

# The Southern Watchman Articles (1903-1905)

The Southern Watchman, Vol. 12 (1903)

April 16, 1903

**"He Shall Glorify Me" *The Southern Watchman* 12, 16 , pp. 113, 114.**

OF the Holy Spirit, Jesus said, "He shall glorify me." And how the Spirit should do this is declared in the very next words: "For he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."

Now we also are to glorify the Lord. And how can we do this in any other way than that in which the Spirit glorifies him? The Spirit glorifies the Lord by receiving of his, and showing it to us; we, then, can glorify the Lord only by receiving, by the Spirit, the things of his, and *showing them to others*.

114

What things are they which the Spirit takes and shows to us? "*All things that the Father hath* are mine: *therefore* said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." The Spirit, then, takes of all things that the Father has, and shows them unto us; nothing is reserved. Thus he glorifies the Lord. And we are to take *all* things that he gives to us, and show them to other people; nothing is to be reserved. Thus shall we glorify the Lord.

True, the Holy Spirit does not show to us all these things *all at one*, but as we can receive and bear them. Neither are we to show to others *all at once*, all that he has shown us. We must show them to others as they can receive them and bear them.

Yet the Spirit receives from the Lord *nothing* that he is *not to give away*. He receives from the Lord, only to show it to us; therefore what he receives from the Lord, he receives only to give it away to us. And from him we receive *nothing* that we are *not to give away*. We receive it only to show it to others.

Wherever the Spirit finds opportunity to give to us most of the things of God, there he most abides and most fully works. And wherever is the place that we can give away the most of what we have received of him, there is the place for us to abide and work. This is the true test as to where the call of the Lord is for you to abide and to work. Wherever you can give to others the most of what the Spirit has shown to you, *that* is the place to which you are called.

The ever present question, then, of the Christian is, Where can I give most fully to others that which I have received of the Lord?" And wherever that may be, *there go*, and glorify the Lord by taking the things of the Lord, by his Spirit, and showing them to others.

He who attempts to keep to himself and for himself that which he has received from the Lord, surely loses it; while he who freely gives it all to others will always have abundance.

"He shall glorify me; for he shall take of mine, and show it unto you." "Freely ye have received, freely give."

A. T. JONES.

## **The Southern Watchmen, Vol. 13 (1904)**

**February 23, 1904**

**"The Third Angel's Message: What Is It?" *The Southern Watchman* 13, 8 , pp. 116, 117.**

THE expression "the Third Angel's Message" has reference to the message borne by the third in a series of three angels, each one bearing a message, in the fourteenth chapter of Revelation. The messages of these three angels blend and culminate in the third, which does not cease to sound until the harvest of the earth is ripe, and made ready for the coming of the Lord to reap it.

The Third Angel's Message itself, as it is announced in the words of the third angel, separated from the other two, is as follows: "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; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

This is the Third Angel's Message, as it would stand separated from the other two. But, in fact, it can not be regarded as separate, and can not be made to stand apart as if it alone were a single, separate message to the world; for the very first words concerning it are: "The third angel *followed* THEM." Thus, by the very first words of the message itself we are referred not only to the *one*, but to the *two* which preceded it. And the Greek word translated "followed" signifies not following *apart*, nor only following, but "following *with*," as soldiers follow their captain, or servants their master; therefore, "to follow one *in* a thing; to let one's self be led." When spoken of *things*, it signifies to follow as a result; to follow "as a consequence of something which had gone before." Thus, as to *persons*, the third angel follows *with* the two which have preceded; and *his message*, as a *thing*, follows as a *result*, or *consequence*, of the two which have gone before.

117

Of the second one also it is written: "And there followed *another* angel." As with the third angel following him, so it is with the *second angel* following the *first*.

And of the first one it is written: "And I saw another angel fly," etc. This is the *first* in this series of *three*. There follows *with him* another; and the third angel follows *with them*. There is a succession in *the order of their rise*; but, when the three have in succession *risen*, then they *go on together* as one. The first one sounds forth his message; the second one follows and joins with the first; the third follows them, and joins with them; so that, when the three are joined, and go on together in their united power, they form a mighty *threefold*, loud-voiced message. It takes all to make the Third Angel's Message complete; and the Third Angel's message can not be truly given without the giving of all.

What, then, is the threefold message in its respective parts? - Here is the first: "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."

Here is the second: "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 here is the third: ""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; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

A glance at the wording of each of these messages will discover that thought in the Greek word "followed, which signifies "following as a consequence." The *first* bears the everlasting gospel, to preach to every creature, calling upon all to fear God and give glory to him, and to worship him, because the hour of his judgment is come. The rejection of this message produces a condition of things which is described as the consequence of such rejection, in the words of the second angel, which followed. And, because of the rejection of the first message, and because of the consequences of that rejection, as announced in the second, a condition of things is produced *as a further consequence*, which requires that the third angel shall follow them, proclaiming with a loud voice his dreadful warning against the terrible evils that have been produced as the double consequence of the rejecting of the first message.

And that the voice and work of the third angel blend with that of the first, is plain from his closing words: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus;" because this is ever the object of the preaching of the everlasting gospel. It is the substance of fearing God and giving glory to him, and or worshipping "him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." And the keeping of the commandments of God and the faith

of Jesus is the only thing that will enable any soul to stand in the hour of his judgment, which the first angel declares "is come."

Immediately following the closing words of the third angel is "heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the death which die in the Lord from henceforth" - from this time forward; and immediately following this, are the words: "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, "The harvest is the end of the world."

Again: the third angel particularly warns all people against the worship of the beast and his image, whatever these may be; and, from Rev. 19:11-21, we find that the beast and his image are "alive" when the Lord comes in the clouds of heaven, and are "both" destroyed with the brightness of his coming.

These facts show that the Third Angel's Message is a mighty, threefold, loud-voiced message, which goes forth to every nation and kindred, and tongue and people, just before the coming of the Lord; which ripens the harvest of the earth; and which makes a people prepared for the Lord. And so, it is the last, the closing, message of God to the world.

Such, in a word, in form, in arrangement, is the Third Angel's Message.  
A. T. JONES.

## **The Southern Watchmen, Vol. 14 (1905)**

**August 15, 1905**

**"Religious Liberty No. 1" *The Watchman* 14, 33 , p. 522.**

RELIGION is "the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it."

Liberty is "the state of being exempt from the domination of others, or from restraining circumstances. In ethics and philosophy, the power in any rational agent to make his choices and decide his conduct for himself, spontaneously and voluntarily, in accordance with reasons or motives."

Religious liberty, therefore, is man's exemption from the domination of others, or from restricting circumstances: man's freedom to make his choices and decide his conduct for himself, spontaneously and voluntarily: in his duty to his Creator, and in the manor of discharging that duty.

Since God has created man, in the nature of things the first of all relationships is that to God; and the first of all duties could be nothing but duty to God.

Suppose a time when there was only one intelligent creature in the universe. He was created: and his relationship to his Creator, his duty to his Creator, is the only one that could possibly be. That is the first of all relationships that can

possibly be. Therefore it is written that "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." All there is of any soul is first due to God; because it all came from God. This, therefore, is the first of all commandments, not because it is the first one that was ever given by spoken word, or that was ever written out; but because it is the first that could possibly be; and this because it is the expression of the first principle of the existence of any intelligent creature. The principle was there, inherent in the existence of the first intelligent creature, in the first moment of his existence.

Now, though that is the first of all possible relationships, and the first of all duties; though that relationship and duty are inherent in the very existence of intelligent creatures; yet even in that inherent obligation, God has created every intelligent creature *free* - free to recognize that obligation or not, free to discharge that duty or not, just as he chooses.

Accordingly it is written: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." Thus it is absolutely true that in religion - in the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it - God has created man entirely "exempt from the domination of others and from restricting circumstances;" has made him free "to make his choice, and decide his conduct for himself, spontaneously and voluntarily." Thus religious liberty is the gift of God, inherent in the gift of rational existence itself.

Any service as to God that is not freely chosen by him who renders it is not service *to God*. There can be no virtue in it; there can be none of God in it. Any service rendered as to God that is not freely chosen on the part of him who renders it cannot be of God; because "God is love": and love and compulsion, love and force, love and oppression, never can go together. Therefore any duty, any obligation, anything, offered or rendered as to God that is not of the individual's own freely chosen choice, can neither be of God nor to God. Accordingly when the Lord created whatever creature - angel or man - in order that that creature should be happy in the service of God, and in order that there should be virtue in rendering service or worship to God, He created him free to *choose* to do so.

And freedom to choose to do so carries with it, and in it, freedom to choose *not* to do so. Therefore, when God says to all creatures, "Choose you this day whom ye will serve," it is left to each creature in the universe to decide for himself in his own freedom what he will do; whether he will serve God or not. And when in that freedom he makes a wrong use of his choice, and chooses not to serve God, *then*, even then, mark it - even then, God, being God, does not persecute him, does not set him at naught, does not hunt him; he does *seek* him; yet not to pursue him, *but*, as it is stated in the parable of the one sheep that was lost away on the mountain alone, he goes to *find* him, and seeks him to bring *him back*.

Therefore note this truth: When God has made every creature perfectly free to choose to serve him, and in that, free to choose *not* to serve him - when that creature exercises his choice in the way *not* to serve God, even then God only loves him: for God is only love. The only disposition that God has toward him is to

love him, and by every possible means to win him yet to the choice to love him and serve him. That is God, and that is religious liberty.

A. T. JONES.

**August 22, 1905**

**"Religious Liberty No. 2" *The Watchman* 14, 34 , pp. 538, 539.**

ALL that was said in the preceding article of God's disposition only to love, and not to condemn or oppress, one of his children who has made a wrong use of his freedom to choose, and has chosen not to honor God, is fully expressed in that proclamation and revelation which God made of himself, of what he is, when in the mount, as Moses was there with him, God promised to make all his goodness to pass before him, and to make him acquainted with himself. Then in this revelation of himself, the Lord passed by before Moses 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 what he is, not what he does - as if he could do something else. No, this is what he *is*; and in this he is God. He cannot cease to be God; and therefore cannot cease to be what is here said, for this is what he is.

What is it, then, that he is? - *Merciful* - full of mercy. Mercy is the disposition, the very heart's life, to treat people better than they deserve. That is himself, and he never treats anybody, he never will treat anybody, he never can treat anybody, in any other way than better than he deserves; because merciful is what he is. Therefore, when one, in his freedom of choice which is essential to virtue, which is essential to happiness, and to the true worship of God - when in the exercise of that freedom, any person exercises it the wrong way and makes the wrong choice, makes the wrong use of it, God is ever merciful to him, treating him better than he deserves, in order that he may be brought to reverse his choice and put it on the right side.

Next he is *gracious*. Gracious is favorable, extending, holding forth favor. And this God does to all creatures, whatever their condition or position may be. God being God, being gracious, he is gracious to every creature, whatsoever the creature may be and whatsoever his condition may be. Consequently when any one exercises his choice in the wrong way, makes a wrong use of it, instead of God abandoning him, threatening him, throwing him over, persecuting him, blotting him out of existence, he is ever gracious, holding forth to him favor, not in any sanction or approval of his wrong course, but in order that if by any possibility he may reverse his choice and use it on the right side.

God is not only merciful and gracious, but *long-suffering*. The definition of God's long-suffering is "salvation": "The long-suffering of our Lord is salvation." Then when one makes the wrong use of his freedom, turns his choice to the wrong side, and goes the wrong way, all the disposition that God has toward him, all that God has for that person, all that he holds out to him is *mercy* and *grace* and *salvation*, seeking to save him from that wrong course, to win him from the

wrong use of his choice, to awaken him to himself and to God that he may choose to make the right use of his freedom of choice and choose to recognize and serve his Creator.

By the way, I just now used the expression, "Awake the person to himself," - awake him to himself and God. This recalls the word that Jesus spoke in the parable of the prodigal son. That parable tells this whole story. There was that son, who chose to leave his father's house and go off for himself; but he made the wrong choice when he started. He was free to choose to do just as he did, but he made the wrong choice, and things did not go well with him.

When he made the choice to live outside his father's house, and away from his father, he went down and down and down, until he reached such a point of deprivation that he fain would have picked up the husks and wrung some more substance from them after they had been abandoned by the swine. When he reached that point, - remember the record is in the words of Jesus - "he came to *himself*." And the next thing in the record is, when he came to *himself*, *he thought of his father*. And the next thing is that he said, "I will arise and go to my father."

Note the moment he came to himself, the first thought was of his father. And what, all this time, was the father's attitude toward him? While that son was away, wasting his father's substance and degrading himself in riotous living, thus lost to himself and to his father by his wrong choice, his father was still thinking of him, was still waiting for him, was still longing that he would come to himself, and come home. And when at last this son did come to himself, and think of his father's house, and said to himself, "I will arise and go to my father," even when "he was yet a great way off, *his father saw him*," and when he saw him he "*ran*" to meet him with joyous welcome, caresses, and kisses.

What is that parable for? What does it tell? - It tells the heavenly Father's attitude toward those who make a wrong use of the freedom which he has given to every soul. It tells the divine story of religious liberty. Otherwise, there would be no such thing as freedom. If it were not so, if God treated any creature otherwise than just that way, the word freedom would not express it, for it would not be freedom; for then the service might be of constraint, not willing, and so have the taint of bondage

539

not the fragrance of freedom. Bear in mind that the freedom of which God is the Author and Giver is freedom indeed. Absolutely, infinitely, and eternally it is so.

A. T. JONES.

**August 29, 1905**

**"Religious Liberty No. 3" *The Watchman* 14, 35 , pp. 554, 555.**

THUS far we have considered the subject of Religious Liberty, upon original foundation, in view of original principles, and as involved in original conditions. Let us now consider it in actual experiences.

Man did use his freedom of choice the wrong way. He did choose to sin, and when he had done this, what is the first manifestation of God's disposition toward

him and of God's treatment of him, after he had gone the wrong way in the garden? After the man had made his choice to do the wrong thing, to serve the wrong one, and to go the wrong way, and God came into the garden, it is true that the man was afraid and hid himself. But did he need to be afraid? That is the question that is here asked.

Was there on the Lord's side any ground for the man to be afraid of God? Did God go into the garden to condemn or punish the man? No; his fear was but the result of what he had done. He had made a wrong choice, he had started the wrong way, he was under the wrong master, and his own life being separated from God and committed to the wrong, in the darkness and gloom of the evil in which he had been taken, he misjudged God, and so was afraid of him. But when the man was come face to face with God, and the Lord had brought the fault to its original source in the evil one, what then did he say? He spoke the word that then meant and everlastingly means only salvation to every soul of man; "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it" - the seed of the woman - "shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Thus it was the word of salvation that God brought the first thing to the man after he had made his wrong choice. That word of salvation was the promise of the One to come who should break off this evil that had been fastened upon man, set the man free again, and bring him to God, where his choice would be on the right side, and he dwell truly with God and in God.

And when Jesus (of whom this was the promise), came into the world in the flesh, in the exact expression of all that we have so far found, this is his word: "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not." What word is it that Christ brought that he desires every man should hear? Only the word of God - the word of *salvation*. He is only the Saviour, he is not the destroyer; and therefore his name when he came into the world was given *Jesus, Saviour*, because "he shall save his people from their sins."

Again, the other name, "Emmanuel," which is being interpreted, "God with us." When he came, he came as God with us; that is, bringing God to man, to make man acquainted with God as the *Saviour*, which alone he is, and than which he cannot be anything else. Thus he came bringing only the word of salvation. And when he came presenting that word in whatever way, in whatever light, he could present it to mankind, yet he proclaims the whole principle of original and eternal religious liberty - "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not." John 12:17.

And although that is there exactly as it is here quoted, yet there are professed Christian people who cannot believe that it is there until they have opened their own Bibles and read, and have found that it says just that. And even then, they can hardly believe that it is right. They say, "That is not the way I thought it read, - I thought it read, 'If any man hear my word and *believe*, I judge him not;' and, if he does not believe, then I supposed that he would be judged and punished for it."

But that is not the way of Christ and of God. That is the way of the world. Indeed, that has been for ages the way of *the church*. And even yet, far, far too much, that is the way in the churches; even to the very latest church. When the

church presents the gospel, the word of God which is committed to the church of God to preach, and the people choose not to obey it, but to reject it, then they are immediately judged as unworthy of further attention or recognition, presently judged to be incorrigible, and then to be compelled to obey, or to be punished for not obeying, the dictates of the church framed into the law of the state. And just there is where the turn is made from religious liberty to religious despotism, from Christianity to anti-christianity.

But that is not the Christian way; that is not Christ's way; that is not God's way; that is not religious liberty. Religious liberty, Christian religious liberty, in the word of Christ is, "If any man hear my words, and believe *not*, I judge him not." Then when Christ sends forth me or you as his ambassador to present his word to the people, and we present it to them, and they choose not to believe it, that is their freedom; and that they choose to exercise their freedom in that way is none of our business at all. They do not derive their existence from us, they are not responsible to us, but to God only. We are not to judge them! nor to set them at naught; nor in any way to slight them; but only to love them freely as before, and seek by every possible Christian means to win them to see that what we preach is the word of God, and the word of Christ; and to win them to believe in him.

Further: God has put his word here to be believed. He longs and waits with all long-suffering for the people to believe it. And when he gives that word to you and to me to present to the people that they may believe it, and at the first essay they choose not to believe it, and then we treat them so as to offend them, we, by that act, are preventing the very thing we are sent to do. We are

555

sent to persuade the people to believe the word of God. When a man chooses not to believe it, and I take a course toward him that will offend him, thereby I fix it so that he will not be inclined to believe it. Indeed, he will be less inclined to believe it, and less liable to obey and go in the right way than if he had never heard me at all. And I by such a course have defeated the very purpose for which I was sent forth into the world.

Therefore the only true way to treat people when we present the word of God to them and they reject it, is just as lovingly, just as tenderly, just as winningly as the great mercy and loving-kindness and long-suffering of the Lord can enable us to do: that thus we may still induce them to incline to believe, and in believing choose to go in the right way. We are commanded to "exhort with all long-suffering." And let it be said again, for it cannot be too much emphasized: When Christians take any other course toward those who do not believe, they prevent the very things that they profess to be trying to accomplish.

**September 5, 1905**

**"Religious Liberty No. 4" *The Watchman* 14, 36 , pp. 571, 572.**

IT is not ourselves only, it is not the Lord's side alone, that is to be considered. It is also the man himself. Read the next verse: "For I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my

word [which in the previous verse he has recognized his freedom to do] hath one that judgeth him." Who is this "one" that judgeth him who believes not? It is not Christ, not is it God. For Christ, in whom God is manifest and who is "God with us," plainly says that he judges him not. Who then is that "one"? Note it: the words that he spoke are the words of eternal life: "Thou hast the words of eternal life." Whether by him as it is in the Bible, or by his true ambassador to-day, when that word is presented, eternal life is presented; because the word is the word of eternal life, bringing the life of God to every soul who receives it. That being the word of eternal life, whosoever rejects it, rejects eternal life. And when he chooses to reject eternal life *in that* he chooses eternal death. Then who judges him to death? Who puts him in the way of death? Only *himself, by his own free choice*.

There can be no other way of it. For when God holds forth to me the word and the way of life, and beseeches me by every possible consideration to receive eternal life; and against it all, I choose to exercise my freedom in rejecting that life, in so doing I do choose death. When life is gone, death is the only thing that remains. When eternal life is rejected, eternal death is chosen. And he who makes that choice, does *himself* put himself in the way of death. He himself judges himself worthy only of death.

And so says the Scripture. In the thirteenth chapter of Acts, when Paul and Silas had preached at Antioch, and the Gentiles besought that the same words might be preached to them the next Sabbath day, and almost the whole city came together the next Sabbath "to hear the word of God;" and the Jews, filled with envy, "contradicted and blasphemed," then Paul and Silas waxed bold and said: "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and *judge yourselves* unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." Who judged those people unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." Who judged those people unworthy of everlasting life? - Only themselves. How? - By persistently rejecting the word of God, which is the word of everlasting life, contradicting and blaspheming.

In yet another scripture, Rom. 1:16-19, this same story is told: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith. For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness."

The Revised Version gives a stronger translation: "*Who hold down* the truth in unrighteousness." The truth comes to them, but they refuse to accept it, they hold it down; again it comes to them, but they beat it back in unrighteousness. And the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold down, who beat back, the truth in unrighteousness.

You note that even then the wrath of God is not primarily against the *men*. The word does not say that his wrath is against ungodly and unrighteous men, but against all *ungodliness and unrighteousness* of man. The eternal love of God

is manifested to every unrighteous man. And every unrighteous man who will accept the word and gift of the love of God will be saved from all unrighteousness and all ungodliness. The wrath of God is against, and will smite, the *ungodliness and unrighteousness* of the man; but the man himself will be eternally saved.

The wrath of God is not against the *man*; but against the *ungodliness and unrighteousness* that is *in* the man. And when the man rejects the word of God's salvation, that would save him from all ungodliness and unrighteousness, and so identifies himself with the ungodliness and unrighteousness that when the wrath of God smites that, it cannot miss the man because he has persistently identified himself with it, then only himself is responsible for that, and by his own confirmed choice.

Then when the finality comes, you know it is written to those on the left hand he says, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" - prepared for you? - Oh no, not prepared for a single man that was ever in this world - "*prepared for the devil and his angels.*" Whosoever gets there, goes because he chooses to go there rather than to be with God in heaven. For when they do go there, they go to a place prepared for somebody else, not for them; and it is of their own free choice that they are there. They made the choice, and struck to it, and that is the only place where they can land. And when they find

572

themselves there, they should be just as glad of it as when they made their choice.

Thus from the beginning to the end, from the creation of the first creature until the destruction of the last creature that shall ever exist, man is upon the foundation of absolute freedom; free to use his freedom in such way as he chooses. And through it all God presents himself in every possible way that even he can, to persuade the man to see and walk in the right way; to use his choice as he should. When against it all, the man uses his choice in the wrong way, he gets at last simply what he has chosen, and he himself is the only one responsible for it. And that is freedom, that is religious liberty.

Thus we have found that when Jesus came as the representative of God - presenting God again to the world - he presents religious liberty on the same foundation as in the beginning.

A. T. JONES.

**September 12, 1905**

**"Religious Liberty No. 5" *The Watchman* 14, 37 , pp. 586, 587.**

WE have found that on original foundation, in original conditions, in actual experiences, and in the teaching and works of Jesus, religious liberty has held on, the same true and perfect liberty. How, now, with the apostles and the early Christians when they went forth to preach the gospel after Christ had gone back to heaven? The briefest and yet the fullest view of this phase of the subject is in the fourteenth chapter of Romans, beginning with the first verse and reading to the twelfth: "Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye." Don't forget that. When he

is weak in the faith, he is liable not to live just as righteously and just as perfectly, perfect as you and I do. but that is because he is weak in the faith; we are to recognize this and have sympathy, and be merciful toward the weak member.

"Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." The margin reads, "Not to judge his doubtful thoughts." Not to question him as to just *how* he believes this or that or the other thing.

Mark it: though he "is weak in the faith," it is the *faith* that he is weak in. and he who has faith, however weak it may be, that faith connects him with divinity; that faith opens the door to him of eternal life; that faith comes from God and connects him with God; and that faith, though he be weak in it, is entitled to the divine respect of all in heaven and on earth. so let me say it again, though he be "weak in the faith," it is *the faith* in which he is weak; and we are to respect the faith, because that faith is of God, faith is of Christ; of it Christ is the author and finisher; and all men must so regard it or else be guilty of supplanting and opposing Christ. Accordingly, no man, no set of men that ever was or shall ever be on earth, can ever have any authority or any right to judge anybody's faith or lack of faith in any degree whatever. Faith is a personal thing, wholly between him who has it and the Author of it. "Hast thou faith? Have it to *thyself* before God."

What is the word of God concerning Christ when he should come? - "A bruised reed shall he not break; and the smoking flax shall he not quench." A bruised reed! You have seen it. Something has struck it on the side. The bruise shows. It is almost ready to topple over. The slightest touch on the opposite side would cause it to bend a little too far and break. This is the one that is weak in the faith. And instead of putting so much as a breath against that bruised reed that would cause it to bend too far and break, every soul must handle it tenderly, and seek to strengthen the life that is in it, that the bruise may be overcome, the faith sustained and increased, and life received and enjoyed.

"The smoking flax shall he not quench." It is true that flax is exceedingly inflammable; and yet on the other hand, when flax is down only to the smoking point it does not take much to put it out. While flax is perhaps the most easily ignited when the *blaze* is there, yet it is also the most easily extinguished when the blaze is slower, and it is only smoking. And he who find in the world one whose faith is so low, so almost extinguished, that it is compared only to the smoking flax, he must be most careful toward such, that he shall exert upon that weak faith no dampening influence that would cause it to be less alive. Even a breath must be only of the breath of life, and it must be breathed so tenderly as to strengthen the faith that is weak and make him who has it a victor. That is the word to you and me.

"He that is weak in the faith, receive ye." Suppose the individual has not the exact degree of faith that I have. That is none of my business; because I am not the author of faith. He does not owe his faith to me, he does not owe his service to me. Nor does he owe it to you, nor to any other man or set of men on earth. Has he faith in Jesus Christ? That is the thing. And when he has, however weak it be, he owes it all to God. It all comes from God, and his relationship in it is

solely to God; and you and I have nothing whatever to do with it, but only to respect it, to encourage it, and to strengthen it.

Let us read onward in this chapter that which will tell it better than I can: "One believeth that he may eat all things; another who is weak eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth; for God hath received him." God received him upon his faith. Even though it be a faith that is only as the strength of a bruised reed or only as the smoking flax; remember that "God hath received him" upon that faith. And he will breathe life into that faith and make it grow, and make the man strong unto eternal life.

"Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth." And I am not his master, nor are you his master, "One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren." Let it be so.

"Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth." All that an individual with faith in Christ, owes, because of that faith, he owes to Christ. He is subject to Christ alone; he owes to him his service, his life, his all. Our place - yours and mine - is to be helpers of

587

his joy, and not judges of his faith. Such a one is God's child, and by the Lord he will be kept, upon his faith; for we read, strictly in this connection: "He shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand."

And this is still the same true religious liberty that we have been studying from the beginning; but here it is the religious liberty of *the other man*. It is easy enough for each man to claim religious liberty for himself. All are ever ready to do this. But very few are they who claim religious liberty for the other man. The fourteenth chapter of Romans teaches us to recognize and to be forever true to the religious liberty of the other man. And it is eternally true that whosoever does not recognize and be true to the religious liberty of the other man does not recognize, and is not true to, religious liberty for himself, as religious liberty is in truth. True religious liberty he does not know.

A. T. JONES.

**September 19, 1905**

**"Religious Liberty No. 6" *The Watchman* 14, 38 , pp. 602, 603.**

AFTER making plain in the fourteenth chapter of Romans the religious liberty of *the other man*, and the importance that every soul shall recognize this, next there is taken up the thought and the importance of "the powers that be" recognizing and respecting religious liberty.

Therefore it is written: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." That touches a question that is rife everywhere to-day; the question of compelling people to observe a certain day and in a certain way. But in the matter of observance of a day, the regarding of one day above another, God says to all people, "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." So you see any day regarded not to the Lord is not truly regarded at all: for there is nothing in it truly to regard. Therefore, since the observance of a day is a matter that pertains to God, and lies between God and the individual's faith and conscience, any observance of a Sabbath or rest-day enforced by law, by statute, by police, judge, court, or prosecution, is an invasion of the province of God and the realm of faith and conscience in the first instance; and in the second instance, is not the observance of the day and never can be.

That repeats the original truth that is expressed in Genesis and all the way through the Book. The observance of a day, the observance of a Sabbath or a rest day, pertains to God: and to the relationship between God and the individual faith and conscience. God has appointed a day, that is true. He calls upon all people to observe that day, that is true. But in the original freedom in which he has created man, any man is free to choose not to do it just as he is free to choose not to believe his word.

And when any man chooses not to regard the day that God appointed, his responsibility for it is to God alone, and not to any man, to any set of men, to any legislature, or to any court on earth. therefore by the word of God all this campaign that covers the whole land, yes, covers all Christendom, that is seeking for law, more and more law, to compel the observance of a day, whether it be Sunday or any other day - even if it were the day that God has appointed - is a direct invasion of the province of God and of the realm of faith and conscience; and must be repudiated by every Christian; by every one who would respect the sovereignty of God and the freedom of faith and conscience - in a word, by every soul who would regard religious liberty.

Service to God must be *chosen* to be true and acceptable. When it is not freely chosen and is compelled, such compulsory and constrained service is only sin. As the leading church historian has expressed it, "The truth itself forced on man otherwise than by its own inward power, becomes falsehood." Thus the truth cannot be forced upon men. For it to be to men the truth that it really is, it must be received upon their personal choice freely made: and when men simply *cannot* be compelled to obey *the truth*, much less should they be compelled to obey lies.

Another phase of this invasion of the province of God and of the realm of faith and conscience is the widespread and growing demand for the established teaching of religion in the public schools. Only the last spring this phase of the question was by an organized movement pressed at Washington City: and for a purpose this was done at the capital of the nation. Yet this that was done at Washington is but a part of a movement that is being conducted throughout the whole land. There is a national association that has gained a large place, that is organized expressly to get the government, whether state or national, committed to the established teaching of religion in the public schools. these things serve to make it plain that this subject of religious liberty is a living issue, and a very present truth.

But remember the definition of religion: "The duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it." And from the Scripture and divine

principles which we have studied, it is evident that when any nation, any state, any people or government, puts itself between man and God and undertakes to decide in the matter of religion and faith, and presumes to put upon man against his choice what some men say that the recognized religion shall be, then such is not religion at all: it is iniquity. Even though they may intend that it shall be the right religion, the Christian religion, yet when it is forced upon men, it is destroyed as the Christian religion. By such procedure men are separated from God: and a set of men have put themselves between man and God, have shut out God, and require that men shall render obedience to what *they* say is the faith. It is no longer having faith to *thymself* before *God*: but having faith to a *set of men* before *the government*.

Has not that been tried enough in the world for people in this age to have found it out? It is one of the most surprising things that people in this day and in this nation should act in all things just as if this were the earliest of all nations, instead of the latest. If the United States were the first nation on earth, and the people without any advantage of experience were feeling their way along, there might be some possibility of an excuse for the course that the people are taking to-day. But when the United States is the latest of all the nations, and has the benefit of all the experience of all the nations and countries from Nimrod down until this hour, then for the people of the United States to act as they are acting in this matter of national and enforced religion, just as if history had never occurred: and they with blinded eyes go crookedly on in opposition to all the lessons of human experience - that is a most puzzling thing.

Has not this identical thing been tried over and over in every nation from the time that Nimrod set up his kingdom, until now? Has not every nation, and every government from Nimrod until now tried to compel people to be religious? But were they ever made religious by compulsion? In every instance it has only increased iniquity, and has been sheer vanity from beginning to end.

And when Christianity came into the world, itself conceived in religious liberty, and preached religious liberty to the world, the perversion of it brought the Dark Ages and the great power

603

of the papacy, and compulsory religion again. And when in the Dark Ages the papacy dominated all Europe and dictated the faith and compelled all to be religious - what did it bring? - It brought the worst system of iniquity, and the most widespread evil that was ever upon this earth.

Now this nation of the United States was founded upon principles drawn from the lessons of all the history of those preceding ages; and above all upon this principle of religious liberty, 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, and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience. "And to judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercises of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own conscience, is an inalienable right, which upon the principles upon which the gospel was first propagated and the Reformation from popery carried on, can never be transferred to another."

That is what our fathers said who made this American nation. And because of this they put in the fundamental and supreme law, the provision that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for office or public trust under the government;" 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." And that is religious liberty. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and their noble associates who laid the foundations of this mighty nation, laid that foundation firmly upon the eternal rock of true religious liberty: and this in view of the lessons derived from the *prima facie* evidence of all history.

And now, after this noble nation has continued thus for more than a hundred years, and has been a blessing to the world, in the enlightenment of the nations and all mankind upon the principles of liberty, of justice and right, - I say that when in the face of all this, men at the head of the church and high in the nation will shut their eyes and turn their backs upon all the lessons of history, and deliberately take a course to turn this nation back into the old path of religious despotism, this is beyond all powers of comprehension.

Friends and people all, let us open our eyes and look at things as they are, in the light of the truth as God has given it. Let us recognize God in his true place, and the freedom which he has given to every soul. And let us ever remember in behalf of all people that charter of religious liberty from God: "Every one of us shall give account of *himself to God*." "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth." Let us all seek ever the true way of the love of God shed abroad in the heart for all people in the world; seeking by all means of loving-kindness and long-suffering to truly represent Him who introduced Christianity into the world with the divine watchword, "On earth, peace; *good will* toward men," and thus be true representatives of true religious liberty.

A. T. JONES.

**October 31, 1905**

**"Religion in the Public Schools" *The Watchman* 14, 44 , pp. 710, 711.**

[In Elder Jones' closing article on Religious Liberty he mentioned the movement that was so actively carried on last spring in Washington to get the teaching of religion in the public schools established by the civil authorities; and that this was but part of a national movement for the same purpose. For this reason that battle is always a living one; and the discussion of it is of interest everywhere. Brother Jones took part in the discussion of the issue as it was raised in Washington, and has supplied us with abstracts of his three principal addresses on this subject there. They are presented of course as they related to the issue there; but the principle applies equally everywhere. This one was given in LaFayette Theater, Washington, D. C. March 10, 1905. - ED.]

THE proposition of the committee whose report we are to-night considering is that religion shall be taught in the public schools of Washington; and this example to be followed throughout the whole nation. In the interests of this city, in the interests of the whole nation, and in the interests of the Christian religion itself, this proposition and movement should be opposed. Thus we oppose it.

This thing is contrary to the Christian religion itself. Religion is briefly defined as "the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it." It is altogether of faith; for "without faith it is impossible to please God;" and, "whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

And faith itself is of God, a gift to men. It lies wholly between the individual and God, upon the freely made choice of the individual himself as it is written: "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God." Religion therefore, pertaining solely to God, and lying wholly between the individual and God, is, by the Author of all true or right religion, confined exclusively to this realm, in the notable words, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

In these words of the Lord Christ there is drawn for all people in the world a close distinction between that which pertains to Cesar - the state - and that which pertains to God. And this distinction must be recognized always and everywhere, or else confusion will reign. Men are to render to god, *not to the state*, that which is God's; that is religion. And they can so render this to God alone and direct, and *not by the state*.

And yet more than this, in those words of Christ there is no recognition whatever of any relationship, but only positive distinction and separation between the state and God. There is that which is due to the state, and that which is due to God. And neither of those is due to the other. There is no suggestion nor intimation, nor recognition that anything is due from the state to God, nor that anything is to be rendered by the state to God.

By those words of Christ, the realm of Cesar and the realm of God are shown to be two realms wholly distinct from each other. In the realm of God, which is the realm of religion, God is sole and exclusive sovereign. And in that realm God in Christ by the Holy Spirit through his own chosen and appointed church, is the sole Teacher. When the state undertakes this, it simply obtrudes itself between the soul and God, presumes to dominate in a realm where it can only defile, and attempts that which it cannot possibly do.

So much on the general principle involved. In what I shall say further to-night, I shall confine myself briefly to four points: 1. The merits of the case before us; 2. The examples and precedents cited in the committee; 3. A piece of national history; and 4. Some lessons of the world's history.

I. First to the merits of the case, that while there is ostensibly a proposition to teach the ten commandments in the schools as the basis of religion and morals, yet as a matter of fact and plain truth, the teaching of the ten commandments is not to be allowed. Indeed, it is to be "absolutely prohibited." For in plain words the committee's report as adopted declares that it is made "in a spirit which would absolutely prohibit any teaching or interpretation of the ten commandments which would fail to recognize, and to set before the children of

our schools in the most liberal spirit, the fact that conscientious differences exist as to the day of the week to be observed as a day of rest."

The fourth commandment designates "the seventh day" as the day that is to be observed as a day of rest. No teacher is to be allowed to have the children learn the commandment as it reads, and leave it there. Every teacher is "absolutely prohibited" from that, and must not fail to recognize and set before the children "the fact that conscientious differences exist" as to the true observance of the commandment.

Thus instead of allowing the children to learn the ten commandments as those commandments stand written from God, the children are positively to be launched into the sea of "conscientious differences" among men. For the same order of "conscientious differences" do just as certainly exist with regard to the second and others of the commandments, and even regarding the whole law itself, as exist regarding the day of the week to be observed as a day of rest.

.2. The examples and precedents cited in the discussion of the report in the discussion of the report in the committee, in favor of the report, unquestionably prove the same thing. It was there declared that in this thing the committee are but following the example of "Justinian and Charlemagne, who made the ten commandments the basis of their word and legislative systems." All this can be freely admitted. But do the people of this city and this nation want reproduced here the examples and the times of Justinian and Charlemagne?

Was there ever in the world a time of more, or more perverse, "conscientious differences" in religion and morals than in the time of Justinian! And was there ever a person less regardful of "conscientious differences" than was Justinian? Was there ever a more consistent, or more persistent persecutor of all conscientious difference from his own religious or irreligious views than was Justinian?

And Charlemagne. Was there ever in the world a more perverse or more confirmed disagreement with the ten commandments themselves, than in the times of Charlemagne and following? Was there ever a more flagrant disagreement with the seventh commandment (the sixth in the Roman Catholic numbering) in the personal conduct of any legislator who ever thought or heard of the ten commandments than in that of Charlemagne?

And Justinian and Charlemagne are approvingly cited as the example and precedents for the program adopted by this committee for this city and this nation. That ought to be enough for anybody who knows the A B C of history.

And does the committee mean to imply that in the legislation of Justinian

711

and Charlemagne there was no union of church and state, but only of religion and the state? If so, then let them please indicate the difference either in principle or in effect. A. T. JONES.

*(Concluded next week.)*

**November 7, 1905**

**"Religion in the Public Schools. (Concluded.)" *The Watchman* 14, 45 ,  
p. 727.**

*(Concluded).*

3. THERE is a piece of national history that is strictly pertinent to this issue. From 1778 to 1789 this very issue was fought to the finish in this country; and that finish was the provision of the National Constitution prohibiting any religious test or any recognition of religion by the state. The contest had its origin in an attempt in the State of Virginia to secure the enactment of "A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion."

The issue there, in principle and intent, was identical with this now raised by this committee. That, however, was the more ingenuous; for whereas, there, allied churches proposed openly to lay a tax upon all, specifically for the teaching of religion; here they propose to use in the teaching of religion the taxes raised from all, for other purposes.

However, this unworthy movement was at that time opposed by James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, and George Washington. Madison was in the lead, and bore the larger burden of the contest made by the opposition. These men then declared that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical." That is true now, nor is the character of the actions in any degree modified by taking the money for this purpose, after it has been levied and paid as taxes for something else, instead of levying and collecting it directly for this purpose.

They declared the bill to be "itself the signal of persecution;" and, "distant as it may be in its present form from the Inquisition, it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the career of intolerance." That is true of this thing now. We say to the gentlemen of that committee and of the School Board, Do not take that first step. And we say to the people of Washington City Do not you take that first step by letting the School Board take that first step. As certainly as you take that first step, others will take the other steps, even to the last.

But they quote the "unanimous decision" of the Supreme Court of the United States that "this is a Christian nation." Yes, upon the language of documents issued by Ferdinand and Isabella, Queen Elizabeth, the Puritan and other colonies; and by the total exclusion of all documents, records, and words in any way connected with the vital contest that accompanied the making of the nation, the Supreme Court did reach and announce that enormous conclusion.

Madison said, "There is not a shadow of right in the general government to intermeddle with religion. Its least interference with it would be a most flagrant usurpation." Washington, in a treaty, and thus this nation itself, said, "The government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion." And with all due respect and deference to the Supreme Court, I respectfully submit to the American people that what Madison, Jefferson, and Washington said, and wrote, and did, in the making of the nation, is of far more

legitimate use in estimating the standing of the nation, than can possibly be anything that was ever issued by Ferdinand and Isabella, Queen Elizabeth, and the Puritan colonies.

4. This brings me to the fourth and final thought for this occasion: Of what value shall be to us to-day these lessons of history - not only the history of this, the latest and grandest nation, but the history of all times and of all nations? The history of all the government sin the world from that of Nimrod onward is one unbroken story of the union of religion and the state and consequently of oppression and persecution. And from beginning to end, the attitude of God, the Author of religion and morals, as recorded in the Bible, and consequently the attitude of his true people has been, and is, an equally unbroken protest against it all, and the assertion of the absolute and everlasting freedom of *the individual* in all matters of religion.

In the account of the three worthies in the presence of Nebuchadnezzar and the fiery furnace, and of Daniel amidst the Persian persecutors and in the lions' den, God has made plain to all people for all times that in matters of religion, the state has no place at all under any pretense whatever. And in the account and cases of the church against Christ and his apostles, it is made equally plain to all people, and to all church people especially, that with the enforcing of their religion by the power or authority of the state, or *even by their own collective power or authority*, religious people have nothing at all to do under any pretense whatever.

Religion forever lies between God and the individual alone. The securing of religion or the observance of religious rites or institutions, pertains solely to the family and the church, within the jurisdiction of God alone; and under the dominion of the Holy Spirit alone. And within this jurisdiction alone and under this dominion alone, the means to be employed is loving persuasion alone, submitted ever to the free choice of the individual alone. This is the principle upon which our fathers founded this nation. The plainly said that they were proceeding "upon the principles upon which the gospel was first propagated and the Reformation carried on."

Shall the principles of religious freedom upon which these noble men founded the nation prevail in the capital and in the nation? or shall this latest and grandest nation be swung away from these principles, and be turned back into the hateful paths of religious despotism?

A. T. JONES.

**November 14, 1905**

**"Religion in the Public Schools" *The Watchman* 14, 46 , pp. 742, 743.**

(This Address given in the *Pythian Temple*, Washington, D. C., Sunday night, March 26, 1905.)

**FIRST ARTICLE OF SECOND ADDRESS**

IN the campaign now being conducted in Washington City to require the teaching of religion in the public schools, the ten commandments are ostensibly proposed as the basis of the whole system.

In this connection it is pertinent to ask, What form of the ten commandments will be adopted? What copy of the ten commandments will be used?

Will the ten commandments be used as *God himself gave* them with *his own voice* from heaven? or will they be used as they have been changed or modified by men?

If any copy of the ten commandments shall be used that differs in any way from those commandments precisely as God gave them, then what kind of lesson in morals will be given to both teachers and children in the alteration of the law of the Creator by his creatures? If some of his creatures put into the schools an altered version of the law of the Creator, why shall not others of his creatures yet further alter that altered version - especially in their conduct? For what power is there, or should there be, to require obedience to an altered copy of the law of the Creator? And what moral quality could possibly attach to obedience to such altered law?

To the resolutions adopted in the meeting, all the religious denominations in the District of Columbia, except two or three, are committed. This includes the Roman Catholic Church. But it is a well-known fact that there is a material difference between the version of the ten commandments used by the Roman Catholics and that commonly used by Protestants. Which of those versions will be used?

If the version used by the Roman Catholics shall be used, then there will be omitted the second commandment, which forbids the making of images or the bowing down to them in worship; which in turn would openly countenance such use of images. But will any of these Protestant ministers attempt to justify in morals any use of images in worship?

If on the other hand, the version of the ten commandments commonly used by Protestants is used, then there will be taught by the teachers, and studied and recited by the children, the second commandment in full, which most positively forbids any making of images or any bowing down to them.

Then to avoid "sectarian instruction," the teachers will be required to inform the children that the great majority of religious people do make and bow down to image, while some religious people do not. And if some inquisitive pupil shall ask, "But which of these classes is keeping the commandment?" then still to "avoid anything like sectarian instruction or influence," what shall the teacher answer? Shall he say nothing? Shall he say that both are keeping the commandment or think they are? In either case the impression given the children is that it makes no difference, and they must do as they like.

Please let no one think that this is either far-fetched or over-drawn, for on the fourth commandment the adopted report of the committee distinctly says: -

"It is declared to be the wish of every member of this committee to have the utterances of the committee understood as made in a spirit which would absolutely prohibit any teaching or interpretation of the ten commandments which should fail to recognize, and to set before the children of our schools, in the most

liberal spirit, the fact that conscientious differences exist as to the day of the week to be observed as a day of rest."

The fourth commandment distinctly, and with reasons, designates "the seventh day" as the day of rest. When this commandment shall be studied, learned, and recited by the children, then instead of letting the matter stand in the minds of the children as the commandment reads and as they have learned it, by the very words of this committee each teacher is "absolutely prohibited" from *failing* "to recognize and to set before the children in our schools . . . the fact that conscientious differences exist as to the day of the week to be observed as a day of rest." And when each teacher is absolutely prohibited from failing to recognize and to set before the children this fact, then, each teacher is thereby absolutely directed to recognize and set before the children this fact.

And when the teacher shall set before the children this fact; and the children shall thus plainly be given to understand that in "this supreme question of morals that involves the existence of the nation," the practical instruction from the words and example of the professed moral leaders is, "The *words* of the ten commandments are plain, but in *conduct* you are to do as you like." In such a course of instruction, where is there to be found any corrective of the immorality, the vice, and the crime that are sweeping like a mighty tide over the whole land, which the gentlemen of this committee are deploring, and which by the means proposed they propose to cure?

In answer to such instruction as that every one can justly say, "Well, when in practice we are all to do as we like, then what is the use of all this? Do we need the ten commandments of God, or any special daily instruction, to enable us to do as we like?"

And whether or not such answer shall be made in morals, it is certain that such is the answer that will be made in *practice*; for this is the only result that can ever follow from such teaching. When such is the provision actually made as to the fourth commandment, the same will inevitably have to follow as to the second commandment; and the inevitable result from this will be that in practice the immoral principle will be applied with respect to all the other ten commandments.

But that is just the trouble already. The vital mischief *now* is, *not* ignorance of the ten commandments; but that each one does as he likes as to the observance of them. and this vital mischief is only the plain result of the teaching in the pulpits of the whole nation, and this for years upon years.

And now such mischievous results from such immoral causes results from such immoral causes, this committee seeks to remedy by multiplying and intensifying the causes! Such procedure can do nothing but multiply and intensify the mischievous results already so rife as to threaten to sink the nation. It was therefore strictly appropriate that in advocacy of this program and movement the example and times of Justinian and Charlemagne were cited. Yes, Justinian and Charlemagne and their accompanying clergy are strictly proper examples to cite in advocacy of what is here proposed. For what was done then

by those men simply increased the flood of immorality, vice, wickedness, crime, persecution, and religious despotism that whelmed the world in the Dark Ages.  
A. T. JONES.

**November 21, 1905**

**"Religion in the Public Schools" *The Watchman* 14, 47 , p. 758.**

(An Address Given in the *Phythian Temple*, Washington, D. C., Sunday night, March 26, 1905.)

### **SECOND ARTICLE OF SECOND ADDRESS**

THE Reformation arose to deliver the world from the awful flood of immorality, vice, wickedness, crime, persecution and religious despotism that whelmed the world in the Dark Ages. But Protestants, instead of maintaining in sincerity the principles of the Reformation, have ever been prone to lapse to the baleful principles that bring only the results from which the Reformation principles only can deliver. Geneva, Scotland, England, and New England bear only too abundant witness to the truth of this. But in view of those ages of dreadful experience, when this latest nation of the United States was established, it was, by its great seal, committed to "a new order of things." One essential of this new order of things was, and forever is, that "religion is wholly exempt from the cognizance of civil society." This, too, "upon the principle on which the gospel was first propagated and the Reformation from papacy carried on."

The issue made, and the program that is urged, by this committee of the Washington clergy, clearly raises the question as to whether this nation shall still stand committed to the new order of things, or whether it shall positively be swung back to the old order of things. For in the meeting in which the program and resolutions were adopted in open speech in advocacy of that cause, it was said and repeated, with emphasis and applause, that in this matter and program of governmental recognition and teaching of religion, "the majority have rights that the minority are bound to respect."

That is precisely the motto of the old order of things, of the compulsory religionists, from the time of Nimrod, the "overbearing tyrant in Jehovah's sight," to this late day. But in this issue the minority has always been right, and God has invariably witnessed to it. It was so when Nimrod began it, when Ilgi carried it on, and when Pharaoh repeated it. When Nebuchadnezzar took it up, the minority numbered only three, but when the crisis was forced, there was with them "the form of the fourth," who was "like the Son of God."

When the thing was repeated in the reign of Darius the Mede, when the majority was so imperious as to override the king himself, and the minority numbered only *one*, still the minority was in the right, and continued just as aforetime; and again, when the issue was forced, God stood with the minority, and "shut the lions' mouths," because innocency was found in the minority on its

own part, and also because the minority, in disrespecting the program and decree of the majority, had done no hurt to either the king or the state, nor yet to the majority.

But in the working of this principle of the majority and minority in religion, the climax was reached when there came into the world the Author of the ten commandments and of religion itself. The majority was against him. The minority was only himself alone. And bear in mind that in this case the majority was composed of the church. He could not, and so he would not, respect the program and the purposes of the majority, even though that majority was of the church. And by the aid of the civil power the majority actually succeeded in carrying through their program by a large majority. But their triumph was short, god was still on the side of the minority, and raised him from the dead, and caused him to triumph over their triumph in ascending to heaven and sitting on the right hand of the throne of God. And because of that grand example and glorious precedent, all who know him have never been at all lonesome nor discouraged in being in the minority, even though the majority be of the church, and even though the minority number only one. And such have been Peter and the other apostles before the Sanhedrim, - Paul under Nero, John under Domitian, the faithful Christians of the Dark Ages, Whycliffe, before his accusers, Huss and Jerome before the council and in the flames, Luther before the Diet, Roger Williams before the New England Puritans, and John Wesley before the Georgia grand jury. Such an unbroken record from the beginning of history until the present time most assuredly gives just ground for the query, In this matter of religion in the public schools, may it not be possible that the minority is in the right?

It is true that immorality and vice are so rife as to constitute practically a moral pestilence; that crime is enormously on the increase cannot be denied. All this is rightly admitted and greatly deplored. But bad as things may be in the nation, or even in the city of Washington, even yet conditions are not as bad as they were in the Roman empire when Christ sent forth his disciples as sheep among wolves. And yet that little band of one hundred and twenty, endued at Pentecost with the promised power from on high, checked, turned, and beat back the tide of Roman iniquity, and revolutionized the Roman empire.

Let the clergy of Washington City and of the nation lead the thousands of members of the churches in this city and the millions of them in the nation to the fountain of promised power from on high, in such loyalty to Christ and the ten commandments as characterized that little company of one hundred and twenty, and they can easily, speedily, and permanently revolutionize moral conditions in this city and nation.

That is the way that is cast up for the church to walk, to work, and to win in.

The way that is chosen by the committee is another, a wrong, a forbidden way, which as certainly as it is followed will end in multiplied mischiefs more dangerous than any that they thus seek to avoid.

A. T. JONES.