls into the field of prophecy and history the Roman power. And when the Roman power does enter the field, the Word says that it is done "to establish the vision"—"the children of robbers shall exalt themselves *to establish the vision*."

This shows that the Roman power was the great object of the vision; that whatever was given preceding the rise of that power, was given only as certain stepping-stones unto the time when that power should rise; and that when this power was met, in its rise, the object of the vision was met—the vision was established. And when that power is once entered upon the scene, it continues, if not in one phase then just as certainly in another, till the time of the coming of the Lord and the end of the world.

Therefore, when Jesus cited "the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet," in that very thing He brought to mind that which would continue unto the coming of the Lord and the end of the world. And when Jesus cited this power in His discourse upon the sign of His coming and of the end of the world, this certifies that in the career of that power there is that which is instructive as to His coming and the end of the world. And when He cited this power as the one which would betray Jerusalem, then this certifies that in the destruction of Jerusalem there is that which is instructive as to His coming and the end of the world.

Now it was their rejection of the Lord Jesus that brought upon that people the destruction of their city and nation by the Roman power—the abomination of desolation. And by the plain showing of the Gospels we have seen that it was in rejecting the divine idea of the Sabbath of the Lord that they rejected the Lord of the Sabbath, and persecuted Him, and sought to kill Him, until they had killed Him, to save the nation from the Romans, but which only caused the nation to be destroyed by the Romans.

And then, at a later date in its history, this Roman power, this abomination of desolation, at the time of the development of the "little horn" of Dan. 7:8—this power itself rejected God's idea of the Sabbath, and set up wholly man's idea of it; rejected the true Sabbath and set up a wholly false one, even to the substituting of another *day*—Sunday—for the Lord's day, the Sabbath day which God had established and appointed. It was said by those who did it, "All things whatsoever that was duty to do on the Sabbath day, these WE have transferred to the Sunday." Laws were enacted by the Roman power to compel all to accept the false idea of the Sabbath instead of the true. All who would observe the Sabbath of the Lord were "accursed from Christ," and whosoever did not accept the false, was held guilty of sacrilege and subject to penalties from the Roman power—the abomination of desolation.

And what was the consequence of this second course of rejecting the Sabbath of the Lord, and in that the Lord of the Sabbath? What came upon this second nation that did that thing?—It likewise was brought to ruin, and was swept from the earth as completely as was the nation of the Jews that first did that heaven-daring thing. The Roman Empire was as utterly ruined as was the Jewish nation.

A Lesson to the United States.

And *now*, in these last days, in these days when we know that the coming of the Lord "is near, even at the doors"—in these days "the abomination of

desolation," the Roman power, exists in a different phase from that of the days of the destruction of Jerusalem, and also in a somewhat different phase from that of the days of the destruction of the Roman Empire. And in *these days* this abomination of desolation still insists upon that rejection of God's idea of the Sabbath, and the substitution of man's; the rejection of the true, and the acceptance, even by force, of the false. And in this heaven-daring thing, in this thing which has *twice* wrought, as a world-example, the ruin of nations, the abomination of desolation has gained the support of THE UNITED STATES.

The United States, as certainly as ever did Jerusalem, or as ever did Rome, has rejected God's idea of the Sabbath, and has accepted man's—"the man of sin;" it has rejected the true, and has set up the false, to be forced upon all people by the power of the State. In her legislation of 1893, God's idea of the Sabbath was read in His own words from His own Word, and then that was deliberately set aside and rejected, and one utterly false in every respect was accepted and established here by governmental recognition. This nation, as really as did Jerusalem, or as did Rome, in thus rejecting the Sabbath of the Lord, has in this rejected the Lord of the Sabbath.

And what must be the consequence? What only *can* be the consequence? Can this nation now fare any better than fared Jerusalem and Rome in doing the same thing? Can it be fairly hoped that she can fare as well as did they, since she has done this thing in the face of these two world-warning destructions? But how shall destruction come here for this heaven-daring offense? It came to Jerusalem by the Roman power. It came to the Roman Empire by the barbarians of the North. Whence can it come next in punishment of this offense of the king?—It comes in the brightness of the consuming glory of the coming of the Lord, and the armies of heaven following Him upon white horses, when out of His mouth goeth the sharp sword with which He shall smite the nations. Rev. 19:11-21; Joel 2:1-11. And this is why it is that the destruction of Jerusalem is a sign to the people of the United States to-day, and why it is a sign of the coming of the Lord and of the end of the world.

And when the "abomination of desolation," as it is to-day, Rome, as it is in its latest phase, shall have gathered to her principles and under her influence all the nations; and when, by the

741

example, and power, and influence of the United States the abomination of desolation shall have done this only the more effectually; and when by the power thus regained the abomination of desolation shall have accomplished once more and finally for her, to scatter the power of the holy people, and shall have made as effectual as possible the rejection of the Sabbath of the Lord, and in that the Lord of the Sabbath; *then* it is written, "All these things shall be finished." Dan. 12:7. And as that power will be universal, so the destruction will be universal—and this at the coming of the Lord; for this "abomination of desolation," this "man of sin," this "mystery of iniquity," is to be consumed "with the spirit of His mouth," and is to be destroyed "with the brightness of His coming."

And this is why it is that the destruction of Jerusalem is instructive of warning to all the people of the world to-day. And this is why it is that the destruction of

Jerusalem is a sign, amongst the other "signs," of the coming of the Lord and the end of the world.

And now is the time. "Get ready! get ready! get ready!"
ALONZO T. JONES.

¹ Delivered to a large and enthusiastic audience in the Metropolitan Temple, San Francisco, June 14, 1896

² Rights of the People, p. 8.

³ "Rights of the People," p. 70.

⁴ "Rights of the People," pp. 26-102. Blakely's "American State Papers," pp. 27-34. Jones, "Two Republics," pp. 667-692.

⁵ "Rights of the People," pp. 190, 191.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ [*According to the Constitution, all treaties are a part of the supreme law of the land.óED. S. OF T.]

⁸ *The quotations as to President McKinley and governmental support of the Catholic Church in Cuba are from an article by the Washington Bureau of the Baltimore *Daily American*, printed in that paper October 18, 1898.óA.T.J.