

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY LIBRARY.

A monthly publication (with occasional extras) published by the International Religious Liberty Association. The following have been issued :—

No. 1. Due Process of Law and the Divine Right of Dissent. An interesting and instructive work upon the "Process of Law," "Christianity and the Common Law," "Individual Right of Religious Belief," "The Divine Right of Dissent," etc., in review of Judge Hammond's decision in the King case. By A. T. Jones. 120 pages. Price 15 cts.

No. 2. Religious Intolerance in the Republic. A lucid and vivid portrayal of recent persecutions in Tennessee, written by the editor of the *Arena*. 16 pages. Price 2 cts.

No. 3. Church and State. A timely document upon the origin of Church and State union with the arguments and excuses for Sunday laws, laws exempting Church property from taxation, laws against blasphemy, religious tests, etc., all well considered. By James T. Ringgold, of the Baltimore Bar. 60 pages. Price 10 cts.

No. 4. The National Sunday Law. Arguments in behalf of the rights of American citizens, presented by A. T. Jones in opposition to the Blair Sunday-rest Bill. A thorough catechism upon the subject of Church and State. 192 pages. Price 25 cts.

No. 5. Sunday Laws in the United States. Their groundlessness and unconstitutionality exposed. By James T. Ringgold. 24 pages. Price 3 cts.

No. 6. The Captivity of the Republic. A Report of the Hearing on the Sunday Closing of the World's Fair, before the House Committee on Columbian Exposition, Jan. 10-13, 1893. 128 pages. Price 15 cts.

No. 7. Appeal and Remonstrance. Resolutions adopted by the General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventists, Feb. 24, 1893, with documentary evidence attached. 24 pages. Price 3 cts.

No. 8. Appeal from the U. S. Supreme Court Decision Making this a "Christian Nation." A Protest. A review of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, declaring that "this is a Christian nation;" a powerful protest against the union of Church and State involved in this decision; also the subsequent act of Congress closing the World's Fair on Sunday, and how it was secured. The work contains the text, in full, of this remarkable decision of the U. S. Supreme Court. By A. T. Jones, Editor *American Sentinel*, New York City. 86 pages. Price 15 cts.

No. 9. Shall Religion be Taught in the Public Schools? A lucid exposition of both the unconstitutionality and impracticability of connecting religion with our public school educational system. 12 pages. Price 2 cts.

No. 10. Religious Liberty and the Mormon Question. Is the Prohibition of Polygamy Religious Legislation? 20 pp. Price 2½ cts.

No. 11. The "Civil Sabbath:" or Disguised Religious Legislation. Sabbath laws shown to be religious and only religious. 12 pages. Price 1½ cts.

No. 12. The Columbian Year, and the Meaning of the Four Centuries. An address delivered by Alonzo T. Jones, on Columbus Day, 1893. Revised to date. 44 pages. Price 5½ cts.

No. 13. The Limits of Civil Authority, from the standpoint of natural rights and divine obligation. 12 pages. Price 1½ cts.

No. 14. Christ and the Sabbath. A study of the spiritual nature of the Sabbath and of what Sabbath-keeping really is, showing the impossibility of its enforcement by civil law. 40 pages. Price 5 cts.

No. 15. Rome's Challenge: Why Do Protestants Keep Sunday? A reprint of a series of articles which appeared recently in the *Catholic Mirror*, the official organ of the papacy in the United States, in which Protestants are sharply arraigned on account of the absurdity of their position with reference to the Sunday institution, with copious notes by A. T. Jones, editor of the *American Sentinel*. 32 pages. Price 4 cts.

No. 16. Our Answer: Why do Seventh-Day Adventists Suffer Imprisonment Rather Than Keep Sunday? A brief, historical, Scriptural presentation of the Sabbath—the sign of loyalty to God—and Sunday—the sign of loyalty to the Roman Catholic Church. “It should be translated into every language, and placed in the hands of every person on the earth.”—A. T. Jones, Editor *American Sentinel*. 12 pages. Price, 1½ cts.

No. 17. Scriptural Relation of Religion and the State. A scriptural presentation of the principles upon which the proper relation of religion and the State is based, substantiated by facts of history. 80 pp. Price, 10 cts.

No. 18. Christ and the Pharisees; or, Christ's Faithfulness in Sabbath-keeping.—A striking parallel between the time of Christ and our day, showing that as Christ was persecuted and even put to death for his faithfulness in keeping the Sabbath according to God's idea, so in our day those who keep God's Sabbath—the seventh day—are being and will continue to be persecuted for the same thing and for the same reasons. 40 pp. Price, 5 cts.

Annual subscription to the Library, \$1. Liberal discounts on any of the numbers in quantities and to the trade.

Address any one of the offices named on first page of cover.

PROTESTANTISM

TRUE AND FALSE.

BY A. F. BALLENGER.

Is true Protestantism dead? Not, are there organizations wearing the *name* Protestant and many others *professing* to adhere to Protestant principles? but, is *true* Protestantism dead? In searching for an answer to this important question, it is necessary to inquire, What is true Protestantism? Protestantism derives its name from the protest of the German princes at the Diet of Spire, April 19, 1529. The following are its closing paragraphs:—

“Moreover, the new edict declaring the ministers shall preach the gospel, explaining it according to the writings accepted by the holy Christian Church; we think that, for this regulation to have any value, we should first agree on what is meant by the true and holy Church. Now, seeing that there is great diversity of opinion in this respect; that there is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the Word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine; that each text of the Holy Scriptures ought to be explained by other and clearer texts; that this Holy Book is in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness: we are resolved, with the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of his only Word, such as it is contained in the Biblical books of the Old and New Testaments, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it. This Word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God.

“For these reasons, most dear lords, uncles, cousins, and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we PROTEST by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviour, and who will

For the position of Luther and the Reformation on the Sabbath question, see Appendix I.

One day be our Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and for our people, neither *consent* nor *adhere* in any manner whatever to the proposed decree, in *anything* that is *contrary to God*, to *his holy Word*, to *our right conscience*, to *the salvation of our souls*, and to the last decree of Spires.

“At the same time we are in expectation that his imperial majesty will behave toward us like a Christian prince who loves God above all things; and declare ourselves ready to pay unto him, as well as unto you, gracious lords, all the affection and *obedience* that are our *just* and *legitimate duty*.”¹

In commenting upon this Protest, we shall adopt the words of D'Aubigné, the historian of the Reformation, as follows:—

“The principles contained in this celebrated Protest, the 19th of April, 1529, constitute the very essence of Protestantism. Now this Protest opposes two abuses of man in matters of faith: the first is the intrusion of the civil magistrate, and the second the arbitrary authority of the Church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate; and the authority of the Word of God above the visible Church. In the first place, *it rejects the civil power in divine things*, and says with the prophets and apostles: *We must obey God rather than man*. In presence of the crown of Charles the Fifth, it uplifts the crown of Jesus Christ. But it goes farther; it lays down the principle that *all human teachings should be subordinate to the oracles of God*.”²

This is *true* Protestantism, and at the same time, true Christianity. Christ began his work by protesting against “laying aside the commandment of God” and “teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.”³ And besides calling the minds of men away from tradition to the word of God, he taught the separation of Church and State in the following words: “Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.”⁴

In the presence of “a great multitude with swords and staves from the chief priests,” he said to one who would defend his Master with carnal weapons, “Put up again thy

¹ D'Aubigné's “History of the Reformation,” book xiii, chap. vi, pars. 13-15.

² *Id.*, par. 19.

³ Mark 7: 7, 8.—

⁴ Matt. 22: 21.

sword into his place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."¹ And when the church was clamoring for the aid of the Roman state to silence in death the voice of the Great Teacher, he said to Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world ; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews ; but now is my kingdom not from hence."²

These principles were maintained during the early history of Christianity, but gradually the word was supplanted by tradition, and the gospel which is the "power of God unto salvation,"³ was supplanted by the power of the State. Then professed Christianity exchanged the pilgrim's garb for the purple robe, "the sword of the spirit"⁴ for the scepter of power ; and thus equipped, she ascended the throne of the Cæsars and hurled the kingdoms of the world against the gospel of Christ. Peter's carnal sword was again unsheathed, and bathed in the blood of Christians who chose to follow the dictates of conscience rather than the decrees of councils. Tradition was again exalted and the word of God suppressed. Conscience was stifled. The lamp of God burned low. Its flickering light shone only in darksome dungeon, in secluded valley, or mountain cave. The papacy prospered, and the darkness deepened. The long papal night settled like a pall over the earth. It was midnight,—the *noonday* of papal power, but the moral *midnight* of the world. For more than a thousand years the Bible was banished, or locked in the language of the "learned," and chained to a convent wall. Liberty was lost.

But at last the world passed its midnight. "The hours of darkness were wearing away, and in many lands there appeared tokens of the coming dawn." "The Morning Star of the Reformation" appeared, leading away from the traditions of men back to the word of God. Wycliffe translated the Bible into the English language, and demanded liberty for all men to practice its precepts. His grave was dese-

¹ Matt. 26 : 47, 52.

² John 18 : 36.

³ Rom. 1 : 16,

⁴ Eph. 6 : 17.

crated and his bones burned, but morning was coming. Huss and Jerome, the Bohemian torch-bearers, were burned. But day was dawning. Martyrdom followed martyrdom. "But as well might men attempt to turn back the sun in its course as to prevent the dawning of that day which was even then breaking upon the world." Next came the "Wittenburg monk," crying, "The gospel! the gospel! Christ! Christ!" to the answering challenge of Rome, "Customs! Customs! Ordinances! Ordinances! Fathers! Fathers!"¹ Like his Master, when the sword was about to be unsheathed to defend his cause, he quickly declared: "There is no sword that can further this cause. God alone must do everything without the help or concurrence of man."² "It is with the word that we must fight, by the word must we overthrow and destroy what has been set up by violence."³ "Christians fight not with swords or muskets, but with suffering and with the cross. Christ, their Captain, handled not the sword; . . . he was hung upon a tree."⁴

Luther translates the Bible into the German tongue, the Princes make their noble Protest, and the day has dawned. The bright beams of the Sun of Righteousness warm the hearts of men with the love of God, and the world awakes from the slumber of ages.

True Protestantism is the same yesterday, to-day, and to the end of time. It always has demanded, it demands to-day, and always will demand a "Thus saith the Lord," and with this the complete separation of Church and State, that all may render unto God the things that are God's.

Its enemy, under varying names, is ever the same. It always has pleaded, it pleads to-day, and always will plead to the end of time, for the traditions of the church, and for civil law to force them upon the consciences of all men.

Protestantism of the sixteenth century mounted higher

¹ D'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation," book ix, chap. x, par. 21.

² *Id.*, book ix, chap. viii, par. 18.

³ *Id.*, book ix, chap. viii, par. 32.

⁴ *Id.*, book x, chap. x, par. 19.

and higher on the wings of faith, poised a moment, and then fluttered slowly, but surely back to earth ; and in every country where the Reformation was carried forward with such power, there is to-day a return to tradition and its complement, a union of Church and State.

Touching this sad fall, the historian says, —

“The Reformation was accomplished in the name of a spiritual principle. It had proclaimed for its teacher the word of God ; for salvation, Faith ; for king, Jesus Christ ; for arms, the Holy Ghost ; and had by these very means rejected all worldly elements. Rome had been established by the *law of a carnal commandment* ; the Reformation, by the *power of an endless life*.

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

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

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

“Henceforth its decline was at hand.

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

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

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

“If three centuries have gone astray, it is because they were unable to comprehend so holy and so solemn a lesson.”¹

¹ *Id.*, book xiv, chap. i, pars. 1-10.

After the sun of Protestantism had set in Europe, it was still shining in America. One portion of the Reformation did here seek an alliance with the world; but another portion, looking up to God, fearlessly rejected "the arm of the flesh," and by this very act secured a noble victory,—the establishment in the American Constitution of the first government the world had ever seen in which Church and State were divorced;¹ a free Church in a free State.

But American Protestantism has at last proved unfaithful to the principles it laid down, and "having abandoned what constituted its life, it can find naught but death." It has sought the alliance of the world, and in this alliance is finding "a destruction full of desolation." Are these statements too strong?—We submit the facts; let the reader judge. Let it be remembered that the "life" of Protestantism "lays down the principle that all human teaching should be subordinate to the oracles of God;" and "rejects the civil power in divine things." This is the Protestant platform. The following is the papal platform as touching the same principles:—

"Like two sacred rivers flowing from Paradise, the Bible and divine Tradition contain the word of God, the precious gems of revealed truths.

"Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of equal sacredness, and are both full of revealed truths, still, of the two *Tradition* is to us more clear and safe."²

¹ Touching this point, the historian Bancroft says: "No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual until a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Cæsar only that which is Cæsar's. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men. No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman Empire than it was shorn of its character of universality and enthralled by an unholy connection with the unholy State. And so it continued until the *new nation*, . . . when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or a state. Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to *set the example* of accepting in its relations to God the principles first divinely ordained of God in Judea." — *Bancroft's "History of the Formation of the Constitution," book v, chap. i, pars. 10, 11.*

² "Catholic Belief," by Rev. Joseph Faa' Di Bruno, D. D., American edition, edited by Rev. Louis A. Lambert. Imprimatur, John Cardinal McCloskey, etc.; Benziger Bros., New York, 1884, page 45.

Touching the other principle of Protestantism, it is well known to all that the papacy has always made use of the civil power when available, to force her decrees upon the consciences of men, and curses the doctrine of separation of Church and State.¹ On which of these two platforms does American Protestantism stand? Let us apply the test to the great Protestant denominations of America and decide the question. The word of God says : —

“Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work : but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God : in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates : 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.”²

In the face of this plain command, the Methodist Episcopal Church, while claiming to be Protestant, observes Sunday, the first day of the week. This she does, though admitting in the following quotations that there is no command for the change : —

“This law is spiritual and perfect, extending to all the inward creations and outward actions of men, and can never be changed or annulled. Ps. 19 : 7, 8 ; Prov. 30 : 5, 6 ; Rom. 8 : 12, 14 ; Rev. 22 : 18, 19.

“This seventh-day Sabbath was strictly observed by Christ and his apostles previous to his crucifixion. Mark 6 : 2 ; Luke 4 : 16, 31 ; 13 : 10 ; Acts 1 : 12-14 ; 13 : 14, 42, 44 ; 17 : 2 ; 18 : 4.

“Jesus, after his resurrection, changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. . . .

“When Jesus gave instruction for this change we are not told, but very likely during the time when he spake to his apostles of the things pertaining to his kingdom.”³

¹The Roman Catholic Church curses the following doctrine : “The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.” See “Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion,” page 123.

²Ex. 20 : 8-11.

³Binney's “Theological Compend., Improved,” by Rev. Amos Binney and Rev. Daniel Steele, D. D.; Hunt and Eaton, New York ; pages 153, 170, 171.

Thus it is seen that this church repudiates the commandment of God,—“The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,”—and observes Sunday, the first day of the week, while acknowledging that, “we are not told when Jesus gave instruction for this change,” and that the commandment for this change is “unrecorded.” In this matter, therefore, this church teaches by precept and practice, that tradition, or the “unrecorded” word is “more clear and safe” than the plain word of God, and in doing this plants herself on the papal platform. But besides teaching for doctrine the commandments of men, she is asking aid of the civil power,¹ “the arm of the flesh,” to force upon others the “unrecorded” decree, even to the extent of imprisoning men² who choose to keep the commandments of God; and in this she violates the other cardinal principle of Protestantism, and takes the side of the papacy.

The Protestant Episcopal Church, while bearing the noble title, Protestant, constantly violates God’s plain command, “The *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,” and requires the observance of the *first* day of the week, a requirement in flagrant contradiction to the command of God. This the church does while acknowledging as follows that their course is without scriptural authority:—

“Is there any command in the New Testament to change the day of weekly rest from Saturday to Sunday?

“None.

“What, then, does this universal custom in the church seem to show?

“It shows that the change of day was one of those ‘things pertaining to the kingdom of God’ (like infant baptism, confirmation, liturgic worship, etc.), concerning which Christ gave ‘commandment’ to his apostles after he rose from the dead. Acts 1 : 2, 3.”³

¹ The Methodist Church not only has endorsed the work, but took the preliminary step toward the organization of the American Sabbath Union, whose sole purpose is to secure the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws. At its last quadrennial General Conference a resolution was passed, asking Congress to enact a law to close the World’s Fair on Sunday.

² The first arrest of Seventh-day Adventists in Maryland was the case of John W. Judefind, who on complaint of Rev. Robert Roe, a Methodist minister, was imprisoned for thirty days for the crime (?) of gathering corn on Sunday.

³ “Manual of Christian Doctrine,” p. 127; published by James Pott & Co., 12 Astor Place, N. Y.

"There are some points of great difficulty respecting the fourth commandment. . . .

"In the first place we are commanded to keep holy the seventh day; but yet we do not think it necessary to keep the seventh day holy; for the seventh day is Saturday. It may be said that we keep the first day instead; but surely this is not the same thing; the first day cannot be the seventh day; and where are we told in Scripture that we are to keep the first day at all? We are commanded to keep the seventh; but we are nowhere commanded to keep the first day. There is another difficulty on this subject: We Christians, in considering each of the ten commandments, turn to what our Lord says in explanation of them; for in the sermon on the mount he says, that 'not one jot or tittle' of the law shall fail; that he has come 'not to destroy but to fulfill' the law; and then he shows in the instance of the sixth, seventh, and third commandments, how he will require them to be fulfilled by Christians, not in the letter only, but in the spirit, the heart, and thought. . . .

"The reason why we keep the first day of the week holy instead of the seventh is for the same reason that we observe many other things, not because the Bible, but because the church, has enjoined it."¹

In the face of these fatal admissions, in the face of its own declaration that "Holy Scripture containeth all that is necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man," and "it is not lawful for the church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written;" in the face of the further fact that after reciting the fourth commandment, it prays weekly, "Lord incline our hearts to keep this law;" in the face of all this, the church commands the observance of the first day of the week, which "cannot be the seventh day," and which "is contrary to the word written," and has labored and is laboring in the person of its bishops² and otherwise for the legal enforcement of this unscriptural dogma, thus violating both principles of true Protestantism, and though flying the Protestant banner has arrayed herself on the papal platform.

¹ "Plain Sermons on the Catechism," vol. i, pp. 334-336; by Rev. Isaac Williams, B. D., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford; Longmans, Green & Co., 15 E. 16th St., N. Y., and 39 Paternoster Row, London, E. C.; also James Pott and Co., N. Y.

² Senator Hawley, of Connecticut, presented the names of fifteen Protestant Episcopal bishops in favor of a law enforcing the observance of Sunday at the World's Fair. See Congressional Record of July 12, 1892, page 6701.

At this point it may be objected that these churches, and others introduced later, are widely separated from the Roman Catholic Church on many points of doctrine and practice. While this is true, the fact remains that in violating the principles of Protestantism in the vital matters above cited, they place themselves on papal territory, and can give no valid reason why they should not accept all other doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church on the same authority. Touching this point the Protestant Church historian, Dowling says : —

“‘The Bible, I say, the Bible only is the religion of Protestants!’ Nor is it of any account in the estimation of the *genuine* Protestant, *how early* a doctrine originated, if it is not found in the Bible. He learns from the New Testament itself, that there were errors in the time of the apostles, and that their pens were frequently employed in combating those errors. . . . The consistent and true-hearted Protestant, standing upon this rock — ‘the Bible and the Bible only,’ can admit no doctrine upon the authority of tradition; . . . he who receives a single doctrine upon the mere authority of tradition, let him be called by what name he will, by so doing, steps down from the Protestant rock, passes over the line which separates Protestantism from papacy, and can give no valid reason why he should not receive all the earlier doctrines and ceremonies of Romanism, upon the same authority.”¹

The Presbyterian Church desecrates the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, and keeps as holy, Sunday, the first day of the week, though admitting that there is no recorded command for the change. This she does in the following quotation : —

“To guard the inviolability of his law, God had signally punished Saul, Nadab, and Abihu. How then could he have been pleased with the substitution of the first for the seventh day, if not provided for in his new revelation. . . . This change may have been one ‘of those things pertaining to the kingdom of God’ concerning which Luke tells us Jesus spake to his disciples after the resurrection.”²

¹ Dowling’s “History of Romanism,” book ii, chap. i.

² “The Sabbath; Its Defense,” pp. 50, 51, 52; by W. W. Everts, D. D., Presbyterian minister; recommended and sold by the Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school work; 44 Madison St., Chicago; 1885.

To supply the lack of a recorded command for the change, this church delves into the musty traditions of the Fathers with the following astonishing results : —

“The epistle of Barnabas, *whether genuine or not*, dating in the first part of the second century¹, says,” etc.¹

“The church hand-book, called, ‘The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,’ *recently discovered, whether genuine or not, seems equally conclusive* of the observance of the first-day Sabbath.”²

Thus the law spoken by the voice of God, amid the awful grandeur of Sinai, and transmitted to us in unmistakable clearness, is violated and a day observed which has no command of God in its favor, and which is supported only by forged traditions of men. But besides all this, this church is also petitioning the civil government³ to force this tradition of the Catholic Church upon all men; and in this she violates the second great principle of Protestantism, and arrays herself on the side of Rome.

The Congregational Church, while claiming to be a Protestant body, and to take the Bible as the rule of faith, treats as a secular day God’s holy Sabbath, the seventh day, the day which alone was blessed, hallowed and sanctified by the Lord of the Sabbath, and treats as a holy day, Sunday, the first day of the week, though making the following fatal admissions: —

“Christ’s endorsement of the decalogue must be accepted as revealing his view of the permanency of the Sabbath. This endorsement is several times repeated. In the opening part of the sermon on the mount, he uses this language: ‘Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.’”⁴

“But any lingering doubt of Christ’s position on the Sabbath is put to rest by his own express words, ‘The Sabbath was made for man,’ not for

¹ *Id.*, p. 62.

² *Id.*, p. 64.

³ The Presbyterian Church endorses the work of the American Sabbath Union; and at its last general assembly, passed resolutions asking Congress for a law to close the World’s Fair on Sunday.

⁴ “A Plea for the Sabbath and for Man,” p. 87, by Rev. J. Q. Bittinger; Congregational Sunday-school and Publishing Society, Boston and Chicago, 1892.

man in any limited period or in any stage of his history, but for man universally and always. The Sabbath can never cease as a memorial of divine rest." ¹

"Many works of beneficence were done on the Sabbath, which brought the observance of the day into prominent discussion. The Gospels, accordingly, abound in frequent reference to the subject. A different state of things existed when the epistles were written. There did not seem to be any special occasion for calling attention to the Sabbath. *The day was kept. Its validity was not questioned.*" ²

"The Sabbath immediately after the resurrection, continued to be a day in which Christ's followers met for religious worship, as they had done with the Great Master before his crucifixion." ³

"In ancient writers frequent mention is made of religious assemblies on Saturday. Athanasius says, 'They met on the Sabbath, not that they were infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath.'" ⁴

Notwithstanding the above truthful admissions, and notwithstanding the previous statements that 'the fourth commandment is "clothed with such particularity of detail, to obviate the danger of obscurity;"' ⁵ "that the Sabbath precept, . . . in fullness and minute instruction, is more pronounced than any other;" "given with such circumstances of detail and particularity;" ⁶—notwithstanding all this, this denomination teaches by precept and example, that this same Sabbath is no longer holy, but that Sunday, the first day of the week, is holy time. And not satisfied with thus teaching and practicing this Heaven-defying doctrine, she is attempting to force it upon all men by means of pains and penalties.⁷ Thus she repudiates both principles of Protestantism, and takes her stand on the side of tradition and the use of civil power in religious things.

The Baptist Church, while loudly denouncing infant baptism as a papal doctrine without foundation in Scripture;

¹ *Id.*, p. 90.

² *Id.*, pp. 90, 91.

³ *Id.*, p. 95.

⁴ Bingham's "Antiquities," book xiii. chap. ix; and "A Plea for the Sabbath and for Man," p. 96.

⁵ *Id.*, p. 72.

⁶ *Id.*, p. 71.

⁷ The Congregational Church endorses the work of the American Sabbath Union, and is petitioning Congress for laws to enforce the observance of Sunday upon all the people,

and declaring that "what is not there commanded is not binding;"¹ yet observes Sunday, notwithstanding the following fatal admissions:—

"Up to the time of Christ's death, no change had been made in the day."²

"So far as the records show, they did not, however, give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath, and its observance on the first day of the week."³

Thus the Baptist Church, though admitting that, so far as the records show, there is no command for the change of the Sabbath from the seventh day, blessed at creation and rehearsed amid the sublime glory of Sinai, with a voice that shook the earth, yet observes Sunday which was never blessed of the Lord, never sanctified, nor hallowed, never kept by the Saviour of men, nor by his apostles. And besides all this, the Baptist Church, the church of Roger Williams, the church which claims the pre-eminence as champion of religious liberty in America, and which has always argued for a complete separation of Church and State, is now petitioning for civil power,⁴ "the arm of the

¹ "Principles and Practices of the Baptist Denomination," chap. xvi.

² "The Lord's Day" (One Thousand Dollar Prize Essay), p. 186; by A. E. Waffle. M. A. (Baptist); recommended and sold by the American Baptist Tract Society, Philadelphia and Chicago, 1886.

³ *Id.*, p. 187.

⁴ The Baptist Church opens its pulpits to the officers of the American Sabbath Union, and joined in petitioning Congress for a law closing the World's Fair on Sunday. There are a few in this church, as there are in all the churches, who protest against this alliance with the world, and are still loyal to the principles of religious liberty for which this church has been so long the champion; but the large majority has abandoned the principles of Roger Williams, and has joined the Sunday-law crusade.

At a prayer meeting held in the First Baptist Church of Chicago, during the agitation for the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, the leader asked those present to sign a petition to Congress for a law to close the World's Fair on Sunday. After he had finished, a young man rose and in broken English said: "I am from Russia, the land of intolerance; the land of a union of Church and State. I have seen the scars on the wrists of the missionaries whom you sent to my country,— scars made by chains placed on them by Russia's union of Church and State. I joined the Baptist Church in Russia, because it trusted in God, not in the State. And now I come to America and enter my beloved Baptist Church and hear you petitioning Congress for a law to bind chains on the wrists of your fellow-men. In the name of God, send your petition to the throne of God, and not to the Congress of the United States." There are some who share these views, but they are in the minority. For the position of the Baptist Church, previous to 1892, against religious legislation in general, and compulsory Sunday observance in particular, see Appendix II.

flesh," to force upon all men the Sunday institution, the mark or badge of Rome. In view of these facts, on which platform does the Baptist Church stand?

The Christian or Disciple Church, which above all other churches claims to be founded upon Scripture, and which most strongly attacks the traditions of the church, observes the first day of the week, in the face of the following admissions from the pen of its founder, Alexander Campbell:—

"The popular doctrine taught from many pulpits, which has given rise to the many errors of the religious public on the nature and observance of the Lord's day, is that it came in the room of the Jewish Sabbath, or that the Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, a notion which originated in the dark night of popery, or which obtained credit in the same ratio as the following article of the Catholic Church obtained credit; viz., 'The unwritten word of God, or the apostolic traditions [*i. e.*, the traditions of men] are equally the rule of Christian faith, and Christian holiness as the written word.'

"A zealous and intelligent defender of the faith and practice of 'the holy mother Church,' told me in a late conversation, if I would not admit the above article in the Catholic sense, I must renounce the Protestant faith in the Christian Sabbath and infant baptism, for they have no other foundation than 'the unwritten word of God or the traditions of the holy Catholic Church.' I told him that I agreed with him in this, but that I renounced the above article, and also the Protestant faith in the Christian Sabbath and infant baptism, as being contrary to the written word of God, by which *alone* I was regulated. 'Then' said he 'you must be considered a heretic, not only by the Catholic Church, but also by many Protestant churches.' 'Yes,' said I, 'an heretic of the first magnitude; "For this I *confess* unto them that after *the way they call heresy* so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things that are written in the law, in the prophets, and in the apostles." I do not believe that the Lord's day came in the room of the Jewish Sabbath, or that the Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day for this plain reason, that where there is no *testimony*, there can be no *faith*. Now there is no testimony in all the oracles of heaven that the Sabbath was changed, or that the Lord's day came in the room of it.

. . . "I believe that "the dead shall be raised." My faith in this instance is a divine faith, or a faith founded on divine testimony; viz., "There shall be a resurrection of the just and unjust." The argument deducible from the above is fairly this: Where there is no divine testimony, there can be no divine faith. But there is no divine testimony that the Sabbath was

changed, or that the Lord's day came in the room of it; therefore there can be no divine faith that the Sabbath was changed or that the Lord's day came in the room of it. . . . Everything that is believed upon human testimony alone, is received and acted upon by a mere human faith, but that the Sabbath is changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, or that the Lord's day came in the room of it, is believed on human testimony alone; therefore he that believes that the Sabbath was thus changed, etc., receives it on a mere human faith." ¹

Having shown from the writings of the founder of the Disciple Church, that in his view the Sabbath has not been changed by scriptural authority from the seventh day of the week to the first day, we now quote a leading modern writer of the same denomination touching the institution of Sunday observance and the authority on which it rests.

"The Lordian Supper (Lord's Supper) was instituted by the Saviour, whereas the Lordian day (Sunday) was not." ²

"There was vastly greater propriety that institutions solely designed for man to honor Christ, should *originate with man himself*." ³

"We are not of those who think that either the *value* or *authority* of the day depends upon *divine command*." ⁴

"It (Sunday) is the day of all days—immensely, immeasurably, infinitely superior to the Sabbath in every lesson which it teaches." ⁵

In this last quotation the climax is reached. A day which was not instituted by the Lord is declared to be "immensely, immeasurably, infinitely superior to the Sabbath" which he *did* institute, which he "blessed," "hallowed," ⁶ and "sanctified!" ⁷ and which he calls "my holy day." ⁸ A day which "originated with man himself," is declared to be "*immensely, immeasurably, infinitely superior* to the Sabbath," which the Lord himself instituted, which he says "was made for man," ⁹ and of which he declares, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath day." ¹⁰ The day

¹ Alexander Campbell (Candidus) in Washington (Pa.) *Reporter*, Oct. 8, 1821.

² "The Evolution of a Shadow," p. 188; by A. M. Weston, A. M., President of Eureka College, Ill. Christian Standard Publishing Co., Cincinnati, O., 1886.

³ *Id.*, p. 190.

⁴ *Id.*, p. 191.

⁵ *Id.*, p. 200.

⁶ Ex. 20: 11.

⁷ Gen. 2: 3.

⁸ Isa. 58: 13.

⁹ Mark 2: 27.

¹⁰ Mark 2: 28.

which the Lord *did not* institute, which originated with man himself, "the man of sin;" a day whose "*value*" or "*authority*" does not depend upon "*divine command*" is here blasphemously declared to be "*immensely, IMMEASURABLY, INFINITELY superior* to the Sabbath," a day which was instituted by the Lord himself; a day whose value and authority *does* rest on divine command, a command which God placed in the heart of that law which Paul calls "spiritual,"¹ "holy and just and good;"² and concerning which the scripture says, if a man "offend in one point, he is guilty of all."³ Notwithstanding these startling statements regarding the man-made institution, this church is keeping the first day of the week, and joining in the movement to secure the civil power,⁴ "the arm of flesh," to force this man-made day upon those who choose to keep the day, made, blessed, hallowed, sanctified, and kept by the Lord of the Sabbath, the Saviour of men. On which platform, Protestant, or papal, does the "Christian Church" stand?

Again we ask, Is American Protestantism dead?

Has it not abandoned the principles which constituted its life?

Has it not passed "over the line which separates Protestantism from papacy?" Is it not encamped on Roman territory? Yes, and the "mother of harlots" is not a silent

¹Rom. 7:14.

²Rom. 7:12.

³James 2:10.

⁴The Christian Church, whose founder, Alexander Campbell, so nobly, persistently, and successfully combated all Sunday laws, has at last succumbed to the prevailing crusade for legally enforced Sunday observance. During the agitation for congressional legislation to close the World's Fair on Sunday, the Christian Church forsook the principles of Alexander Campbell, and worked for the law. A small minority protested against this return to papal principles. Among them were Dr. Kirkham, editor of the *Christian Oracle*, and Rev. J. L. Parsons, pastor of the First Christian Church of St. Louis. These pleaded the principles advocated by Mr. Campbell, but were unable to stem the tide of opposition which was so bitter that the editor said to the writer: "I have received some letters in which is manifested a spirit of intolerance that would be ready to burn me at the stake." Deploring this fall, a minister of the Church, Dr. James A. De Moss, writing in the *Christian Standard*, of Aug. 12, 1893, says: "And the saddest of all sad things is that the Church of Christ has stultified itself in its action in this matter, and taken one step backward toward Rome." (For the position of Alexander Campbell against all Sunday laws, see Richardson's "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," vol. i, p. 528. See also Appendix III.)

witness of this self-contradictory and suicidal position but is just now calling loudly upon her daughters to take out naturalization papers,—become Roman Catholics in form as well as principle,—or else quit her territory at once. She has long declared that she “substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority;”¹ she has long said, “In profaning Saturday they (Protestants) violate one of God’s commandments, which he has never clearly abrogated;”² but not until professed Protestantism had repudiated the great fundamental Protestant principle of separation of Church and State, by forcing the national government into a legislative recognition of the Sunday Sabbath, the badge, or “mark,” of Roman Catholic power,—not until then did she call upon the professed Protestant churches, as in the following quotation, to abandon her territory or return wholly to the mother church. She says:—

“The only resource left the Protestants is either to retire from Catholic territory where they have been squatting for three centuries and a half, and, accepting their own teacher, the Bible, in good faith, . . . commence forthwith to keep the Saturday,—the day enjoined by the Bible from Genesis to Revelation; or abandoning the Bible as their sole teacher, cease to be squatters, and a living contradiction of their own principles, and taking out letters of adoption as citizens of the kingdom of Christ on earth,—his church,—be no longer victims of self-delusive and necessary self-contradiction. . . . Reason and common sense demand the acceptance of one or the other of these alternatives: either Protestantism and the keeping holy of Saturday, or Catholicity and the keeping of Sunday. . . . Compromise is impossible.”³

This is the challenge which fallen and humiliated Protestantism is listening to with shamefaced silence. This is Rome’s bugle call to line up for battle, a call to rally around the standard of Catholicity, tradition, and the Sunday, or

¹ “A Doctrinal Catechism,” p. 174; by Rev. Stephen Keenan; R. J. Kennedy, Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay St., N. Y.

² *Id.*, p. 352.

³ *Catholic Mirror*, Baltimore, Dec. 23, 1893.

the banner of Protestantism, the Bible and the Sabbath.
 "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."

But again, "having abandoned what constituted its life," fallen Protestantism is finding "naught but death." Having sought an "alliance with the world" it is finding "a destruction full of desolation." In evidence of this let the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist), Cincinnati, of July 19, 1893, testify:—

"TO THE CHURCH OF METHODISTS, WRITE!

"The great trouble with us to-day is, that the rescue of imperiled souls is our last and least consideration. Many of our congregations are conducted on the basis of social clubs. They are made centers of social influence. Membership is sought in order to advance one's prospects in society, business, or politics. Preachers are called who know how to 'smooth down the rugged text to ears polite, and snugly keep damnation out of sight.' The Sunday services are made the occasion of displaying the elegancies of apparel in the latest fashions. Even the little ones are tricked out as though they were the acolytes of pride. If the 'Rules' are read, it is to comply with the letter of a law whose spirit has long since fled. The class books are filled with names of unconverted men and women. Official members may be found in box, dress-circle, and parquet of opera and theater. Communicants take in the races, and give and attend card parties and dances. The distinction between inside and outside is so obscure that men smile when asked to unite with the church, and sometimes tell us that they find the best men outside.

"When we go to the masses, it is too often with such ostentatious condescension that self-respect drives them from us.

"And yet we have so spread out, under the inflation of the rich and ungodly, that they are a necessity to us. The enforcement of the unmistakable letter of the Discipline for a single year would cut our membership in half, bankrupt our missionary society, close our fashionable churches, paralyze our connectional interests, and leave our pastors and bishops unpaid and in distress. But the fact remains, that one of two things must happen—the Discipline must purge the church, or God's Holy Spirit will seek other organized agencies. The ax is laid at the root of the tree. The call is to repentance. God's work must be done. If we are in the way, he will remove us."

Let Rev. George Guirey, a Baptist minister, also bear testimony upon this point. In his work entitled, "The

Hallowed Day," for which he received the Fletcher prize of five hundred dollars from Dartmouth College, and which is devoted principally to a plea for Sunday laws, and in which the author boldly advocates the "arrest"¹ of Christians who observe the seventh day and labor on Sunday, the first day of the week; he speaks thus plainly of the condition of the churches:—

"But is there not some reason for the common impression that the worldly spirit in the church is weakening her power with the public? Are there not evidences at hand that seem to confirm the impression that the history of the church in the Roman empire, in the fourth century, is repeating itself in the United States to-day? This is a Christian country, and the laws are all in favor of religion; but the enervating influence of wealth, luxury, and fashion, tells upon the church, producing spiritual declension, neglect of holy vows, and indifference to responsibility. The blandishments of the world are too much for human nature to withstand, and we see the sad spectacle of the great moral and religious activities of the church, drop down into the rut of the ordinary routine of mere business affairs, while her beautiful and glorious life is shorn of its spiritual power. As a result, Sabbath desecration is almost as common in the church as out of it. It is not the noisy, offensive kind of desecration, but it is all the more harmful for that very reason. It does not seem too much to say that with her vast resources and advantages, her intelligence and her ability consecrated to the service of God, and with the leverage of civil law in her hands, the church could to-day have a Sabbath such as is enjoyed in Toronto, in every city in the United States. But the love of the world, the greed for wealth, and the ambition for place and power, leave the church in the hands of a faithful few to bear her burdens and responsibilities, while the great body of her membership joins the world in Sunday pleasuring. . . . And we say to the mixed multitudes that make up her nominal membership: 'Fall in!'"²

Such is the condition of American Protestantism according to its friends; and their testimony is in harmony with the prediction of Christ. On the authority of this word, the writer will change one letter in the last sentence, and instead of saying to the "mixed multitudes [Babylon] that make up her

¹ "The Hallowed Day," p. 20; by Rev. George Guirey. The Baker & Taylor Co., 740 and 742 Broadway, New York, 1893.

² *Id.*, pp. 57, 58.

nominal membership, 'Fall in ;' " will say, "*Fallen.*" "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." ¹

And instead of saying, "Fall in," we say on the authority of the word of God, to the "faithful few" who "sigh and cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof," ² "*Come out* of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." ³

Seventh-day Adventists have, for more than forty years, predicted this fall with all its dire consequences. We have declared on the authority of the prophetic scriptures, that, as the "beast" was the result of a "falling away" from the principles of primitive Christianity, so the "image to the beast" ⁴ would result from the falling away of American Protestantism from the principle of primitive Christianity, the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and the principles of the American Constitution. ⁵

We have warned and intreated both the Church and the State not to unite what had been separated by Christ, the Reformation, and the Constitution. Our warnings have been unheeded; that which we have protested against has been begun. The Constitution of the United States has been violated and subverted. The precedent for religious legislation has been established, and the Constitution which has stood for more than a hundred years as a breakwater against the angry seas of intolerance, has at last been broken, and through this breach will rush the billows of persecution. "As milder measures fail, the most oppressive laws will be enacted." ⁶

¹ Rev. 18:2.

² Eze. 9:4.

³ Rev 18:4, 5.

⁴ Rev 14:9.

⁵ See "Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation," chap. xiii.

⁶ "Great Controversy," Vol. IV, p. 444, edition of 1887.

And now, like the mysterious rider, who with the swift-ness of the wind, galloped down the Conemaugh Valley, warning the people of the onrushing floods, so we turn from petitioning the nation, and with the "loud voice" of the apocalyptic angels, call to the people to flee for their lives—to flee from Babylon the mother and Babylon the daughters. This is God's bugle call to line up for battle. Who will respond? To give this final warning, we have pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."¹ Reader, will you enlist under Christ's banner of Protestantism,—the Bible and the Sabbath? will you unite with us in giving this warning? It will cost you persecution in this world, but it promises "victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark," and "in the world to come, *eternal life*."²

¹ See "Religious Liberty Library" No. 7, "Appeal and Remonstrance."

² Rev. 15: 2; Mark 10: 30.

APPENDIX I.

THE blighting influence of the Sunday institution upon the Reformation has never been thoroughly appreciated. Beginning with an appeal to the word of God as against tradition, the Reformation soon encountered the traditional Sunday Sabbath. Some of the reformers, notably Carlstadt, who was professor of theology in the university of Wittemberg, and "during Luther's confinement at the Wartburg, had almost sole control of the reform movement at Wittemberg, and was supreme in the university,"¹ was a strong advocate of the seventh-day Sabbath. Of his position on this point Luther wrote as follows:—

"Indeed, if Carlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath—that is to say Saturday—must be kept holy."²

¹ M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. ii, p. 123.

² "The Book Against the Celestial Prophets," by Martin Luther. Quoted in the "Life of Martin Luther in Pictures," p. 147; J. W. Moore, 195 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.

In 1519 occurred the notable discussion between Luther and Eck, in which the chief point of controversy was, whether the Bible, or the Church and the pope, were the higher authority. Dr. Eck made the following claims:—

“Concerning the authority of the Church, the Scriptures teach, Remember to keep Saturday holy; six days you are to labor and do all your work; but on the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God, etc.; and yet the Church has transferred the celebration of the Sabbath to Sunday, solely by her own power, without the Scriptures, and no doubt by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.” — *Dr. Eck's Little Handbook ("Enchiridion")*, 1533, p. 78.

“The Sabbath has been manifoldly commanded in the Scriptures. And as neither the Gospels, nor St. Paul, nor yet the Bible itself states that the Sabbath has been abandoned, and Sunday instituted, it follows that it has been done by the apostolic Church, without Scripture for it.

“But if the Church has had the power to set aside the Sabbath of the Bible, and enjoin the observance of Sunday,—why should she not have power to do the same with other days? If you do not observe them and leave the church to go back to the Scriptures alone, you must, with the Jews keep the Sabbath, which has been kept from the beginning of the world.” — *Id.*, p. 79.

Luther, prejudiced, no doubt, by the extreme contempt in which the Jews were held at that time, swerved from the principle upon which the Reformation had been launched, and abolished the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, but was not so inconsistent as to claim divine authority for Sunday observance; but on the contrary, asserted—as in the twenty-eighth article of the Augsburg Confession, which was drawn up by his approval—that “there is no divine authority for it.”

The dilemma in which this position placed him is illustrated in his “Smaller Catechism,” published in 1529, in the preface of which Luther arraigns the Church of Rome in the following words:—

“O ye bishops! how will ye ever render account to Christ for having so shamefully neglected the people, and having never for a moment exercised your office! May the judgment not overtake you! You command communion in one kind, and urge your human ordinances; but never ask in the meantime, whether the people know the Lord's Prayer, the *Ten Commandments*, or any part of God's Word. Woe, woe unto you everlastingly!”¹

In the same connection he instructs his ministers “first of all to teach the *text* of the *Ten Commandments*,”² and yet

¹ Dr. Martin Luther's “Smaller Catechism,” Explained in Questions and Answers, by Dr. J. C. Dietrich, p. 3. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis Mo., 1885.

² *Id.*, p. 4.

in the same book he violates his own instruction, and instead of teaching the text of the Sabbath commandment, he followed in the footsteps of Rome and supplanted it with the meaningless, indefinite, evasive, human makeshift, "Thou shalt sanctify the holy day."¹

One feels like condoning this mistake when it is remembered what a herculean task was undertaken by him. Luther doubtless unearthed from their covering of human tradition, more precious gems of truth, than any other one man since the time of Christ, but he was not without his mistakes,—mistakes which instead of being rectified by those who profess to be his legitimate successors, have in the matter of the Sabbath, been intensified. They now declare that there have been "transferred to it (Sunday) all the honors of the Jewish Sabbath;"² and although asserting in this same connection that "Christians are at liberty to appoint any day for worship,"³ immediately pronounce the death sentence upon the one who violates their unscriptural, man-made Sabbath.

"What is the particular threat and penalty annexed to this commandment? (The commandment they have made.)

"Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you; every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death. Ex. 31:14."⁴

Having abolished the Sabbath of the Lord under pretext of Christian liberty, and having put in its place a human ordinance in conflict with it, which, for want of scripture they are unable to enforce, they next attempt to re-enact the penalty for the transgression of that law under the theocracy, and apply it to the transgression of a man-made institution. All this is done in the face of the statement from the same book that the Holy Scriptures are a "perfectly sure and sufficient standard, according to which all other sayings, writings, and doctrines are to be judged, so that *what accords with them must be received, what is in conflict with them must be rejected.*"⁵ Does the command, "Thou shalt sanctify the holy day" (the first day of the week) accord with the Holy Scriptures which command, "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," etc.?

The next step in this beaten path of error, is the attempt to secure the observance of this unscriptural, man-made Sab-

¹ *Id.*, p. 7.

² *Id.*, p. 49.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*, p. 52.

⁵ *Id.*, p. III.

bath by means of the strong arm of civil law. This step the professed followers of Luther are now beginning to take. Rev. F. W. Conrad, D. D., of Philadelphia, editor of the *Lutheran Observer*, appeared Dec. 13, 1888, before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, at a hearing given the friends of the Blair Sunday bill, and represented that the German Lutherans were in favor of compelling the observance of Sunday by civil law. The following are his words as reported and published by the government :—

“I desire to speak for the evangelical portion of the German emigrants who are Lutherans and also reformed evangelical Christians, as we call them. In regard to their position on the Sabbath, while they differ relatively as to the basis on which the Christian Sabbath now rests, and also in regard to the manner of observing the Sabbath, they are, I should say, universally in favor of maintaining the Sabbath laws that exist in America.”¹

We know of individual Lutheran ministers who are *not* “in favor of maintaining the Sabbath laws that exist in America,” but we fear that Dr. Conrad’s representation is true of the majority. However, we will watch with much interest the attitude of Lutheran ministers toward the bill for a national Sunday law introduced into the House, April 5, 1894, by Mr. Johnson, of North Dakota.

APPENDIX II.

THE following from a standard publication of the Baptist Church, states clearly the position which the church has held from the days of Roger Williams, but which it violated in joining with other churches in petitioning Congress for a law closing the World’s Fair on Sunday :—

“The duty of the civil magistrate in regard to the observance of the Lord’s day.

“Christ said (John 18 : 36): ‘My kingdom is not of this world : if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews : but now is my kingdom not from hence.’ Here Christ refuses to employ physical force. His kingdom is not of this world ; and civil laws and the force of the magistrate are not the means to

¹ Senate Miscellaneous Documents, No. 43, 50th Congress, 2nd Session, p. 40.

promote its advancement. It is a kingdom of truth and love, because each man is a free moral agent under the government of God, he is accountable to God. This personal accountability to God carries with it the right of every man to decide for himself his religious belief and his worship. With these the State has no right to interfere. These rights of conscience are inalienable. For the protection of these, with other inalienable rights, States are organized, civil laws enforced, and magistrates elected. So far as religion is concerned, the sphere of the State is described in one word — PROTECTION. . . .

"However much we may deprecate the demoralizing tendencies of Sunday theaters and concerts, games and excursions, and the sale of candies and fruits and newspapers on the Lord's day, still we ask for legal restraint upon such things only in so far as they may *directly interfere with public religious worship*. As Christians, we ask of the State only protection in the exercise of our rights of conscience; and we will depend alone upon the truth of God and the Spirit of God to secure the triumph of Christianity. With an open field and a fair fight, Christianity is more than a match for the world, because 'the foolishness of God is wiser than men.' 1 Cor. 1:25. The almightiness of the Eternal God is in the cross. Hence Christ said: 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.'"—"*The Lord's Day*," pp. 29-31, by D. Read, LL. D.; American Baptist Publishing Society, 1420 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

Many earnest appeals were made by Baptist ministers against the denomination's leaving these principles and participating in the Sunday-law crusade. The following from the pen of Rev. G. W. Ballenger, of Chicago, as published in the *Daily Republican*, of South Chicago, March 7 and 15, 1892, will furnish a sample of these courageous protests:—

"Since I am left free to remain away from the Fair on Sunday, I do not consider that my rights are invaded, and I shall not invade the rights of others by asking that Congress, State legislatures, or National Commissioners compel them to act in harmony with my view of Sabbath sacredness.

"Personally, I wish that all men were consistent Christians, and that the Sabbath were universally observed; but all are not Christians, and all do not observe the Sabbath. Under these circumstances it is the duty of the Church to use the God-appointed means to accomplish these reforms. When these fail, the responsibility rests with the individual transgressor. Christians have no right to appeal to civil law to compel men to conform to their ideas of worship."

"I am opposed to securing compulsory Sabbath observance, either by laws avowedly in the interest of such observance, or under cover of purely civil enactment. I simply want the Sabbath institution to stand on its own eternal foundation, unaided by laws impelled by political strife, embittered by partisan feeling, as one of the blessed gifts of an all-wise and loving Creator to humanity for humanity's good. The blessings of the Sabbath will be realized by all who observe it, but when an institution of the loving Creator is made by any man or set of men, a means to coerce or render less happy the lives of others, then the Creator is dishonored,

religion is injured, and the individual is farther from the kingdom of God than though he had been left free to be won by the power of the gospel. . . . When we attempt by the power of the civil law to compel the observance of our ideas by others, an unseen hand will write, 'Ichabod' over our portals, and our glory will have departed forever."

APPENDIX III.

ONE of the most striking examples of the fall of American Protestantism from the principles of complete separation of Church and State is to be found in the Christian or Disciple Church. Alexander Campbell, the founder of the church, as early as 1820, combated certain "moral societies" of Western Pennsylvania,—the ancestors of the National Reform Association,—whose principal object was the enforcement of Sunday laws, in the following forcible style:—

"There is no precept or command in the New Testament to compel by civil law, any man who is not a Christian to pay any regard to the Lord's day, any more than any other day.

"Therefore to compel a man who is not a Christian to pay any regard to the Lord's day, more than any other day, is without authority of the Christian religion.

"The gospel commands no duty which can be performed without faith in the Son of God. 'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.'

"But to compel men destitute of faith to observe any Christian institution, such as the Lord's day, is commanding duty to be performed without faith in God.

"Therefore, to command unbelievers, or natural men, to observe in any sense the Lord's day, is anti-evangelical or contrary to the gospel."¹

Speaking of his motive in opposing these compulsory Sunday observance societies, he said:—

"I wrote from principle; I had no object in view but one; viz., the suppression of an anti-rational, anti-scriptural, and anti-constitutional confederation, that I conscientiously believe to be dangerous to the community and inimical to civil and religious liberty. And while I am able to wield a pen, I will oppose everything of the kind, from the same principles, that comes within the immediate sphere of my observation."²

When the movement was inaugurated, by which the churches compelled Congress to enact a law closing the

¹ "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," by Robert Richardson, p. 528. J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia. See also the *Washington Reporter* of Washington, Pa., Sept. 17, 1821.

² *Washington (Pa.) Reporter*, July 4, 1821.

World's Fair on Sunday, the denomination of Alexander Campbell repudiated the principles of its founder, and joined in the movement. A small minority vigorously protested, calling attention to the principles so persistently advocated by Mr. Campbell. These arguments were declared by Dr. D. R. Dungan, a leading light of the denomination, to be "streaked with insanity," and one of the organs of the denomination characterized those who maintained these views as "evangelical preachers out of color."

The following from the pen of one of the dissenting minority, Dr. J. L. Parsons; pastor of the First Christian Church of St., Louis, published in the *Christian Oracle* of Chicago, July 13, 1893, is worth a place by the side of the noble utterances of Mr. Campbell:—

"I am opposed to Sunday legislation. It is contrary to our Constitution and to the New Testament. On the same principles I am opposed to the American Sabbath Association (Union). It is itself anti-American and anti-evangelical. It is the same thing in principle that Mr. Campbell opposed in the moral societies of Washington county, Pennsylvania, seventy-five years ago. I stand by the principles of this great man on this question. In respect to seeking the aid of the State in maintaining its pet notions and institutions, Protestants are scarcely a whit better than Catholics. In seeking the aid of the national legislature to prevent worldly men from 'desecrating the Sabbath,' *Protestants are doing the same thing they condemn in Catholics.* Both Protestants and Catholics are wrong in this regard, and if either party succeeds, *it will bring ruin to both our civil and religious liberties.* May God defeat them both. Let us fight out the question of religion and of observing holy days, and especially the Sunday question, with the 'sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God,' and not with the sword of Cæsar."

Another Christian minister, Dr. James A. De Moss, writing in the *Christian Standard*, of Aug. 12, 1893, offers the following courageous protest against the part his denomination took in securing the law closing the World's Fair on Sunday:—

"What have we done?

"Our plea for apostolic Christianity, our plea for Christian union, our work and labors throughout the whole *restorative movement* for Christianity pure and unalloyed, our fights upon all things that bear the marks of Romanism, are marred by our action in the Sunday question that has been under agitation, and will be agitated for a few years yet to be.

"It seems now that we list to the misapplied Sabbath-day,—misapplied by the 'infallible pope,' and received as righteousness by the sectarian world. We excuse this action by differential statement, designating it the 'civil Sabbath.'

"What has constructed or made a 'civil sabbath'?—Law. Who takes law?—Man. Who made the Sabbath?—God. For whom did he make it?—For man. Can man make it for himself?—No. Then we bow before the force which takes the affairs of God into its own hands. Who is 'above all that is called God'?—The papacy. To whom and to what do we bow in this question of the 'civil Sabbath'?—To the pope and to Romanism.

"There can be no doubt but that this legislation upon the Sunday (Sabbath) question is a 'mark of the beast.' As a people who have vied in the creation and enforcement of this 'Sabbath law,' we have received upon our foreheads and upon our hands the 'mark of the beast.' We have not too much evidence that the first day of the week is the Lord's day; while we have conclusive evidence that the first day of the week is not the Sabbath day.

"If, as we infer, the first day *be* the Lord's day, then what authority have we to *enforce* the Lord's day upon the world, or expect its recognition by legal force? Or by what authority do we assume to exact from other brethren by legal force the rights of *honest, conscientious* worship on the only day embodied in the divine law? Church and State should not be combined. Our glorious brotherhood must not assist in combining them.

"If we engraft (it has been engrafted) in law the first day 'Sabbath,' then, indeed, as all law, it must be enforced. Besides injustice to very good and honorable people, we should know we have no right to enforce God's law upon the people that dwell in the earth, presuming it to be the Sabbath day, which we all know quite well it is not. As well might we exact a law to compel all men to be baptized, or fix in law what may constitute a Christian, or by law *create* Christians.

"A person out of Christ is no better by respecting, or being compelled to respect, a day of worship; for he is not spiritually or otherwise in the realm of worship, and therefore beyond the reach (jurisdiction) of God and the church; still this carnal law, when enforced (and enforced it will be sooner or later), has gotten higher than God.

"What now is 'higher than all that is called God'?—Why, it is papal authority, *unmistakably* and *certain*. And the 'saddest of all sad things' is that the Church of Christ has stultified itself in its actions in this matter, and taken one step backward toward Romanism.

"We have brethren who thoroughly understand this question, and this line of prophecy now under fulfillment, and know well these are facts we must confront.

"For shame! May not the General Convention further compromise our position upon these questions, by endorsing our national legislation upon the subject, or giving support by resolution or otherwise to a 'national Sabbath'—the beginning of the union of Church and State in America."