

# **The American Sentinel 7 (1892)**

**January 7, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 1 , p. 1.**

VETERANS of twenty-five years or more in the Russian service, under the Emperors Nicholas and Alexander II., are entitled, by virtue of their military service, to live anywhere they choose within the confines of the Russian Empire, and this privilege applies to Jewish veterans as well as to others. In order to evade this, and lay the heavy hand of expulsion upon this class of Jews also, the Russian Government has, unmindful of the public services of these old soldiers, deprived them of the right of worship, by closing their synagogues, and, as it is a grave penal offense to even read Jewish prayers in any place other than a regularly licensed synagogue, the denial of the right of worship is complete. Such things as these are evidences of the lengths to which the promoters of national religion will go in striving by its enforcement to make theirs a "Christian Nation."

IN the published report of his campaign, for Sunday observance at the World's Fair, in Iowa, M. A. Gault says: "We must be careful to avoid the Union of Church and State, but equally careful to prevent the State from antagonizing the Church. To open the Fair on Sabbath would necessarily shut out a large number of Sabbath-keeping Christians. It would be violating their civil liberty by putting them on an unequal footing before the law. The Government would thus pay a premium on infidelity and irreligion, for none but Sabbath breakers could find employment in the Fair or patronize it. It would seriously interfere with religious liberty, and violate the First Amendment of the National Constitution." Analyze this. Outside of the first phase there is not a sound statement in the paragraph. If the Church is the exponent of pure religion and the State of civil equity there can not be antagonism between them. If the Fair were open every day in the week no one would be shut out at any time. If closed one day all will be shut out on that day, most of them unwillingly. Absolute non-interference from the Government in this matter will alone bring perfect equality, anything else puts Christian believers on a different footing not only from unbelievers, but even among themselves. The Government would pay no premium, for as it has no proper authority

it would have assumed no improper responsibilities. To avoid interference does not interfere; and to obey does not violate. This seems a very superficial way to make the worse appear the better reason, yet it is a fair sample of the methods used by the religious legislationists.

**"The Situation as It Is To-day" *The American Sentinel* 7, 1 , pp. 1, 2.**

ANOTHER year has passed, and THE AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the seventh year of its publication. The evil work, to which it is THE SENTINEL'S business to call attention, has gone steadily and rapidly onward during the whole year. Although the year 1891 has not been one of so much legislative activity as have some of the years before it, yet the progress of the movement to join religion and the State, has been none the less rapid. In fact, as to real material progress, it is safe to say that the movement has gained almost as much in the past year as in any two years before.

In addition to its general strength the movement has made several important accessions. At the beginning of the year the allied organizations stood: The National Reform Association; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union; the Third-Party Prohibition Party; the American Sabbath Union; and the Catholic Church. There have been gained during the year, the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle; and the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor. The latter numbering more than eight millions of members, though a large number of them may be, just now, too young to count in a political way, will in a very few years be able and ready to bear a full part in the grand scheme to make the religious element superior to the civil power in this Government. As for the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle, its platform, throughout the whole United States, has furnished the freest channel and the widest open door for the propagation of the National Reform principles that has been found since the Woman's Christian Temperance Union joined the movement in 1886. And the Young Men's Christian Association, which has all along kept itself well aloof from the movement, is now becoming more and more a part of it.

In years past influential members of the legislative department of the national Government have proved themselves anxious to perform a prominent part in the scheme to make religion an essential branch of politics, and in the past year a large number of members have

shown themselves willing to do the same. The *Independent*, of this city, attempted a sort of census of the Sunday standing of members of the Fifty-first Congress. There was not a majority of the members who made answer, but a large majority of those who did reply, freely expressed themselves in favor of the governmental recognition of the sacredness of Sunday, by declaring their readiness to vote for congressional legislation to close the World's Fair on Sunday. The Fifty-second Congress is largely a new body and its attitude is yet to be manifested.

Until the past year the legislative was the only department of the Government that had been called upon, or had had an opportunity, to express itself upon this subject. During 1891, however, the judicial department of the national Gov-

2

ernment was called upon to view the question. And so far as the question has yet been discussed, by this department, the very least that can be said of it is that the question has been dealt with in a manner that should thrill with joy the very hearts of the most rabid National Reformers and would-be-persecutors in all the land. If the Supreme Court of the United States should adopt the views and confirm the opinions of the decision referred, then Heaven pity the individual who should ever venture to think or act for himself religiously in this country. As the victim of this particular piece of persecution is now dead, it is hardly likely that the Supreme Court will be called upon to notice the question as soon as was expected. And in view of the result, so far as the case did go, the people may count themselves fortunate that there is this prospective delay.

Of the three departments of the national Government the executive only remains untouched by this specific movement for securing governmental sanction to religion by direct and positive legislation enforcing religious observances. But in view of the record made by the present chief Executive it would seem that even there the way is fully open to the National Reformers as soon as they can succeed in carrying any of their measures that far. For President Harrison, not only, like several of his predecessors, went beyond the Constitution and issued a religious proclamation appoints a day of religious thanksgiving, but went even beyond them, so far as our knowledge goes, and actually assumed the prerogative of deciding what were the "*appropriate observances of the day*," one of which he declared to be "*worship in the public congregation*."

So far as our recollection goes, previous proclamation of this character only appointed the day and left the people free to decide for themselves what were the appropriate observances of the day. But President Harrison, not only appoints the day but, actually presumes to decide for the people what observances are "appropriate" and distinctly names "worship" as one of those things which are "appropriate." This is all logical enough it is true; for if it be the prerogative of the President of the United States to appoint a day for religious exercises, it is only proper enough that he should define the religious exercises that are appropriate to the occasion. He who decides that a day should be observed, is, as a matter of course, best qualified to decide *how* it should be observed. And it is but natural, and proper too, that those who would respect the appointment of a day of religious exercise should look to the same source for directions as to how it should be observed. But how much further will President Harrison or any other President ever have to go *in principle*, to assume entire control of the religious exercises and worship of the people and proclaim himself Pontifex Maximus at once in full feather?

No, no, such was not the view of the makers of the national Government. Madison, the chief worker in the cause, declared that "executive proclamations of fasts and festivals" are a "deviation from the strict principle of the immunity of religion from civil jurisdiction." And Jefferson, Madison's predecessor in the presidential chair, and his admirable colleague in the battle for religious freedom in Virginia, and in that for the Nation, declared that "No power to prescribe any religious exercise, or to assume authority in religious discipline, has been delegated to the general Government." This *ought* to be apparent to every person who can read these words of the United States Constitution. "*The powers not delegated* to the United States by this Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, *are reserved* to the States respectively, or to the people." Yet for more than a quarter of a century this plain provision has been habitually disregarded in this respect; and not only has the precedent distinctly supplanted the Constitution, but it grows more bold and advanced as time goes on. *And the people*, religious as well as otherwise, *love to have it so*. If not they would remember these weighty words of President Jefferson:—

I do not believe that it is for the interest of religion to invite the civil magistrate to direct its exercises, its discipline, or its doctrines; nor of the religious societies, that the general government should be invested with the power of effecting any uniformity of time or

matter among them. Fasting and prayer are religious exercises; the enjoining them, an act of discipline. Every religious society has a right to determine for itself the time for these exercises, and the objects proper for them, according to their own particular tenets; and this right can never be safer than in their own hands, *where the Constitution has deposited it.*

But instead of respecting the Constitution, which both in its provisions and its intent, has left to the individual this whole matter of religion to be exercised or not as to him seems proper, the chief executives of the Nation, in disregard of their oath to maintain the Constitution, have taken from the people this inalienable right. And the people, instead of jealously guarding this right and being grateful that the Constitution recognizes and guarantees its free exercise, dully submit to it all, and rather caress the hand that is steadily filching from them this inalienable right and inestimable privilege, which have been bought with such torrents of blood and such untold suffering.

In addition to all these things there has been in the past year a more rapid growth than ever before in the country, of the nefarious doctrine that the safety of the State and of Society as a whole is dependent upon the public and official recognition of religion, and that to deny it, is to commit a treason against the State and to strike at the very foundation of organized society. And, as THE SENTINEL has always pointed out, this point is made to turn entirely upon the Sunday institution. It is religion as signified by Sunday that is essential to the preservation of society and the State. It is the religion represented by Sunday that must be publicly recognized and established in order to preserve the State and save society. It is therefore held that to speak against Sunday, and above all to disregard it, is to commit treason against society and the State. Thus the disregard of Sunday is coming more and more to be recognized and declared to be the supreme offense against society and the State.

Upon this point too, during 1891, the Pope has come to the support of this doctrine, with the renewed proclamation that "It is we who are the chief guardian of religion;" and therefore enjoins "the obligation of the cessation of work and labor on Sundays and certain festivals;" declares that this "should be rest from labor consecrated by religion;" and that the Church "acts upon the decided view that . . . recourse should be had, in due measure and degree, to the help of the law and of the State authority."

And now even now as we enter upon the New Year everything possible is being done throughout the whole Nation, to secure the official recognition of Sunday and all that is involved in it, by congressional action. One of the very earliest bills introduced in the Fifty-second Congress, now in session, was one by Senator Paddock of Nebraska, to close the World's Fair on Sunday.

In view of all these things THE AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon its seventh year with its original and abiding convictions deepened that the Government of the United States, as founded by our fathers will be subverted, and will be made subject to a religious power; and that there will be here a union of religion and the State, with all its attendant evils, and the perfect likeness of the Papacy. The accomplishment of this is as certain as that time shall continue. The thing is only a question of time; and the time is short; for all things are now ready. Will the people ever awake?

A. T. J.

**January 14, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 2 , p. 9.**

HE is wise who never attempts to sunder those things which God hath joined, nor to join those things which God hath put asunder; and he who has this wisdom is he who has been taught of God.

IT is not man's physical, but his spiritual needs that are to be held in view in the Sabbath commandment. The Sabbath is intended to be a day in which to worship God—a day of holy remembrance of him and of meditation upon his works. The day is to be kept *holy*. If it is not kept holy, it is not kept at all. When the State undertakes to demand the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, it demands of men that which does not belong to it, but which belongs only to God. When the State undertakes to secure the observance of the Sabbath, it undertakes that which, to it, is an impossible task, because holiness is not an attribute of civil government, nor has it even the power or the authority to promote holiness.

THE importance to the American citizen at this time, of definite and correct conceptions of the distinct and separate spheres of civil law and ecclesiastical polity can not be over estimated. And yet, never in the political and religious history of this country has there been a time when such powerful agencies have been so actively engaged in

propagating deceptive and erroneous theories upon this question as at the present hour. The weight of the entire body of human precedent is used, and relied upon, the support not only the propriety but the duty of enforcing religious moralities by legal suasion. This reliance upon precedent has been established until it is no less an idolatry, in fact, than the ancestor worship of China.

The truth is, that the whole assumption upon which they proceed, who are now advocating legal interference, national, State, and municipal, in religious and moral questions, is established upon a purely human basis of blind adherence to the *dictum* of human authority, without in any way, subjecting it to test in the crucible of principle.

Unalloyed civil freedom in religious affairs is an achievement of religion pure and undefiled, which the unregenerate heart is unable to comprehend. Correct conceptions upon these questions, in their entirety can only come with a regenerate heart. It is not easy then to over estimate the value of proper views upon a problem in the true solution of which lies the secret of the truth of God; while the acceptance of error, in its solution, develops the mystery of iniquity.

**"Sunday Law Interest in the Masses and the Workingmen" *The American Sentinel* 7, 2 , pp. 9, 10.**

THE American Sabbath Union exists for no other purpose than to secure the enactment and the enforcement of Sunday laws. This too is solely in the interests of worship, religion and the Church. This is the only method which it employs or knows for the advancement of religion, or for the better observance of Sunday and the forms of worship that belong with it. This is well set forth in their own words, in an editorial in one of their own official organs. The *Michigan Sabbath Watchman* is "A monthly publication in the interest of the work of the American Sabbath Union, by Rev. Francis W. Ware," and in this paper for October, 1891, an editorial runs as follows:—

In sustaining the American Sabbath Union the churches are preparing the way of the churches and making their paths straight. Close out the Sabbath saloons, and make it impossible to run the theatres, shut up the cigar stands, ice cream saloons, and soda water fountains, and prevent baseball playing, put an end to railroad and other Sabbath excursions, *and the masses will the more easily be turned to the house of God.* Break down these

sacrilegious, but fascinating amusements, and *the Church will have the right of way* to our masses.

This is pretty strong, but in the same paper this zealous editor goes still further in calling for contributions in support of the work of the Union, under the heading "A Good Investment for the Churches," he lays out their designs in the following explicit style:—

If the churches of this State were to contribute \$10,000 this year to assist the American Sabbath Union to push its work, they would in our judgment make for themselves the finest possible investment. Money so invested would soon return to them with fine rates of interest. The money now spent in Sabbath desecration by those who are in large sympathy with the churches, but who are led off to the parks, on excursions, and to other places where money is spent freely, by the enchantments of music and scenery, and persons, would, *if our Sunday laws were enforced*, return to the churches and contribute to their support, and would find it much cheaper to do so than it now is to support the places and institutions they now do. The churches ought to sustain very liberally the Union out of self-defense and they will doubtless do it.

This shows just what the "civil" Sabbath plea of the American Sabbath Union amounts to; and it also shows just what kind of an *interest* this organization has in the "poor enslaved workingman."

Their interest in the workingman is simply "fine rates of interest" on the money which they invest in securing and enforcing "our Sunday laws."

Their advocacy of the rights of the "toiling masses" is simply the advocacy of the "right of way" of the churches to these same "masses" that "the masses may the more easily be turned to the" houses of the churches, and spend their money there instead of where they now do. And further, in their tender "interest" for the workingmen, they have found that it will be "much cheaper" for them to support the churches "than it now is to support the places and institutions they now do." What verdant and gullible creatures

10

they must suppose the workingmen of the United States to be!

Nor is the American Sabbath Union alone in this. The National Reform Association is the original organization in the United States, pledged to the enforcement of religious observances by law. This organization even demands the adoption of an amendment to the National Constitution "declaring this to be a Christian Nation;" "placing Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis;" and "enforcing upon all the laws of Christian morality."



And this Association, in national convention in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, in 1887, declared that "socialism, and anarchism, and Catholicism, are all trying to catch the workingmen; but National Reform must secure the workingmen, and *they can best be secured through the agitation of the Sabbath*, for workingmen do not want to work on the Sabbath."

The would be head of the Sunday Rest Leagues of the United States, W. F. Crafts, lately published (*Christian Statesman*, Dec. 11, 1891), the statement that "We fear that a majority of the workingmen can not yet wisely use eight hours a day of leisure."

It needs no proof to show that the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and the Sunday Rest League, are so closely allied as to be but simply different branches of the one grand scheme of the churches to gain control of the civil power to enforce upon all their arbitrary decrees.

Nor do we need to present any further evidence to demonstrate that the "civil" Sabbath plea is a deception and a snare; or that the professed interest of these preachers and organizations in the "poor enslaved workingmen" and "the toiling masses" is a fraud.

The editor-in-chief, of the leading labor journal in the United States, said lately, "We have discovered the hypocrisy in the claim that Sunday laws are only designed to enforce the 'civil' Sabbath." It seems strange how anybody with half an eye could fail to discover it.

The truth of the matter is that the workingmen, of the United States, have intelligence enough to know for themselves when they are oppressed or enslaved, and are abundantly able to apply the needed remedies for relief. The workingmen of the United States are not so ignorant, nor so childish, that the church managers need to assume the office of self-appointed guardians to decide for them when they are oppressed and when they are not; and when they are tired and when they are not; and whether they can safely be trusted with eight hours leisure a day.

Away with such presumptuous arrogance! Let the workingmen arise in their manliness and in the genuine dignity of labor, and denounce, as it deserves, and as the wicked thing that it is, this hypocritical "mothering," and fraudulent "interest," of the church managers in their evil devised schemes to invade the rights and liberties, not only of the workingmen, but of all the people. A. T. J.

**"Sunday at Toronto" *The American Sentinel* 7, 2 , pp. 11, 12.**

TORONTO, Ontario, has enjoyed for some years the perfect cessation of all forms of business on Sunday. The street cars are stopped and every wheel of commerce and industry ceases to move. But this "Sabbath hush" in Toronto, so often dwelt upon by the ardent admirer and advocate of Sunday laws, was destined to a great disturbance. A short time since the Mayor of the city called on the people to vote, on whether or not they would have the street cars on Sunday. As might be expected, the believers in Sunday laws are up in arms about it, and seem to think that the Mayor has done a very wicked thing in even thinking to submit this question to the people, or in any way stir it up.

G. M. Milligan, "Convener Toronto Ministerial Association Committee," in descanting upon the Mayor's proposition to the people and explaining a petition that his association is circulating, in regard to the proposed Sunday street cars, says in the *Mail*:—

The position of the association is that the proposition now made to run Sunday street cars is an invitation to this city to decide whether it shall or shall not desecrate the Lord's day. It is in short an invitation to debate whether we shall keep or break God's commandments. Such an invitation, when duly meditated upon, it to all right-minded people insulting alike to God and man. It is the duty of the people not to let pass this opportunity of telling the City Council that it went beyond its powers that God settled long ago for the good of men, when he enjoined that their secular occupa-

12

tions should give place to those directly and formally religious one day in seven, and that all activities on his holy day should be made to subserve their spiritual interests.

Judging from the whole tenor of Mr. Milligan's article, it seems that he does not mean what a strict analysis of the above language would convey. Yet nevertheless in his zeal he has inadvertently uttered an important truth. Does he mean it when he says "It is the duty of the people not to let pass this opportunity of telling the city council that it went beyond its powers when it asked the people to legislate upon matters which God settle long ago for the good of men," etc.? If the principle he states is correct, then when Toronto made her first Sunday law was when the wrong was committed. If God enjoins the observance of a day, nothing is added to it by enforcing it upon men by civil law. This is a cardinal point that should never be lost sight of. In giving man his time, God reserved to himself the seventh day to be

devoted to him and his worship. Civil law can only enforce idleness on that day. It can neither put religion or worship in it. Worship can only come from the individual who renders it of his own choice and from will. A man's time is his own, barring the exception of the seventh day, and that is a claim God alone has on him, and to be settled between him and God and not between him and the State. And Mr. Milligan stated a great truth in the above quotation, if he only means what he says.

**"Georgia Methodists and Sunday Closing" *The American Sentinel* 7, 2 , p. 14.**

AT the recent session of the North Georgia Conference of Southern Methodists, they passed resolutions calling on the managers of the World's Fair to close that exhibition on Sunday, and also pleading that Sunday rest be granted to the railroad men.

Let the Church work for the conversion of men, and leave the Fair to look after itself. And also let it tell the railroad men, and everybody else, that they now have the privilege to rest on Sunday if they wish to, and no one can hinder them. But the North Georgia Conference doubtless means by its vote that it wants the railroad men to be allowed to rest without any danger of losing his job. However a church that wants a man to be allowed to observe a religious institution without making any sacrifices, has certainly overlooked a very essential point in the teachings of Christ. If a man has convictions in the matter he should follow them regardless of business positions or anything of the kind. If he does not have convictions, he should not be compelled, by law, to follow what some one else may regard as right or duty.

RD:"4 BookSection">January 14, 1892

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 2 , p. 16.**

ROBERT BAIRD, of Edinburgh, writing on "Religion in America" in the year 1843, having narrated the story of the discovery and early settlement of North America says:—

He who "hath made of one blood, all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation," had resolved in this manner to prepare a place to which, in ages then drawing near,

those who should be persecuted for Christ's sake might flee and find protection, and thus found a Protestant empire.

This is a candid statement of the hope and expectation held by a certainly body of religionists, in reference to this country, nearly fifty years ago; that there might be founded here "a Protestant empire." The expression is without reserve, because at that time, and writing in Scotland, there was no need to veil such a thought behind any wordy sophistry, as now.

The idea that the new world should be a refuge for the persecuted of all nations meant, with them, always, persecuted Protestants; and it never so much as entered their minds that the Lord had opened a refuge for the down-trodden of any sect or denomination, or all; and also equally, for those who know not God or any church.

It is certain that man's ways are not God's ways. He did not direct that those who first took sanctuary in his city of refuge should monopolize its privileges and deny them to others.

THE ministers of Minneapolis, Minnesota, have presented to the common council of that city a draft of an ordinance in reference to Sunday amusements, containing six sections, in the drawing of which they have employed able legal counsel, and which they place before the city fathers with the evident assurance that in consideration of the source from which it originates, and the moral purpose it is to subserve, they must necessarily adopt it and enforce its regulations. Such systematic effort on the part of organized ministerial and religious bodies, with the intent to control of direct municipal government in the interest of their own views of moral and religious "reform," is no longer unique in this country. In fact, cities where such movements have not been inaugurated are now rather than exception than the rule. Over the entire country, from east to west, and from north to south, the delusion has passed that the State and the citizen must be evangelized, undergo moral reformation, by force of law, and that the clergy and the Church bear the responsibility, not only of asserting this as a fact, but of providing the necessary legal remedies, and securing the enforcement of them, with the application of their penalties. This is a remarkable condition of affairs to exist thus early in a country, the Government of which, national, State and municipal, was supposed to have been established on the principle of absolute separation of Church and State.

**January 21, 1892**

**"Abstract Principle Not Personal Interest" *The American Sentinel* 7, 3, pp. 19, 20.**

IT seems that the lately elected Corresponding Secretary of the American Secular Union has accepted and published the false ideas in reference to the principles of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, the National Religious Liberty Association, and the Seventh-day Adventists, as regards religious legislation, which Sunday-law workers have so industriously circulated. The inability of those who favor legislation upon religious subjects to understand that they who oppose them do so from love of the abstract principles of religious and civil right and duty, and from no selfish thought or purpose whatever, is phenomenal. So persistent is this misconstruction that it would seem a mental impossibility for them to conceive of any one acting from impersonal motives of abstract right. If they had stood by and heard Christ say, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do," they would have asked what possible advantage he could have expected to gain from such a speech as that.

The Corresponding Secretary of the American Secular Union, in an article in the *Boston Investigator*, gives credence to this mistaken idea as to the ground of opposition to religious laws and makes an unconscious quotation from some Sunday-law advocate in this paragraph:—

Said one to a prominent Adventist who was working against the Sunday law, "But if it were the observance of the old Jewish Sabbath that was to be enforced,—what then?" "Then," he said, "I should feel compelled to work for its enforcement."

The palpable error of any such statement as this is so fully and satisfactorily set forth in the *Investigator* of December 30, by C. B. Reynolds, Secretary, Washington Secular Union, that the article is here quoted almost entire:—

"This is a gross perversion of things. Every prominent Seventh-day Adventist working against the Sunday law is most thoroughly posted upon the subject. It would, therefore, be utterly impossible for such an one to have made such reply. The connecting paragraphs give evidence that this unprovoked attack upon our most efficient and influential co-workers was a mistake and a misrepresentation of the position of the Adventists.

"The Seventh-day Adventists are, without exception, the opponents of any union between Church and State, and earnest,

persistent workers for civil and religious liberty. Their National Religious Liberty Association is a large and powerful organization, with offices in New York City, Washington, D. C., Chicago, Illinois, Oakland, California, and Battle Creek, Michigan. Its mottoes are, 'Equal and exact justice to all'; 'Keep the State and Church forever separate.' Among its published and avowed principles I find: 'We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience,' and, 'we deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.'

"Its organ is THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, a most fearless, able and consistent opponent of Sunday laws, religious exercises in our public schools, and the exemption of Church property from taxation.

The Seventh-day Adventists have written, printed and distributed more pages of literature advocating the abolition of all Sunday laws, and giving the facts and arguments in favor of the entire and complete divorce of Church and State, in any one week during the past three years, than the American Secular Union, and all its auxiliaries have ever distributed from the day of its first inception up to the present hour.

"So far from 'suppressing free thought,' or 'strangling free speech,' the Seventh-day Adventists are honest, zealous defenders of free speech. Their leading ministers have attended our conventions, and from our rostrum most ably and eloquently advocated and defended the justice of the nine demands.

"The Seventh-day Adventists have a record upon the Sabbath and Sunday observance question that is plain and unmistakable. Their position is a matter of public and national record. The record of the Senate of the United States (see 50th Congress, second session, message and documents, No. 43, pages 75-102).

"On December 13, 1888, the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor held a hearing upon the bill for a national Sunday law, introduced by Senator Blair, who was chairman of that committee. At that hearing the Seventh-day Adventists were officially represented

20

by their honored and accredited exponent, Alonzo T. Jones, editor of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL. Before that committee this very point was brought out clearly and distinctly, over and over again. I give brief quotation:—

*Senator Blair.*—Would it answer your objection in that regard if instead of saying "the Lord's day," we should say, "Sunday?"

*Mr. Jones.*—No, sir. . . . If this bill were framed in behalf of the real Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, the day which we observe, if this bill proposed to promote its observance or to compel

men to do no work upon that day, we would oppose it just as strongly as we oppose it now.

*Senator Blair.*—You oppose all Sunday laws of the country, then?

*Mr. Jones.*—Yes, sir.

*Senator Blair.*—You are against all Sunday laws?

*Mr. Jones.*—Yes, sir. We are against every Sunday law that was ever made in this world, from the first enacted by Constantine to this one now proposed; and we would be equally against a Sabbath law if it were proposed; for that would be anti-Christian too.

"And this is the constantly avowed position of every one of their papers, publications, and ministers, and heartily indorsed by every Seventh-day Adventist in good standing.

"This whole argument of Elder Jones was published in pamphlet form and thousands of copies have been distributed.

"Nor is this the only record on the subject. On February 18, 1890, the house committee on the District of Columbia, held a hearing on a Sunday bill, introduced by Hon. W. C. P. Breckenridge. The Seventh-day Adventists were heard before this committee. I quote from the verbatim report of the speeches:—

*The Chairman.*—We desire to know in whose behalf you appear.

*Mr. Corliss.*—I speak in behalf of the Seventh-day Adventist church at Washington, of which I am pastor; I appear not as has been affirmed before you, to speak in behalf of a Saturday Sabbath. Far from it, gentlemen of the committee. If this bill No. 3,854 were to have incorporated into it instead of "Sunday," the first day of the week, the words "Saturday, or the seventh day of the week" there is no one who would oppose it stronger than I.

*Mr. Jones.*— . . . Congress can make no law upon the subject of religion without interfering with the free exercise thereof. Therefore the Seventh-day Adventists while observing Saturday, would most strenuously oppose any legislation proposed to enforce the observance of that day. Gentlemen, it is time for all the people to declare, as the Seventh-day Adventists decidedly do, that this Nation is, and of right ought to be, free and independence of all ecclesiastical or religious influence, connection, or control.

"In the case of 'State of Tennessee vs. King,' Judge Hammond in his decision of the case made false statements akin to those of the Corresponding Secretary of the American Secular Union. A full refutation was published in THE AMERICAN SENTINEL of November 19, giving copy of letter from Mr. Jones to Elder O. A. Olsen, President of the General Conference (the highest office in the Seventh-day Adventists' ranks).

"Mr. Jones quoted the statement made by the judge that 'his (King's) own religious feelings or fanaticism (is) that the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, should be set apart for the day of public rest and religious practices. This is what he really believes

and wishes, he and his sect; and not that each individual shall select his own day of public rest, and his own day of labor,' and asked, 'Is this true?' Elder Olsen replied:—

I have been personally connected with the Seventh-day Adventist denomination for more than thirty years, and I can freely say that no such belief or wish is entertained by this people. Our belief and wish is directly the opposite of that stated by the judge.

"There is no excuse for an avowed exponent of secularism being ignorant of these well known facts.

"The Corresponding Secretary of the American Secular Union has placed herself in the unenviable predicament of having in her first official publication made statements which are not only utterly unfounded, but which public and official records show to be untrue, and which all who have ever briefly conversed with any intelligent Seventh-day Adventist know to be untrue."

**January 28, 1892**

**"God the Moral Governor" *The American Sentinel* 7, 4 , p. 29.**

THE State has nothing whatever to do with interpreting and administering the law of God. Every man must answer for himself to God; which would not be the case if the State was permitted to come between the individual and God. In that case men would be responsible to the State, and the State to God; there would be in that case no direct accountability to God; the citizen would inquire, what does the State say, and knowing and doing the will of the State, the individual would be free. But such is not the plan of God. He has ordained civil government to regulate the civil affairs of men, and in civil matters men are responsible to the State; but in morals, men are answerable alone to God. He is the only moral governor and his law is the only moral law.

THE State can not make laws touching religion on the plea of its own responsibility; and the citizens do not need such laws, because each one is personally responsible to another tribunal infinitely higher than the State, for his standing in morals. Then all that the State can do, is to make laws prohibiting any man, or any set of men, from interrupting others in the enjoyment of their peculiar form of worship. Any law violating this principle, would work gross injustice to the whole people.



**February 11, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 6 , p. 41.**

LINCOLN'S immortal declaration expresses the American idea of government, "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people." That is, the people compose the government. It is a government in which the people act. In this government the people govern themselves. They do this by their own authority, by their own will, by their own power of government exerted upon themselves by themselves; and they do it for themselves, for their own good.

**"Morality and Civil Government" *The American Sentinel* 7, 6 , pp. 41, 42.**

THE SENTINEL has been criticized in the past for the statement that morality is a matter that does not come properly within the scope of civil government. Nevertheless the statement is literally true, and the position entirely tenable. *Morality*, as defined by Webster, is "The relation of conformity or non-conformity to the true moral standard or rule; . . . the conformity of an act of the divine law." The true moral standard is the law of God—the ten commandments. The keeping of the ten commandments is morality; the breaking of any one of them is immorality. The keeping of the ten commandments is righteousness; the breaking of any one of them is sin.

This true moral standard takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. To hate is murder; to covet is idolatry; to *think* impurely of a woman is adultery; and these things are immoral. Morality or immorality lies in the heart; it pertains to the thoughts and intents of the heart; and with it the State can have nothing at all to do. The civil government has nothing to do with hatred, nor with covetousness, nor with impure thinking; yet all these things are immoral. A man may hate his neighbor all his life; he may covet everything on earth; he may think impurely of every woman that he sees; he may keep this up all his days, and the State will not touch him, nor has it any right to touch him. It would be difficult to conceive of a more immoral person than such a man would be, yet the State can not punish him. And this demonstrates our proposition that with immorality the State can have nothing at all to do.

But only let the man's hatred lead him to attempt to do an injury to his neighbor, and the State will punish him. Only let his covetousness lead him to lay hands on what is not his, in an attempt to steal, and the State will punish him. Only let his impure mind lead him to attempt violence to any woman and the State will punish him. Yet, bear in mind, the State does not punish him even then for his *immorality*, but for his *incivility*. The State punishes no man because he is immoral, but because he is *uncivil*. It *can not* punish immorality; it *must* punish incivility. This distinction is shown in the very term by which we designate State or national government. It is called civil government; no person ever thinks of calling it *moral* government. The government of God is the only moral government. God is the only moral Governor. The law of God is the only moral law. To God alone pertains the punishment of immorality, which is the transgression of the moral law. Governments of men are *civil* governments, not moral. Governors of men are *civil* governors, not moral governors. The laws of States and nations are *civil* laws, not moral. To the authorities of civil government it pertains to punish *incivility*, not immorality. Thus again it is demonstrated, that with immorality civil governments can never of right have anything to do.

On the other hand, as God is the only moral Governor; as his is the only moral government; as his law is the only moral law; and as it pertains to him alone to punish immorality; so likewise *the promotion of morality* pertains to him alone. Morality is conformity to the law of God; it is obedience to God. But obedience to God, must spring from the heart in sincerity and truth. This is must do, or it is not obedience; for, as we have proved by the word of God, the law of God takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. But "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." By transgression all men have made themselves immoral. "Therefore by the deeds of the law [by obedience] shall no flesh be justi-

42

fied [accounted righteous or made mora] in his sight." Rom. 3:20. As all men have, by transgression of the law of God, made themselves immoral, therefore no man can, by obedience to the law, become moral; because it is that very law which declares him to be immoral. The demands, therefore, of the moral law, must be satisfied, before he can ever be accepted as moral by either the law of its Author. But the demands of the moral law can never be satisfied by an immoral person, and this is just what every person has made himself by

transgression. Therefore it is certain that men can never become moral by the moral law.

From this it is equally certain that if ever men shall be made moral, it must be by the Author and Source of all morality. And this is just the provision which God has made. For, "now the righteousness [the morality] of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness [the morality] of God which is *by faith of Jesus Christ* unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned [made themselves immoral] and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:21-33. It is by the morality of Christ alone that men can be made moral. And this morality of Christ is the morality of God, which is imputed to us for Christ's sake; and we receive it by faith in him who is both the Author and Finisher of faith. Then by the Spirit of God the moral law is written anew in the heart and in the mind, sanctifying the soul unto obedience—unto morality. Thus, and thus alone, can men ever attain to morality; and that morality is the morality of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ; *and there is no other in this world*. Therefore, as morality springs from God, and is planted in the heart by the Spirit of God, through faith in the Son of God, it is demonstrated by proofs of Holy Writ itself, that *to God alone pertains the promotion of morality*.

God, then, being the sole promoter of morality, through what instrumentality does he work to promote morality in the world? What body has he made the conservator of morality in the world? The Church or the civil power, which?—The Church and the Church alone. It is "the Church of the living God." It is "the pillar and ground of the truth." It was to the Church that he said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" "and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." It is by the Church, through the preaching of Jesus Christ, that the gospel is "made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." There is no obedience but the obedience of faith; there is no morality but the morality of faith. Therefore it is proved that to the Church and *not* to the State is committed the conservation of morality in the world. This at once settles the question as to whether the State shall teach morality. The State *can not* teach morality. It has not the credentials for it. The Spirit of God and the gospel of Christ as both essential to the teaching of morality, and neither of these is committed to the State, but both to the Church.

But, though this work be committed to the Church, even then there is not committed to the Church the prerogative either to reward morality or to punish immorality. She beseeches, she entreats, she persuades men to be reconciled to God; she trains them in the principles and the practice of morality. It is hers by moral means or spiritual censures to preserve the purity and *discipline* of her membership. But hers it is not either to reward morality or to punish immorality. This pertains to God alone, because whether it be morality or immorality, it springs from the secret counsel of the heart; and as God alone knows the heart, he alone can measure either the merit or the guilty involved in any question of morals.

By this it is demonstrated that to no man, to no assembly or organization of men, does there belong any right whatever to punish immorality in any way. Whoever attempts it, usurps the prerogative of God. The Inquisition is the inevitable logic of any claim of any assembly of men to punish immorality. Because to punish immorality, it is necessary in some way to get at the thoughts and intents of the heart. The Papacy asserting the right to compel men to be moral, and to punish them for immorality, had the cruel courage to carry the evil principle to its logical consequences. In carrying out the principle, it was found to be essential to get at the secrets of men's hearts; and it was found that the diligent application of torture would ring from men, in many cases, a full confession of the most secret counsels of their hearts. Hence the Inquisition was established as the means best adapted to secure the desired end. So long as men grant the proposition that it is within the province of civil government to enforce morality, it is to very little purpose that they condemn the Inquisition, for that tribunal is only the logical result of the proposition.

By all these evidences is established the plain, common-sense principle that to civil government pertains only that which the term itself implies—that which is *civil*. The purpose of civil government is civil and not moral. Its function is to preserve order in society, and to cause all its subjects to rest in assured safety by guarding them against all incivility. Morality belongs to God; civility, belongs to the State. Morality must be rendered to God; civility to the State. "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

A. T. J.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 6 , p. 48.**

THAT Sunday laws are and always were religious is shown by a mere glance at the British system, as set forth by Blackstone in his chapter on "Offenses against God and Religion." There "profanation of the Lord's day" is classed with such things as "apostasy," "heresy," "reviling the ordinances of the church," "non-conformity to the worship of the church," "witchcraft," "conjuraton," "enchantment," "sorcery," "religious imposture, such as falsely pretending an extraordinary commission from Heaven," adultery as an ecclesiastical offense cognizable by the spiritual court, and such confusion of civil and religious ideas as the punishment of drunkenness as an offense against God and religion. This is the company with which Sunday laws belong. The penalty for apostasy was, first, burning to death; this fell into disuse after a while. Then the penalty was that "for the first offense the offender should be rendered incapable to hold any office or place of truth."

**June 16, 1892**

**"A Judicial Profession of Christianity for the Nation" *The American Sentinel* 7, 24 , pp. 187, 188.**

[Extract from an address by A. T. Jones, delivered at Battle Creek, Mich., May 14, 1892, as reported in the *Review and Herald*.]

ON the 29th of February, 1892, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision that does more than any constitutional amendment could possibly do, or Congress either, to make the image to the Papacy. All that remains of whatever religious observances any bigots may choose, who can control the civil power.

Several years ago, Congress enacted a law forbidding any aliens to come to this country under contract to perform labor or service of any kind. The reason of that law was that large contractors in the United States, and corporations of great wealth who wanted to increase their wealth with as little expense as possible, would send agents to Europe to employ the lowest of the people whom they could get, to come over and work. They would pay their expenses over, and allow them to work it out at very small wages after they got over here. This was depreciating the price that Americans should receive for their labor, and therefore Congress enacted a law as follows:—

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation, or in any way assist or encourage the importation or migration of any alien or aliens, any foreigner or foreigners, into the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia, under contract or agreement, parol or special, expressed or implied, made previous to the importation or migration of such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, to perform labor or service of any kind in the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia.

A certain church corporation in New York City hired a preacher in England to come over here and preach for them. They contracted with him before he came. He was an alien, and came over under contract, to perform service for the church. The United States District Attorney entered suit against the church for violating this law. The United States Circuit Court decided that the church was guilty, and rendered judgment accordingly. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, upon writ of error.

The Supreme Court reversed the decision, *first* upon the well-established principle that "the intent of the law-maker is the law." The court quoted directly from the reports of the Senate Committee and the House Committee who had the bill in charge when it was put through Congress; and these both said in express terms that the term "laborer" or "labor or service," used in the statute, was intended to mean only *manual* labor or service, and not *professional* service of any kind. Therefore, that being the intent, and the only intent of the law, and the intent of the law-maker being the law, the Supreme Court reversed the decision of the lower court, and said that the act complained of was not a violation of the law.

So far as this goes, the decision is perfectly proper, and it needed to have gone no further. But between that paragraph and the closing paragraph of the decision, the declaring of this Nation to be "a Christian Nation," this making of the image of the Papacy, was stuck right in, as much out of place as anything could possibly be. It is altogether false; it is totally subversive of the Government of the United States as the people established it at first, and virtually makes an image to the Papacy. So I turn to that part of the decision.

After reviewing the act of Congress, the reports of the committees, etc., and deciding that the law had no such intent as the lower court gave it, the Supreme Court proceeds thus:—

But beyond all these matters, no purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, State or national, because this is a religious people. [Everybody knows that this is not true.] This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation.

Suppose it be granted that this is "historically true," what kind of religion was this "historical" religion? Was it of a kind that the people of the United States now desire to see perpetuated? We shall presently see what kind it is; and that whatever be the kind, or whether the people desire to see it perpetuated or not, it *is* perpetuated by this decision.

In order to get it before you in the most forcible way, I will first run down to the end of the decision, and show the interpretation and application which the court makes, of the Constitution as it respects religion. After citing "historical" statements which show that the Roman Catholic religion might be the religion of this nation; which establish the righteousness of religious test-oaths as a qualification for office; which require belief in the doctrine of the Trinity—the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, of course—and in the inspiration of the Old and New Testaments; and which establish the righteousness of Sunday laws,—after citing statements which establish the legality of all these religious things, then the court quotes from the First Amendment to the Constitution that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and upon this, flatly declares:—

There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and re-affirm that this is a religious nation.

Now when I read these "historical" statements, and you see what they say, and what they mean, you will know that is the estimation of the Supreme Court of the United States, *that is what the Constitution of the United States means*. I begin to read, as follows:—

From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affir-

188

mation. The commission to Christopher Columbus, prior to his sail westward, is from "Ferdinand and Isabella, by the grace of God, king and queen of Castile," etc., and recites that "it is hoped by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered," etc.

What religion did Ferdinand and Isabella have in mind when they issued that document? What religion did they profess? And what

religion did they *possess*, too? Does anybody know?—(From the audience, "The Catholic religion.") Yes, the Catholic religion. And not only that, it was the Catholic religion with the Inquisition in full swing. For it was Ferdinand and Isabella who established the Inquisition in Spain under the generalship of Torquemada; and who, because Spain was a "Christian nation," sentenced to confiscation of all goods and to banishment, every Jew who would not turn Catholic. And by virtue of such religious activity as this, Ferdinand and Isabella fairly earned as an everlasting reward, and by way of pre-eminence, the title of "THE CATHOLICS." And that is a part of the historical authority by which the Supreme Court of the United States makes American citizens "a religious people," and by which that court makes this a "Christian nation"!

Now that is quoted to prove that this is "a religious people" and "a Christian nation:" and it is declared that the language of Ferdinand and Isabella, and the language of the Constitution of the United States, "have one meaning."

Then in view of that quotation and this decision, should it be wondered at if the Catholic Church should claim that this is so indeed, and should demand favors from the government as such? Everybody knows that the Catholic Church already is not slow to take part in political questions, to interfere with the government, and to have the government recognize the Catholic Church and give it money from the public treasury. The people know that this is already the case. And now, when the Catholic Church is virtually recognized by official action of the Supreme Court, and when the Supreme Court declares that this is what the Constitution means, should it be thought strange if the Catholic religion should claim that that is correct, and act upon it?

It is true, the Supreme Court does not stick to this side of the question all the way through, but turns over to the Church of England, and to Puritan Protestantism. But this rather intensifies than modifies the danger, as it opens the way for a strife among these religions, to see which shall be indeed the religion of the Nation. This decision opens the way for that thing to be done, and all that the message tells about will come as the consequence of this.

As the intentions of Ferdinand and Isabella did not reach the part of the continent now occupied by the government of the United States, the court now proceeds to introduce documents which give to



Protestantism the prior right here, and which do in fact make this the national religion, so I read:—

The first colonial grant, that made to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584, was from "Elizabeth, by the grace of God; of England, France, and Ireland, queene, Defender of the Faith," etc.; and the grant authorizing him to enact statutes for the government of the proposed colony; *Provided*, That "they be not against the true Christian faith nowe professed in the Church of England." . . . Language of similar import may be found in the subsequent charters, . . . and the same is true of the various charters granted to other colonies. In language more or less emphatic, is the establishment of the Christian religion declared to be one of the purposes of the grant.

This establishes as the religion of this nation and people the religion "professed in the Church of England" in Queen Elizabeth's time. What religion was this? The queen's title of "Defender of the Faith" will help us to understand this. That title was obtained in this way: Henry VIII., Elizabeth's father, wrote a book against Martin Luther and the Reformation. He sent a copy of his book to the pope. In return, the pope bestowed upon him the title and dignity of "Defender of the Faith." And this was the Catholic faith.

**June 23, 1892**

**"A Judicial Profession of Christianity for the Nation" *The American Sentinel* 7, 25, p. 196, 197.**

[Further extracts from an address by A. T. Jones, delivered at Battle Creek, Mich., May 14, 1892, as reported in the *Review and Herald*.]

WHEN Henry VIII wanted a divorce from his wife the Pope could not make his political ends meet so as to grant it; and Henry took the matter into his own and Cranmer's hands, and divorced both his wife and the Pope. This separated the Church in England from the Catholic Church. Then that which had formerly been the Catholic Church *in* England, became the Church *of* England, the only difference being that Henry was head of the church instead of the Pope. Thus Henry still maintained his title of "Defender of the Faith," and it was the same faith—except only as to the head of it.

Under Edward VI., a few very slight steps were taken further away from the absolute Catholic faith. Under Mary, a powerful effort was made to bring all back into full harmony with the papal religion. Mary

soon died, and Elizabeth succeeded, and would have been glad to complete Mary's scheme, but could not, and was obliged to be content with things as they were left by Edward, for the nation and people, while in her own private individual life, she inclined strongly to the papal religion outright. So that the sum of the matter is, that the religion professed in the Church of England in Queen Elizabeth's time, was a religion which was just as near to the Roman Catholic religion as was possible, without being precisely that religion.

And this is the religion which the Supreme Court of the United States finds to be historically intended to be established here, and which by this decision the court declares now to be established here, according to the meaning of the Constitution of the United States; because the language of the Constitution and the language of all these other documents *is one language*, "having one meaning." It is to be expected also that the religion established should be as much like the papal religion as possible, without being precisely that religion itself, as the prophecy says that it would be said "that they should make an image to the beast"—the Papacy.

Yet the court does not propose to be partial, nor presume to establish strictly this particular phase of religion without giving any other any chance or recognition. It proceeds next to introduce Puritanism, as follows:—

The celebrated compact made by the Pilgrims in the "Mayflower," 1620, recites:—

"Having undertaken *for the glory of God and Advancement of the Christian Faith*, and the honor of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the ends aforesaid."

Having thus established what it chooses to declare to be "the Christian faith" as the religion of this Nation, the court next proceeds to cite historical evidence that it is legitimate to use the civil power to maintain "the disciples of the churches." This is done by citing the compact of the Puritans who settled Connecticut, as follows:—

Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Almighty God by the wise dispensation of his dinyne prudence so to Order and dispose of things that we the inhabitants and Residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and vppon the River of Conectecotte and the Lands thereunto adioyneing; And well knowing where a people are gathered together, the word of

God requires that to mayntayne the peace and vnion of such a people there should be an orderly and decent Government established according to God, to order and dispose of the affayres of the people at all season as occation shall require; doe therefore assotiate and conioyne ourselues to be as one Publike State or Comonwelth; and *doe, for our seluce and our Successors and such as shall be adjoined to us all day tyme hereafter, enter into Combination and Confederation together, to mayntayne and preserve the liberty and purity of the gospel of our Lord Jesus wch we now pfesse,* AMS ALSO THE DISCIPLYNE OF THE CHURCHES, *wch according to the truth of the said gospel is now practiced amongst vs.*

By this "historical" citation, the Supreme Court just as certainly establishes and justifies the employment of the "Civil Body Politick" for the maintenance of "the discipline of the churches," as by the previous ones it establishes the Christian religion as the religion of this nation. And this decision declares that the language of this citation and the language of the national Constitution is "one language," "having one meaning." By this, therefore, the Supreme Court has decided that the civil power, even of the United States government, can rightly be employed to maintain the discipline of the churches. And this, as we know and have shown over and over again, is exactly what the churches are aiming to bring about by the national enforcement of Sunday laws; and this is precisely what is done by the enforcement of Sunday laws, either State or national. And this the decision of the Supreme Court fully establishes by its decision, and sanctions and justifies by its (mis)interpretation of the national Constitution.

So far, therefore, in this decision, we find a national religion established with the maintenance of the discipline of the churches. What next?—Why, the requirement of the religious oath of witnesses, and the religious test oath as a qualification for office. After citing William Penn's grant of privileges to the province of Pennsylvania, and the Declaration of Independence, in which "the Creator," "the Supreme Judge of the world," and "Divine Providence" is referred to, and the constitution of Illinois, in which God is recognized, the court quotes from the Constitution of Maryland, as follows, and for the purpose of establishing the legality of the religious oath and the religious test oath:—

"That as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore, no

person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless, under the color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace, or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights; nor ought any person to be compelled to frequent or maintain or contribute, unless on contract, to maintain any place of worship, or any ministry; nor shall any person, otherwise competent, be deemed incompetent as a witness, or juror, on account of his religious belief; *Provided*, He believes in the existence of God, and that, under his dispensation, such person will be held morally accountable for his acts, and be rewarded or punished therefor, either in this world or the world to come."

"Provided he believe in the existence of God." That is, in other words, no man ought to be interfered with in his profession or principles of religious belief, *provided* he holds these according to the dictates in all the history of the Catholic Church. It is the very doctrine of the papacy. It was also the doctrine of pagan Rome, before the Papacy supplanted it. Paganism declared that "no man should have particular gods of his own, except they are recognized by the laws of the State." But the court continues this quotation, providing further:—

That no religious test ought ever to be required as a qualification for any office of profit or trust in this State, *other than a declaration of belief in the existence of God*; nor shall the Legislature prescribe any *other* oath of office than the oath prescribed by this Constitution.

That is the provision and the requirement of the constitution of Maryland. But, says the Supreme Court, that speaks the same language as the Constitution of the United States, and that the Constitution of the United States and this quotation have "one meaning." And although the Constitution of the United States positively declares that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under this government, this decision says that it *means* that no *other* religious test shall ever be required, as does the constitution of Maryland, for these documents "all" have "one language" and "one meaning."

So, then, we find that so far, this decision establishes a national religion, with the maintenance of the discipline of the churches, and the requirement of the religious oath in court, and the religious test-oath as a qualification for office. And what next?—Why, public taxation for the support of religion. This is justified and established by a quotation from the constitution of Massachusetts, as follows:—

It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society, publicly and at stated seasons, to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and Preserver of the universe. . . . As the happiness of a people and the good order and preservation of civil government essentially dependent upon piety, religion, and morality, and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community but by the institution of the public worship of God, and of public instructions in piety, religion, and morality: Therefore, to promote their happiness and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and *the Legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require, the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies-politic or religious societies to make suitable provision, at their own expense, for the institution of the public worship of God, and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily.*

And says the court, This document and the Constitution of the United States have the same language, have "one meaning," and both alike, with all the other quotations, "speak the voice of the entire people." So far, then, by this decision there is es-

197

tablished here a national religion, with maintenance of the discipline of the churches by the civil power, the requirement of the religious oath and the religious test-oath, and public taxation for "the worship of God" and for "the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of religion." The wicked thing grows rapidly as it goes.

**June 30, 1892**

**"A Judicial Profession of Christianity for the Nation" *The American Sentinel* 7, 26 , pp. 204, 205.**

[Further extracts from an address by A. T. Jones, delivered at Battle Creek, Mich., May 14, 1892, as reported in the *Review and Herald*.]

JUSTICE BREWER'S decision establishes and justifies the requirement of all officials, of a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity and the inspiration of the Scriptures by a quotation from the constitution of Delaware, of 1776, as follows:—

"I. A. B., do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed forevermore; and I do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be given by divine inspiration."

And the doctrine that is held all through the decision, that this thing and the Constitution speak the same language and have one meaning, is just at this point emphasized in the following words:—

Even the Constitution of the United States, which is supposed to have little touch upon the private life of the individual, contains in the First Amendment a declaration common to the constitution of all the States, as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And also provides that the Executive shall have ten days (Sundays excepted) within which to determine whether he will approve or veto a bill. [And there is a sly recognition of Sunday observance as constitutional.] There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and re-affirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons; they are organic utterances; they speak the voice of the entire people.

Having now established a religion for "the entire people," with all the appurtenances thereto, the court cites and sanctions the declaration of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, that "Christianity is, and always has been, part of the common law," and then proceeds to establish the doctrine that it is blasphemy to speak or act in contempt "of the religion professed by almost the whole community." And this is done by citing the pagan decision of Chief Justice Kent of New York, which "assumes that we are a Christian people."

There remains but one thing more to complete the perfect likeness of the whole papal system; and that is the direct and positive sanction of Sunday laws. Nor is this one thing lacking. It is fully and completely supplied. As before observed, it is broadly hinted at in the quotation last made above. But the court does not stop with that; it proceeds to cite the Sunday laws as one of the "organic utterances," which proves conclusively that "this is a Christian Nation." The words of the Court are as follows:—

If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life, as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs, and its society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth. Among other matters, note the following: The form of oath universally prevailing, concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the custom of opening sessions of all deliberative bodies, and most conventions, with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills, "In the name of God, Amen;" *the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath*, with the general cessation of all *secular* business, and the closing of courts, legislatures, and other similar public assemblies on that day. . . . *These*, and many other matters which might be noticed, *add a*

*volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances*  
that THIS IS A CHRISTIAN NATION.

Now let us sum this up and see what has been done: There is a national religion established, and it is called Christianity and Protestantism. With this there is also specifically justified and established as the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, (1) the maintenance of the discipline of the churches by the civil power; (2) the requirement of the religious oath; (3) the requirement of the religious test-oath as a qualification for office; (4) public taxation for the support of religion and religious teachers; (5) the requirement of a belief in the Trinity and the inspiration of "holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments;" (6) the guilt of blasphemy upon every one who speaks or acts in contempt of the established religion; (7) and laws for the observance of Sunday, with the general cessation of all secular business. All this is declared by unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, to be the meaning of the Constitution of the United States.

Now what more was ever the Papacy than that? What more than that was ever required by the Papacy?—Not one thing. And all this is declared in favor of Protestantism. What, then, is this but the legal establishment, and that by the highest court of the government,—What then is this but the legal establishment of the very likeness of the Papacy? If there is one here who does not think so, then I wish he would tell us what more needs to be done, or what more could be done, to make the likeness of the Papacy, in the *principle* of the thing?—in principle, I say, not yet in its practical workings, for life has not yet been given to it. But so far as the *making* of the things goes, and the establishment of the principles of it, the likeness of the Papacy is made in this decision.

Look at it from another standpoint. Suppose an amendment to the Constitution has been passed by Congress and presented to the people for adoption. Suppose that amendment had recited in a preamble these very historical statements here cited by the Supreme Court, and then upon that had declared that this is a Christian Nation. What then ought Seventh-day Adventists to think? I do not say, what would they think, but what ought they to think? Ought they not to think that if that should be adopted and become a part of the Constitution of the United States, that the image to the beast would be made? I think they ought, don't you? But even more than this has been and is now actually done by this decision. If such an amendment were even

adopted, and so were made a part of the Constitution, it would still remain for the Supreme Court to define the meaning of it. But the Court has already done all this.

The Court has traced the whole course of religious purposes in government from Ferdinand and Isabella down "to the present hour," and has declared that this is the "meaning" of the Constitution *as it now stands*. This is the unanimous voice of the authoritative interpreter of the Constitution. Legally, and so far as the

205

governmental action is concerned, what the Supreme Court says the Constitution means, that *is* what it means. Such, then, being the officially declared meaning of the Constitution as it now is, what more could be done even by an amendment containing these very statements, when it would still remain for the same court to declare its meaning?

This decision, therefore, is actually stronger, if anything, than an amendment would be in itself. Consequently if we would be justified in saying to the people that such an amendment would be the making of an image to the beast, how much more are we justified in lifting up the voice and saying to all people that this is the making of the image to the beast, that that image is now made, and that this decision opens the way for the fulfillment in completest meaning, of all that the third angel's message announces and warns against.

Now do not misunderstand. I do not say that the image is living and speaking and acting. I only say that in principle it is made. There yet remains that life shall be given to it, that it shall speak and act.

**July 21, 1892**

**"Front Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 28 , p. 217.**

LET none misunderstand the position of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL; it is that while men have been, and still are, required to yield something to the majority in matters of religion, yet no such requirement ever has been, or ever can be, just. Religious belief is a matter which properly rests solely with the individual. Religion pertains to man's relationship to God, and is the man's personal relationship of faith and obedience, of belief and observance, toward God. Every man has therefore the personal, individual, and inalienable right to believe for himself in religious things.



AND this right of the individual to believe for himself in religious things, carries with it the same personal, individual and inalienable right *to dissent* from any and every other phase of religious belief that is held by anybody on earth. This right is recognized and declared by Jesus Christ, not only in the words in which he has commanded every man to render to God that which is God's, while rendering to Cesar that which is Cesar's, but likewise in the following words: "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not, for I can not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him. The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day."

THE word which Christ spoke was the word of God. The one who is to judge, therefore, is God; and in the last day he will judge every man for the way in which he has acted. To this judgment the Lord Jesus refers every man who refuses to believe and rejects his words. If any man hears Christ's words and believes not, but rejects him and his words, Christ condemns him not, judges him not; but leaves him to the Judge of all, who will render to every man according to his deeds, in the last day.

In these words, the Author of Christianity, the Saviour of the world, has clearly recognized and declared the right of every man to dissent from every religion known to mankind; and even the religion of Christ itself, being responsible only to God for the exercise of that right. He wants every man to believe and be saved; but he will compel none. Christ leaves every man free to receive or reject, to assent or dissent, to believe or disbelieve, just as he chooses; his responsibility is to God alone, and it is the individual who must answer for himself in the last day. "So then every one of us shall give account of *himself* to God." Rom. 14:12.

WHOEVER therefore presumes to exercise jurisdiction over the religious belief or observances of any man, or would compel any man to conform to the precepts of any religion, or to comply with the ceremonies of any religious body, or would condemn any man for not believing or complying—whoever would presume to do any such thing, puts himself above Jesus Christ, and usurps the place and prerogative of God, the Judge of all.

SUCH is the doctrine of the free exercise of religion, as announced by Jesus Christ himself. And such is the doctrine upon this point that will ever be held by every one who respects that glorious Being. Thus is declared and established by the Author of all

true religion, *the inalienable*, the divine, *right of dissent*. And such is the *divine right* of the freedom of religious belief.

NOR is this all in this connection. The founders of the Government of the United States recognized this divine right as such, and established the exercise of it as an inalienable *civil* right, "by refusing to treat faith as a matter of government, or as having a headship in a monarch or a State;" by excluding all religious tests; and by forbidding Congress ever to make "any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." In short, by prohibiting the law-making power from making any law whatever upon the subject of religion.

THE people of Tennessee following this example of the makers of the national Government established in that State that *divine* right, as also an inalienable *civil* right, by declaring in the Constitution of the State that "no human power can in any case whatever control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship." But the courts of the State have nullified that provision and declare that by the laws of that State the conscientious observer of the seventh day is a nuisance if he quietly labors on Sunday, and thus outrages the religious feeling or prejudice of his neighbors.

**"Some Scraps of Early New England History" *The American Sentinel*  
7, 28 , p. 218.**

**(Condensed from "*Two Republics*."**

THE early history of New England is the history of the Puritans, whose rise was on this wise: To escape the persecutions by Mary, in her attempt to restore Catholicism as the religion of England, many members of the Church of England fled to Germany. The worship of these while in exile was conducted by some with the rites of the Church of England as established under Edward VI, while others adopted the Swiss or Calvinistic form of worship. This caused a division, and much contention between them. "The chief scene of these disturbances was Frankfort." Those who maintained the English form of worship were called *Conformists*, and those who advocated Calvinistic forms, were called *Non-Conformists*. The contentions finally grew so bitter that the Conformists drove the Non-Conformists out of the city.

At the accession of Elizabeth, November, 1558, the exiles returned to England carrying their differences with them. There the Non-Conformists acquired the nick-name of "Puritans." They were not only not separate from the Church of England, but it was not the purpose of the Puritans to separate from either the church, or the government, of England. It was their set purpose to remain in, and a part of, both, to "reform" both, and create and establish instead a Puritan Church of England, and a Puritan government of England.

As Elizabeth saw that the Puritan party was rapidly growing, she thought to check it by enforcing uniformity according to the established usage. Elizabeth zealously supported, if not led, by the Archbishop of Canterbury and his subjects, exerted all her power to crush the Puritans. And though the persecution was cruel, they bore it all with patience; first, because every effort that was made to crush them only multiplied their fame and influence a hundred-fold, and, second, because they lived in strong hope of better days, when James of Scotland should come to the throne.

James, though a Presbyterian, continued the war which Elizabeth had already waged against the Puritans and Congregationalists. They were so persecuted and abused by all classes, as well as by the officers of the law, that in 1608, they fled to Holland, stopping first at Amsterdam to Holland, stopping first at Amsterdam, and afterward going to Leyden in 1609. From there a company of these Pilgrims, sailed and landed at Plymouth, New England, in 1620.

The success of this venture suggested to the Puritans a new scheme. Was not here an opportunity to establish a complete and unabridged Puritan government? And was not the way fully opened, and the opportunity easy to be improved? Enough! They would do it. A company was formed, a grant of land was obtained, and John Endicott, with a company of sixty, was sent over in 1628. They joined a fishing settlement at the place afterward called Salem on Massachusetts Bay.

In 1629 a royal charter was obtained, creating "The Government and Colony of Massachusetts Bay in New England;" and four hundred and six people, led by Francis Higginson, were sent over, and Endicott became governor of the whole colony.

A Puritan or Calvinistic government was at once established and put into working order. A church was immediately organized according to the Congregational form, with Higginson and Samuel Skelton as the ministers. All, however, were not inclined to

Puritanism. Two persons of the former company at Salem, John and Samuel Browne, took the lead in worshipping according to their own wish, conducting their service after the Episcopal order, using the book of common prayer. Their worship was forbidden. The Brownes replied, "You are Separatists, and you will shortly be Anabaptists." The Puritans answered, "We separate, not from the Church of England, but from its corruptions. We came away from the common prayer and ceremonies, in our native land, where we suffered much for non-conformity; in this place of liberty we cannot, we will not, use them. Their imposition would be a sinful violation of the worship of God." In return the Brownes were rebuked as Separatists; their defense was pronounced sedition; their worship was declared mutiny; and they were sent back to England as "factious and evil-conditioned men," Endicott declaring that "New England was no place for such as they."

Higginson died in the winter of 1629-30. In 1630 there came over another company led by John Winthrop and Thomas Dudley, who were the governor and deputy-governor to succeed Endicott. "Their embarkation in 1630 was the signal of a general movement on the part of the English Puritans. Before Christmas of that year seventeen ships had come to New England, bringing more than one thousand passengers." Dudley's views of toleration and liberty of conscience are expressed in the following lines, which he wrote:—

Let men of God in courts and churches watch  
O'er such as do a toleration hatch,  
Lest that ill egg bring forth a cockatrice  
To poison all with heresy and vice.

And Winthrop's estimate of the preachers is seen in his declaration that "I honored a faithful minister in my heart, and could have kissed his feet." It was therefore not at all strange that under the government of Winthrop and Dudley in 1631, the following law should be enacted:—

To the end this body of the commons may be preserved of honest and good men, it is ordered and agreed that, for the time to come, no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same.

"Thus the polity became a theocracy; God himself was to govern his people; and the 'saints by calling,' . . . were, by the fundamental law of the colony, constituted the oracle of the divine will. . . . Other States have confined political rights to the opulent, to free-holders, to the first-born; the Calvinists of Massachusetts,

refusing any share of civil power to the clergy, established the reign of the visible church, a commonwealth of the chosen people in covenant with God."

This was the Calvinistic system precisely. The preachers were not to hold office in itself, but they were to be the rulers of all who did. For, as no man could be a citizen unless he was a member of the church; and as none could become members of the churches or even "propounded to the congregation, *except they be first allowed by the elders*;" this was to make the preachers supreme. This is exactly the position they occupied. They were consulted in everything, and everything must be subject to their dictation.

How these Puritans, who had themselves fled from persecution in Europe, further used the power that they acquired in Massachusetts, will have to be told in subsequent numbers of THE SENTINEL.

**"Note" *The American Sentinel* 7, 28 , p. 222.**

STRANGE as it may seem, according to the decisions of the District and Supreme Courts of Tennessee and of Judge Hammond, of the United States Court, there is in Tennessee to-day, no constitutional guarantee of any freedom of religious belief beyond that which was allowed in New England two hundred and fifty years ago.

In sustaining the decision of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, Judge Hammond said:—

Sectarian religious belief is guaranteed by the Constitution, not in the sense argued here, that King, as a Seventh-day Adventist, or some other as a Jew, or yet another, as a Seventh-day Baptist, might set at defiance the prejudices, if you please, of other sects having control of legislation in the matter of Sunday observance; but only in the sense that he himself should not be disturbed in the practices of his creed; which is quite a different thing from saying that in the course of his daily labor . . . he might disregard laws made in aid, if you choose to say so, of the religion of other sects.

The Judge's meaning, is made clear by a further extract, as follows:—

If a non-conformist of any kind should enter the church of another sect, and those assembled there, were required, every one of them, to comply with a certain ceremony, he could not discourteously refuse, because his mode was different, or because he did not believe in the divine sanction of that ceremony, and rely upon this constitutional guarantee to protect his refusal.

This is precisely the measure of freedom of religious belief that was "guaranteed" or allowed under the Puritan theocracy of New

England. The Congregational Church had control of legislature. It embodied Congregationalist doctrines in the law, and required every one to conform to the Congregational mode of worship. Every one was required to go to church. And some who did not go were forcibly taken to the church. The Baptists and Quakers did not believe in the divine sanction of the ceremonies of the established religion. They therefore refused to comply. Their refusal, of course, was counted "discourteous." This discourtesy was a violation of the law, and they were fined; but they refused either to pay the fines, or to comply with the required ceremonies. They were then whipped; still they refused. They were then banished, and yet they refused; and the Quakers even refused to be banished. Then they were hanged; and yet those who still lived would not comply with the required ceremonies. *And they had no constitutional guarantee to protect them in their refusal.*

And now says Judge Hammond, in Tennessee, "If a non-conformist of any kind refuses to comply with a certain ceremony required of every one by another sect which has control of legislation, *there is no constitutional guarantee to protect his refusal.*" And the persecution of the Seventh-day Adventists in that State under the forms of civil law demonstrates that it is even so.

**July 28, 1892**

**"As It Was Then So It Is Now" *The American Sentinel* 7, 29 , p. 227.**

LIKE the four Adventists now in the Henry County, Tenn., Jail, the subjects of persecution for conscience' sake have always been accused of contumacy. In pagan Rome, even those governors who cared little for the worship of the gods, and had nothing to gain either in wealth or influence by persecuting the Christians, could see in their refusal to obey the laws made in aid of paganism, nothing but willful obstinacy and downright stubbornness. As related in the "Two Republics," they regarded such willful disobedience to the law to be much more worthy of condemnation than even the disrespect to the gods. Such an one was Pliny, who said, "Let their confessions be of any sort whatever, this positiveness in inflexible obstinacy deserved to be punished." Many of the governors "would sooner pardon in the Christians their defection from the worship of the gods, than their want of reverence for the emperors in declining to take any part in those idolatrous demonstrations of homage which pagan flattery had

invented, such as sprinkling their images with incense, and swearing by their genius."

Still others were disposed to be favorable to the Christians, to sympathize with them in their difficult positions, and to temper as far as possible the severity of the laws against them. And when the Christians were prosecuted before their tribunals, they would make personal appeals to induce them to make some concession, however slight, that would justify the governor in certifying that they had conformed to the law, so that he might release them,—not only from that particular accusation, but from any other that might be made.

Such governors would plead with the Christians to this effect, "I do not wish to see you suffer; I know you have done no real harm, but there stands the law. I am here as the representative of the empire to see that the laws are enforced. I have no personal interest whatever in this matter; therefore, I ask you for my own sake that you will do some honor to the gods, however slight, whereby I may be relieved from executing this penalty and causing you to suffer. All that is required is that you shall worship the gods. Now your God is one of the gods; therefore what harm is there in obeying the law which commands to worship the gods without reference to any particular one? Why not say, 'The Emperor our lord,' and sprinkle a bit of incense toward his image? Merely do either of these two simple things, then I can certify that you have conformed to the law, and release you from this and all future prosecutions of the kind."

When the Christians replied that he could not, under any form or pretense whatever, worship any other god than the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ; not honor any other by any manner or offering; nor call the emperor lord *in the meaning of the statute*, then the governor, understanding nothing of what the Christian called conscience, and seeing all of what he considered the kindest possible offers counted not only as of no worth but even as a reproach, his proffered mercy was often turned into wrath. He considered such a refusal only an evidence of open ingratitude and obstinacy, and that therefore such a person was unworthy of the slightest consideration. He held it then to be only a proper regard for both the gods and the State to execute to the utmost the penalty which the law prescribed.

Another thing that made the action of the Christians more obnoxious to the Roman magistrates, was not only their persistent disregard for the laws touching religion, but their assertion of *the right*

to disregard them. And this plea seemed the more impertinent from the fact that it was made by the despised of the despised.

**"Some Scraps of New England History" <sup>11</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 29 , pp. 228, 229.**

THE Puritans having planted themselves in Massachusetts, and having established there a theocracy, were not slow, as we have seen, to use their power against all dissenters from the established religion. In 1631 Roger Williams landed in Boston, and as the death of Higginson had left a vacancy in the church at Salem, the church called Williams to fill his place; but as Winthrop and his "assistants" objected, Williams went to Plymouth Colony.

The leading minister in Massachusetts Colony at this time was John Cotton. He distinctly taught the blessedness of persecution in itself, and in its benefit to the State, in the following words:—'

But the good brought to princes and subjects by the due punishment of apostate seducers and idolaters and blasphemers, is manifold.

*First*, it putteth away evill from among the people, and cutteth off a gangrene, which would spread to further ungodlinesse. . . .

*Secondly*, it driveth away wolves from worrying and scattering the sheep of Christ. For false teachers be wolves, . . . and the very name of wolves holdeth forth what benefit will redound to the sheep, by either killing them or driving them away.

*Thirdly*, such executions upon such evil doers causeth all the country to heare and feare and doe no more such wickednesse. . . . Yea, as these punishments are preventions of like wickednesse in some, so are they wholesome medicines, to heale such as are curable of these eviles. . . .

*Fourthly*, the punishments executed upon false prophets and seducing teachers, doe bring downe showers of God's blessings upon the civill state . . . .

*Fifthly*, it is an honor to God's justice that such judgments are executed. . . .

And Samuel Shepard, a minister of Charlestown, preached an election sermon

229

entitled "Eye Salve," in which he set forth the following views:—

Men's lusts are sweet to them, and they would not be disturbed or disquieted in their sin. Hence there be so many such as cry up tolleration boundless and libertinism so as (if it were in their power) to order a total and perpetual confinement of the sword of the civil magistrate unto its scabbard (a motion that is evidently destructive



to this people, and to the publick liberty, peace, and prosperity of any instituted churches under heaven).

Let the magistrate's coercive power in matters of religion, therefore, be still asserted, seeing he is one who is bound to God more than any other man to cherish his true religion; . . . and how woful would the state of things soon be among us, if men might have liberty without controll to profess, or preach, or print, or publish what they list, tending to the seduction of others.

In accordance with these principles, every inhabitant of the Colony was obliged to attend the services of the Established Church on Sunday under penalty of fine or imprisonment. The fine was not to exceed five shillings, equal to about five dollars of the present day, for every absence.

About 1633 Roger Williams was called a second time to the ministry of the Salem church. This time he was allowed to take the place; but it was not long before he was again in trouble with the theocrats. He denounced their laws making church membership a qualification for office, and all their laws enforcing religious observances.

He declared that the worst law in the English code was that by which they themselves when in England had been compelled to attend the parish church; and he reprov'd their inconsistency in counting that persecution in England, and then doing the same things themselves in New England.

They maintained, as argued by Cotton, that "persecution is not wrong in itself. It is wicked for falsehood to persecute truth, but it is the sacred duty of truth to persecute falsehood." And, as stated by Winthrop, that "we have come to New England in order to make a society after our own model; all who agree with us may come and join that society; those who disagree may go elsewhere; there is room enough on the American continent.

Roger Williams told them that to compel men to unite with those of a different faith is an open violation of natural right; and that to drag to public worship the irreligious and the unwilling, is only to require hypocrisy. "Persons may with less sin be forced to marry whom they cannot love, than to worship where they cannot believe." Accordingly he insisted that "no one should be bound to worship or to maintain a worship against his own consent."

At this the theocrats inquired with pious amaze, "What, is not the laborer worthy of his hire?" To which Roger replied in words which they could not fail fully to understand, "Yes, *from them that hire him.*"

The view that the magistrates must be chosen exclusively from membership in the churches, he exploded with the argument that with equal propriety they should select a doctor of physic or the pilot of a ship, because of his standing in the church.

Against the statements of Cotton and Shepard and the claims of the theocrats altogether, as to the right of the magistrate to forestall corrupting influences upon the minds of the people, and to punish error and heresy, he set the evident and everlasting *truth* that "magistrates are but the agents of the people or its trustees, on whom no spiritual power in matters of worship can ever be conferred, since conscience belongs to the individual, and is not the property of the body politic; . . . the civil magistrate may not intermeddle even to stop a church from apostasy and heresy; this power extends only to the bodies and goods and outward estate of men."

The theocrats raised the alarm that these principles subverted all good government. To which he replied: "There goes many a ship to sea, with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth or a human combination or society. It hath fallen out sometimes that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked in one ship; upon which supposal I affirm that all the liberty of conscience that ever I pleaded for turns upon these two hinges, that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews, or Turks be forced to come to the ship's prayers or worship, nor compelled from their particular prayers or worship, if they practice any." "The removal of the yoke of soul-oppression, as it will prove an act of mercy and righteousness to the enslaved nations, so it is of binding force to engage the whole and every interest and conscience to preserve the common liberty and peace."

He also denied the right of the compulsory imposition of an oath. The magistrates had decided to require an oath of allegiance to Massachusetts, instead of to the king of England. Williams would not take the oath, and his influence was so great that so many others refused also that the government was compelled to drop the project. This caused them to raise a charge against him as the ally of a civil faction. The church at Salem stood by him, and in the face of the enmity of the theocrats elected him their teacher. This was no sooner done than the preachers met together and declared that any one who should obstinately assert that "the civil magistrate might not intermeddle even to stop a church from apostasy and heresy," was

worthy of banishment. A committee of their order was appointed to go to Salem and deal with Williams and the church "in a church way."

Meantime the people of Salem were punished for choosing him for their teacher, by the withholding of a tract of land to which they had laid claim. Williams was ready to meet the committee at every point in expressing and defining his doctrines, and in refuting all their claims. After the committee had returned, the church by Williams wrote letters to all the churches of which any of the magistrates were members, "that they should admonish the magistrates of their injustice." By the next general court the whole of Salem was disfranchised until they should apologize for these letters. The town and the church yielded. Roger Williams stood alone. He was able and willing to do it, and at once declared his "own voluntary withdrawing from all these churches which were resolved to continue in persecuting the witnesses of the Lord," and "hoped the Lord Jesus was sounding forth in him the blast which should in his own holy season cast down the strength and confidence of those inventions of men." In October, 1635, he was summoned before the chief representatives of the State. He went and "maintained the rocky strength" of his position, and declared himself "ready to be bound and banished, and even to die in New England," rather than to renounce his convictions.

By the earnest persuasions of Cotton, the general court of 1635, by a small majority, sentenced him to exile, and at the same time attempted to justify the sentence by the flimsy plea that it was not a restraint on freedom of conscience, but because the application of the new doctrine to their institutions seemed "to subvert the fundamental state and government of the country." In January, 1636, a warrant was sent to him to come to Boston and take ship for England. He refused to go. Officers were sent in a boat to bring him, but he was gone. "Three days before, he had left Salem, in winter snow and inclement weather, of which he remembered the severity even in his late old age. 'For fourteen weeks he was sorely tost in a bitter season, not knowing what bread or bed did mean.' Often in the stormy night he had neither fire, nor food, nor company; often he wandered without a guide, and had no house but a hollow tree. But he was not without friends. The respect for the rights of others which had led him to defend the freedom of conscience, had made him the champion of the Indians. He had learned their language during his residence at Plymouth; he had often been the guest of the

neighboring sachems; and now, when he came in winter to the cabin of the chief of Pokanoket, he was welcomed by Massassoit; and 'the barbarous heart of Canonikus, the chief of the Narragansetts, loved him as his son to the last gasp.' 'The ravens,' he relates, 'fed me in the wilderness.'"

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 29 , p. 232.**

THOSE officers of the law who excuse themselves when persecuting men for conscience' sake by saying, "It is the law," would do well to ponder Rev. 1:7: "Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, *and they also which pierced him.*" The poor soldiers acting under orders might well have pled, "It is the law;" yet God holds them to strict account for their part in the death of Christ. Nothing excuses participation in the persecution of the people of God.

THE *Twentieth Century* thinks that Christianity has ceased to exist, except in name, because we now hear nothing of the Father who is a "jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation;" and because there is now no burning at the stake here as a preparation for the hereafter. But Christianity has not ceased to be because of these things. There is less genuine Christianity in the world than formerly, but not because of the modified conceptions of God's character. "God is love," and all his dealings with his creatures are tempered with love. And it is this love implanted in the heart by the divine Spirit that transforms the nature and makes the man a Christian; for "he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." The decay of vital piety in the last days, and the reason for it, is thus foretold by the Apostle Paul, 2 Tim. 3:1-4:—

This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despiser of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God.

The trouble is that men love themselves more than they love God. As a natural result they are "without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good." And so while it is true that we have not now burning at the stake, we do have fines and imprisonment for conscience' sake; and social

ostracism, religious boycott, and political blackmail, all in the interests of degenerate Christianity. The more modern tortures are none the less real because more refined.

**August 4, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 30 , pp. 233, 234.**

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is in the seventh year of its publication. From the first number that was ever issued, it has been telling the people that in the national Government, though forbidden by the Constitution, there would be established a national religion; and that there would be national Sunday legislation at the demand of the churches.

ALL of this is now done by the United States Supreme Court decision of February 29, 1892, and by Congress, in the act closing the World's Fair on Sunday. In these two governmental actions there lies wrapped up, and only waiting for swift development, all that THE SENTINEL has been telling about, and warning against, these seven years.

WE knew it was coming. We knew it would be done. And this is why we so continuously and so earnestly protested, and warned the people, against it. We knew not exactly *how* this thing would be done; we only knew *that* it would be done; but we knew enough about the evil thing, to be able to recognize it when it should be done, by whatever way it might be done. We have protested against the doing of this great evil; and now we protest against the thing since it is done. We protest against the evil principle itself, and we protest and shall continue to protest against any and all the consequences of the principle.

WE had the right to protest against the establishment of a national religion; and we have the right to protest this national religion now that it is established. We had the right to disagree with the ecclesiastical combination which was bending every effort to secure the establishment of a national religion; and now that they have secured exactly what they have been demanding, we still have the same right to disagree with them. We had the right to dissent from the propositions, the doctrines, and the dogmas of this ecclesiastical combination, before the United States Government took their side of the controversy and championed their cause; and we have the same

right still. In other words, we have the divine and everlasting right to dissent from any and every religious organization on earth; and when the Government joins a religious organization, then we have the same right still, and the right extends now to that of refusal of obedience to the Government itself, *in so far* as it is joined to the religious organization.

THE one great object of the grand movement to secure governmental recognition of religion was to secure legislation by which Sunday observance could be enforced throughout the Nation, backed up by national power and influence. We protested against their movement, and disputed their right, to use the governmental power for any such purpose. Now that they have secured it, we still dispute their right to use it. We had the right to dissent from their claim of right to use the Government for any such purpose; and we have still the right to dissent from their use of the governmental power for this purpose. We had the right to refuse to keep Sunday when it was required by the churches without the aid of the Government; and we have the same right to refuse to keep it when it is required by the churches *with* the aid of the Government. In other words, governmental aid of churches in enforcing their dogmas and ordinances can not take away any man's right of dissent from those dogmas and ordinances. The Government does wrong in aiding the churches; and men do right in dissenting from both churches and Government in the things wherein they are allied.

IT was lack of power to convince the people that they ought to keep Sunday as the Sabbath, that caused the churches to demand the governmental power to aid in compelling the people to do this. Lacking the power to persuade the people, the churches resorted to power to compel the people to observe the ordinance of the Church. The religious controversy, as to whether Sunday is a sacred day or not, has been going on in the United States longer than has the movement to secure the recognition or declaration of the national Government that it is. Those who demand that Sunday shall be observed have admitted over and over again that there is no divine command for it. And the effort of these churches to secure the alliance and aid of the Government was only an effort to get the national Government to take their side of this controversy. They now have the Government committed to this. In the effort to gain this they have been boastful, and arrogant, and insolent, enough, in all conscience, as has been abundantly shown by their own words all

these years. If any one is inclined to think they will be any less so, now that they have their wish, then the writer only wishes that that one could have sat where he did, in the gallery of the House, when the final vote was taken by which Congress committed the Government to their side of the controversy, and could have seen and heard their exultation.

IN this act of closing the World's Fair on Sunday, Congress has distinctly taken sides in a religious controversy. Congress in this, and the Supreme Court in its decision, have committed the Government of the United States to the decision of a religious controversy. Neither the act of Congress nor the decision of the Supreme Court, will convince the Jew or the Christian who observes the seventh day, that Sunday should be observed. No

234

more will the National Reformers be able to convince these with the aid of the power which these acts give, to inflict pains and penalties upon dissenters. We disagreed with the National Reformers before; we disagree with them now. We denied before that Sunday should be observed; we deny now that it should be observed. We refused before to keep Sunday; we refuse now to keep Sunday. We rejected before, the National Reform claim of right to use the governmental power to compel anybody to keep Sunday; and although they have secured the use of the power, we reject now their right to use it.

ALL these years we have denied the right of Congress to legislate in behalf of Sunday or any other religious rite or institution. We denied this wholly upon *principle*. We protested against Sunday legislation because it is religious legislation. We would have protested equally if it had been proposed to legislate in behalf of any other religious day. We can appeal to the life of THE SENTINEL as clear evidence that this has always been the one prominent feature and reason of our protest against Sunday legislation. And as long as the question had maintained this standing only, so long would this have still been the prominent feature of our protest. Now, however, the question has changed; and the prominent feature of our protest changes accordingly. Congress has now legislated upon the subject. Congress has now decided and has committed the Government to the decision that Sunday is the Sabbath and shall be observed. And now we protest against it, not only because it is religious legislation, but above all, *because it is not true*. In this act Congress has committed itself and the Government to a falsehood.

SUNDAY is not the Sabbath. Sunday is not the Lord's day. Sunday is not in any sense a sacred day. As before stated, the chiefest advocates of this Sunday legislation admit in writing that there is no divine command for the observance of Sunday in any way. they know that the only authority for it is the authority of the church. And if they do not know, they, and everybody else who will look into the question, may learn that "the church" which is authority for Sunday sacredness is *the Catholic Church*, and that alone. And they may likewise know that professed Protestants who keep Sunday, are following the authority of the Catholic Church, and that alone, for there is no other authority for Sunday observance whether by church rulers or governmental statute. And Congress in requiring the observance of Sunday, is requiring of the Catholic Church, for there is no other authority for Sunday observance. It was therefore perfectly fitting that in the chief speech that was made in favor of the Sunday bill in the Senate (the speech of Senator Hawley of Connecticut), the chief place in the speech should be given to the views of Catholic archbishop upon the subject. But the authority of the Catholic Church is no authority at all; it is only usurpation and fraud, and its Sunday sacredness is a falsehood. Therefore it is that the Congress of the United States, in legislating in behalf of Sunday observance, has committed itself, and the Government of the United States, to a falsehood. And not only to a falsehood, but to a *Papal* falsehood. And we refuse to recognize it or yield any respect to it as either true or right.

THE Seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, and Sunday is not the Sabbath. The seventh day is the Lord's day, and Sunday is not. The seventh day is the sacred day and the only sacred day, and Sunday is not at all a sacred day. For thus saith the Lord:—

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 manservant, nor thy maidservant, 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.

"And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. 2:3.



This is the position and the protest of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL now and always.

A. T. J.

**"Some Scraps of New England History" <sup>21</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 30 , pp. 234, 235.**

THE act of 1631 making membership in the church a test of citizenship had involved the Massachusetts theocrats in another dilemma. There was a considerable number of people who were not members of the churches, and because of unfitness could not be admitted. Even more than this, they did not want to be admitted. But as membership in the church was necessary to citizenship, and as they wanted to be, and deemed it their right to be, citizens, they took to organizing churches of their own. But the theocrats were not willing that power should slip through their fingers in any such way as this; they found not only a way to escape from the dilemma, but with that to make their power more absolute. In 1635 the following law was enacted:—

Forasmuch as it hath bene found by sad experience, that much trouble and disturbance hath happened both to the Church and civil State by the officers & members of some churches, wch which have bene gathered. . . . in an vndue manner, . . . . it is . . . . ordered that . . . this court doeth not, nor will hereafter approue of any such companies of men as shall henceforth ioine in any pretended way of church fellowship, without they shall first acquainte the magistrates, & the elders of the greatr of the churches in this jurisdicon, with their intencons, and have their approbacon herein. And ffurther, it is ordered, that noe peson, being a member of any churche which shall hereafter be gathered without the approbacon of the magistrates, & the greater pte of the said churches, shall be admitted to the freedom of this comonwealthe.

Mrs. Hutchinson was condemned, but happily escaped with her life. A few days after her condemnation, the governor sent her a warrant banishing her from the territory of Massachusetts. At the solicitation of Roger Williams, she and her friends went to Narragansett Bay. Miantonomoh made them a present of the island of Rhode Island, where they settled.

In 1636 about a hundred people, under the leadership of Thomas Hooker, a minister second only to Cotton in the estimate of the colonists, removed from Massachusetts Colony to the valley of the Connecticut, and established there the towns of Springfield, Windsor,

Hartford, and Wethersfield; and January 14, 1639, Springfield preferring to remain in the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, the three remaining towns established a form of government under eleven "fundamental orders," the preamble of which is as follows:—

Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Almighty God by the wise disposition of his divine providence so to order and dispose of things that we, the inhabitants and residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and upon the river of Connecticut and the lands thereunto adjoining; and well knowing where a people are gathered together, the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such a people there should be an orderly and decent government established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons as occasion shall require; do therefore associate and conjoin ourselves to be as one public state or commonwealth; and do for ourselves and our successors and such as shall be adjoined to us at any time hereafter, enter into combination and confederation together, to maintain and pursue the liberty and purity of the gospel of our Lord Jesus which we now profess, as also the discipline of the churches which according to the truth of the said gospel is now practiced amongst us; as also in our civil affairs to be guided and governed according to such laws, rules, orders, and decrees as shall be made, ordered, and decreed.

Order number four was to the effect that the governor should "be always a member of some approved congregation, and formerly of the magistracy within this jurisdiction." The oath of office for the governor was as follows:—

I, \_\_\_\_\_, being now chosen to be governor within this jurisdiction, for the year ensuing, and until a new be chosen, do swear by the great and dreadful name of the everliving God, to promote the public good and peace of the same, according to the best of my skill; as also will maintain all lawful privileges of this commonwealth; as also that all wholesome laws that are or shall be made by lawful authority here established, be duly executed; and will further the execution of justice according to the rule of God's word; so help me God in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The oath of the magistrate was substantially the same. Unlike Massachusetts, church membership was not required in order to be a voter. Persons became citizens by vote of the major part of the town where they lived, or the major part of such as should be then present and taking the "oath of fidelity."

In 1637 a colony of Puritan immigrants with John Davenport as their pastor, arrived in Boston, and remained until the spring of 1638, then founded the town and colony of New Haven. In 1639 a colony

from New Haven settled the town of Milford, and another company from England settled the town of Guilford. In the same year a form of government was established, and "by the influence of Davenport it was resolved that the Scriptures are the perfect rule of the commonwealth; that the purity and peace of the ordinances to themselves and their posterity were the great end of civil order; and that church members only should be free burgesses." A committee of twelve was appointed to nominate seven men to become magistrates. In August the seven met together to put into working order the forms of the new government. "Abrogating every previous executive trust, they admitted to the court all church members; the character of civil magistrates was next expounded 'from the sacred oracles;' and the election followed. Then Davenport, in the words of Moses to Israel in the wilderness, gave a charge to the governor to judge righteously; 'The cause that is too hard for you,' such was part of the minister's text, 'bring it to me, and I will hear it.' Annual elections were ordered; and God's word established as the only rule in public affairs." The other towns followed this example, and thus "the power of the clergy

235

reached its extreme point in New Haven, for each of the towns was governed by seven ecclesiastical officers known as 'pillars of the church.' These magistrates served as judges, and trial by jury was dispensed with, because no authority could be found for it in the laws of Moses.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 30 , p. 240.**

CIRCUIT JUDGE SWIGGART, of Tennessee, in ordering the Seventh-day Adventists to prison, also ordered that they, "educate their consciences by the laws of Tennessee." And this in the face of the Constitution of Tennessee which plainly declares that "no human authority can in any case whatever interfere with or control the rights of conscience"! And thus again, he who sits to judge man "according to the law," commands these same men "contrary to the law." See the original instance in Acts 23:1-3.

ARE the civil laws of Tennessee the moral enactments of God, that men shall educate their consciences by them? Does God judge of the righteousness of the citizens of Tennessee by the measure of their subjection to Tennessee statutes, and that alone? IF the Tennessee statutes are the educational standards for the consciences of the

citizens of that State, who made the laws of Tennessee? The State, or the citizens of the State, or Jehovah? If the State made the laws, and the citizens are the State, then the citizens have established the standard for their own consciences, and are a law unto themselves,—their own God. If the State, which is a corporate body of their creation, can make laws to which their consciences must be educated, then the State is their God, and they are themselves above it, for they have made it.

THE difference then between the idolaters of India and of Tennessee is that the one worship the works of their hands and the other the creations of their minds. It is as true of the one as it is of the other that they neither know nor understand the true God and the all-reaching justice of his eternal law. Their eyes are shut that they can not see the difference between sin and righteousness, legalized injustice and divine equity. Their hearts are hardened against their fellow-citizens who do not bow down and worship the god which they have made, the image which they have set up. The image which the King of Babylon made, on the plain of Dura, was no more an idol than is this self-made fiction of pseudo-sacredness which the State of Tennessee puts in its statute books, and to which it requires that men shall bow. The bowing to the image of brass was idolatry; the bowing to the fiction of law would be no less idolatry.

NOW that Congress has committed itself and the Government to the fallacy and the falsehood of Sunday sacredness, the next thing in order will be for it to commit itself to that other widespread fallacy and falsehood—the immortality of the soul. Nor need we expect it to stop there. And, indeed, why should we? Having entered the field of religious controversy, and taken sides in one point of dogma, why not go the whole course? Nor is it sufficient to ask, Why shall it not do it? the real question is now, How can it possibly keep from doing it?

IN the two leading speeches in the United States Senate (those by Hawley and Hiscock), in favor of Sunday closing of the World's Fair, the chief of all the arguments used was that the churches demanded it and it should be granted, because it was "not wise statesmanship" to disregard the demands of so large a number of religious people. This is precisely the doctrine enunciated by United States District Judge Hammond. It may, therefore, now be considered as the established doctrine of the Government of the United States. Consequently, all that now remains, is for the churches to demand a thing, and they will surely get it; for they are officially notified that it is

"not wise statesmanship" to disregard their demands. Thus, in this Sunday legislation, there is fully established the doctrine of Church domination of the civil power, and using it for whatever purpose *she* chooses.

This is but the establishment of a religious despotism. This is precisely what THE AMERICAN SENTINEL has always been saying was in this question of Sunday legislation. And nothing but the most tyrannical and unmitigated despotism will or can ever come out of it.

UNITED STATES senators have declared it to be "not wise statesmanship" to disregard the demands of the churches for legislation deciding a religious controversy as to whether Sunday is the Sabbath or not. Now why shall not this principle apply in other cases? Why shall not the Spiritualists now work up some issue by which they can demand legislation which will decide the question as to whether or not people are alive when they are dead? There are as many Spiritualists as there are church members; and, of course, it would not be "wise statesmanship" to disregard their demands. Besides this, they would have the unanimous and hearty support of all "the evangelical churches" in the country. And as Congress has granted the demands of the churches alone on this Sunday-Sabbath question, how much more would the same body grant the demands of the same ones over again with largely increased numbers with them. For such would only be "wise statesmanship," according to the latest definition of the term. What queer ideas these gentlemen have of what statesmanship is! The truth is that it is not statesmanship at all. It is sheer demagogism; and that of the worst sort. These gentlemen should be told that statesmanship does not pander to the selfish and arbitrary demands of classes; it creates sound and healthy public opinion.

THE influence of this religious demagogism in the Congress of the United States has been shown during this session in the passage of the proviso for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair; in the confirmation of an ordinance for the punishment of profanity in the District of Columbia; and by a favorable decision upon the Sunday ice bill for the District by the House and District Committee of the Senate. The Supreme Court has decreed this to be a Christian Nation. Will the citizens of the United States be invested with natural immorality by decree of the Court or by act of Congress.

**August 11, 1892**

**"The Gospel: What It Is, and Its Work As Opposed to the Mystery of Iniquity" <sup>31</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 31 , pp. 242, 243.**

Text: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. 28:18-20.

THAT which they were to teach all nations is spoken of by Mark as "the gospel," going into all the world and preaching the gospel to every creature. He that believes not shall be damned. But according to Luke, the Saviour said unto them, "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." Luke 24:49. Then in Acts 1:5-8:—

For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But *ye shall receive power*, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.

All these verses are essential for us to know the full force of the commission which the Lord gave his disciples at that time. They were to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, teaching that to all nations; and yet they were not to go until they were endued with power from on high. It would have been useless for them to go until that time; because the gospel is itself the power of God unto salvation, and the preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes. And for them to go for the thinking to preach the power of God when they themselves were not acquainted with that power, would have been simply to preach empty words; it would not have been the gospel, because the gospel is the power of God. This is what the Lord himself has called it, the power of God unto salvation. And to preach that gospel, I say again, is to preach the power of God. Any professed

preaching of that gospel, which is not the preaching of *the power of God*, is not the preaching of the gospel of God at all, it is not the preaching of the gospel of Christ. It may be preaching *about* the gospel, or it may be preaching another gospel; but it is not the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Therefore he would not have them go at all to say anything about this, to attempt to preach it, until they were endued with the power of that gospel itself, the power of God, the power from on high. Then when they should receive power, the Holy Ghost coming upon them,—then he said they should bear witness in Jerusalem, in Judea, in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

In the first chapter of 1 Corinthians, beginning with the 17th verse, is Paul's record of his connection with this gospel, and what he was called to preach: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." Then with Paul the preaching of the gospel was the preaching of the cross of Christ. Next verse: "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God." Then the preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the cross of Christ, and *that* is the preaching of the power of God; for *Christ is the power of God*, as he says in a further verse, and the wisdom of God. So I read on:—

"For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness."

The Greeks sought after wisdom, and the Lord sent them that which they counted only foolishness. The Jews required a sign, and the Lord gave them that which they turned only into a stumbling-block. The Greeks sought after wisdom, and God gave it; but they would not take it, for they counted it only foolishness. The Jews required a sign, and God gave it; but they would not receive it because it came not just as they wanted; therefore they turned it into a stumbling-block, and got no good out of it. "The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ

crucified" "unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, *Christ the power of God*, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is stronger than men."

Now notice, "We preach Christ crucified." Unto them who are called, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God. That is what men are sent to preach; because that is the gospel. And the weakness of God is stronger than men, and the foolishness of God is wiser than men. But notice, they were not sent to preach *weakness*; they were sent to preach *power*, even the power of God, and they preached it. But even if they had been sent to preach the weakness of God, it would have been stronger than anything men can do or know. Then the thing for men to do is to accept it when God sends it,—accept it; for even though it be counted the weakness of God, it is stronger than anything men can get hold of, or create anyway.

Then they sought after wisdom, and the Lord sent them wisdom; he sent them Christ, the wisdom of God. He sent them his own wisdom, the wisdom of God himself; but they counted it foolishness. Yet even though they did, they should have accepted it, for the foolishness of God was wiser than anything they knew or could know otherwise. Then when God sends a message, no difference how we view it, we are to accept it. When God sends a message, men are to accept it, even though we count it weakness; for it is stronger than anything men give. It comes from God, it will not hurt anybody. Even though it be counted foolishness, that has nothing to do with it; accept it. Not that it is foolishness on God's part, but men may count it foolishness. Well, as it came from God, it is wiser than anything man ever got hold of, or ever could. Then I say again, when God sends a message, no difference how men view it, or what they think it is, it is their duty to accept of it; and then they will find out it is something different than they thought it was; because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

Not man wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise: and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty.

He has chosen the weak things of the world to confound those that are mighty, because the weakness of this world can have the power of God; and that will bring to naught the things of the mighty, and confound the things of the world. "And things which are despised



hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are, *that no flesh should glory in his presence.*"

"For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." That is all any one can know who preaches the gospel,—Jesus Christ, and him crucified. That is the whole story; that is all the gospel; that is all there is of God. "And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

Now, any faith that stands in the wisdom of men will fail. Any faith that rests upon the power of argument will fail. Every faith will fail but that which rests upon the power of God, and stands in the power of God. Now, when the power of God is received, when our faith stands upon that, and in that, then the argument will always come with it; there will be an argument that is stronger than all things else. But the argument is derived from the power, and not the power from the argument. Therefore, any faith that stands in the strength of argument and the power of theoretical demonstration, will never stand the test that will be brought upon those who are to enter the kingdom of God.

*(Continued next week.)*

**August 18, 1892**

**"The Gospel: What It Is, and Its Work As Opposed to the Mystery of Iniquity" <sup>41</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 32 , pp. 250, 251.**

IN the field of morals, in the realm of spiritual things, knowledge is not power. There is just the difference between heathenism and Christianity always. In heathenism with its chiefest theories, those of Socrates and all the rest of their philosophers, all they believed they needed to know to be virtuous was virtue. To *know* the good, was all that was necessary in order to do good. To *know* the pure, was all that was necessary in order to be pure. And they laid down first-rate precepts, and gave excellent instruction in the matter of purity, in the matter of right doing—ethics—and in all these things, but they themselves did not do the things which they taught to be right and good; and they could not do it; because, although they had the knowledge, they had not the power.

Every man on earth knows that the statement is true, that *in the field of morals knowledge is not power*; because every man in this world *knows* better than he *does*, and always did know better than he did. He knows better than he is able to do; and always did know better than he was able to do. These philosophers and these wise men knew better than they were able to do; and they taught a great deal better than they did; and I say again, every man in the world knows better than he is able to himself to do, and without Christ, all of his life is made up of efforts and failures to do the good that he knows. Paul describes all men as they are in themselves when he says: "To will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." A man says he will do better, then does his best and fails; and it always will be so until he finds that power which comes from beyond himself, the power of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ.

It is not knowledge that men want primarily; it is power. Now Christ is that power; the gospel reveals it, and the preaching of the gospel makes it known. But yet the excellency of Christ to men is that he brings not only power, but *also*, knowledge far beyond anything man can ever otherwise know. Christ is not only the power of God, but he is the wisdom of God. God gives wisdom beyond anything man can know, and power in equal measure with the wisdom. God gives power beyond anything man could ever do, and wisdom in equal measure with power. And all is in Christ, the gift of God to men, and in him dwellth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. Therefore I say that any faith which stands in the power of argument, and in the wisdom of man; or believes a certain thing because somebody else believes it; or does a certain thing because somebody else does it—that is worth nothing at all. Our faith must stand in power alone. And Christ is the power of God. Christ and him crucified; this is the power of God, and the wisdom of God; this is the gospel. The preaching of this is the preaching of the gospel, *and nothing else is*. Therefore our faith must stand not in the wisdom of men or the power of argument, but in Christ and him crucified. This is the power of God, this is the gospel.

Not I want to call attention to another point, which indeed is the main one in the talk this morning, and that is another statement of what the gospel is. Christ sent Paul to preach the gospel, and Paul tells us in his letter to the Galatians, that Christ did with him just what he did with the twelve at Jerusalem because he started them to preach the gospel. He commissioned them to preach the gospel; but

before they attempted it, they were to be endued with power from on high, and that power from on high was the Holy Ghost. Here we find Paul's experience before he could preach the gospel. "It pleased God. . . to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen." Gal. 1:15, 16. In Acts 26:17, 18 we find the Saviour's commission to Paul as told by Paul himself afterward: "Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."

That is what Christ sent Paul to preach to the children of men, and the Gentiles especially. Paul says when it pleased God to send him to preach Christ, it pleased God to *reveal his Son* in him, *that he might* preach him unto the Gentiles. Before Christ could send Paul to preach, he, too, must be endued with power from on high. Christ must be revealed in him as the power of God and the wisdom of God; then Paul could preach *him*, and not simply preach *about* him. It is not enough to preach *about* Christ, but preach *Christ*. It is not enough to preach *about* the gospel, but preach *the gospel*.

Before Christ could send Paul or any of the rest, *He* must be revealed *in* those who were to preach Him. When Christ is revealed in a man as the power of God and the wisdom of God, that man then is made, and has become, a minister of Christ. He then can minister Christ to men. But if Christ is not revealed in a man as the power of God and the wisdom of God, then that man cannot minister Christ, because he has not Christ. For he who has him not cannot minister *him*. The office of the minister of Christ is to be able to take Christ to men, and have him reach the people in such a way that they can receive *him*, and have *him revealed in them*. This is the ministry of the gospel. The gospel being the power of God, this is ministering the power of God.

Here is another passage in which Paul tells of this:—

"If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister; . . . whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfill the word of God; even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: to

whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; *which is Christ in you*, the hope of glory." Col. 1:23-27.

He was sent to preach the gospel; he was made a minister of the gospel, a preacher of the mystery of God; and that mystery of God is, as he says, "Christ *in you*, the hope of glory." Then the preaching of the gospel is the preaching of Christ *in men*, the hope of glory. The minister of the gospel is the minister of Christ *in men*, the hope of glory. It is still, and forever, the preaching of God in Christ, manifest in the flesh—the incarnation. For "every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come *in* the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God."

But further, I call attention to that expression, "The mystery of God." I read in Eph. 3:3 and onward: "How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; . . . which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men." That mystery, as he says in the other verse, is "Christ in you, the hope of glory." Now he says: By revelation God made known to me that mystery, and it pleased God to reveal his Son in me. "The gospel which I preach is not after

251

man. For I neither received it of man; neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Not alone the revelation which Christ *gives*; it is that and more. It is the revelation of Jesus Christ himself, as he was revealed *in Paul*, and as he is revealed *in men*, the hope of glory. And this is how Paul received the gospel—by the revelation of Jesus Christ, not only *to* him, but *in* him.

This is enough to show that the gospel is the mystery of God; that the preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the mystery of God; and that the preaching of the mystery of God is the preaching of Christ in men. This is the revelation of the mystery of God. This is the gospel that the apostles preached, and this is the only true gospel.

Here is another point. I have read in these verses not only that the gospel is Christ in men, and the power of God, and the mystery of God, but that *it has been hid from ages* and generations, and was then revealed in a way in which it had never been known before. Now, the gospel was made known to men from Adam down, and they had a measure of the knowledge of the gospel. But when Christ himself came, and revealed God in himself, to the children of men—it was never revealed and understood before as it was revealed and understood at that time. Then it came in a fullness that was never

known before. And when the apostles were sent forth to preach it as it then was revealed, they preached it in a fullness and a clearness in which it was never preached before.

So Paul write again in Eph. 3:8, 9: "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, *which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God.*" Then from the beginning of the world unto the apostles' day, this mystery had been hid from the world and from men *in a measure*, and as it was then revealed and preached, not only to these men, but in them and by them. Read these verses over—Eph. 3:3, 5, 8, 9; Col. 1:25-27—with this point in mind.

Then the apostles were sent to preach this gospel, to preach this mystery that had been hid from ages and generations. It was hid before; now it is made known to all men, for the obedience of faith. God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, "which is Christ in you, the hope of glory." That is the mystery that has been hid from ages and generations, and which God would now make known unto the Gentiles and to all men. Read Matt. 14:16, 17: "But blessed are your eyes, for they see: and your ears, for they hear. For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them."

Then by the ministry of the apostles there was made known that which had been hid from ages and from generations, and that thing was the mystery of God. And by the preaching of the gospel, says the word, he would now make known to his saints what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles. And that mystery "is *Christ in you*, the hope of glory." Though it had been hid from ages and generations in the past, now the Lord breaks off the veil, brings it forth, and by the mouth of the apostles, in the preaching of the gospel, spreads it before all nations for the obedience of faith. (Read Rom. 16:26, 27.) This is the gospel; and the preaching of this is the preaching of the gospel.

**August 25, 1892**

**"The Gospel: What It Is, and Its Work As Opposed to the Mystery of Iniquity" <sup>51</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 33 , pp. 258, 259.**

NOW from this let us start into another field. I want you to think closely now, if you have not done so up to this point; and the more so, if you have done so. The gospel is the mystery of God, isn't it? The mystery of God is the gospel. The preaching of the gospel, the unsearchable riches of Christ, is the making known to men what is the fellowship of this mystery. In the preaching of the gospel, God is revealing the riches of the glory of that mystery among the Gentiles, and that is Christ in men, the hope of glory. In former ages this mystery had not been made known unto the sons of men, as it was now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets. And though hidden from ages and generations, when the apostle were sent forth to preach, endured with power from on high, to reveal the mystery of God, that was the breaking off of the vail that had covered this mystery through all these ages; and it was broken off that all nations might see and know and understand and turn to the Lord, and get acquainted with God as he was revealed in Jesus Christ, by having Jesus Christ revealed in themselves.

That was sent forth to be preached to all the world, to be preached to every creature. It was so preached. Before the men had all died to whom that gospel was committed in the beginning, it had been preached in all the world. And while it was being preached, and before Paul had died, who had written so much about it, he wrote these words: "*The MYSTERY OF INIQUITY doth already work.*"

What was Paul preaching?—The mystery *of God*. What was already working?—The mystery *of iniquity*. That mystery of iniquity would oppose and exalt itself "above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Then there was another mystery to be revealed. The mystery of God was revealed; the mystery of iniquity was also to be revealed.

The mystery of iniquity was revealed. That mystery of iniquity rose up and hid the mystery of God which had been revealed. That mystery of iniquity was the Papacy in all its workings; and the beginning of its working was there when Paul wrote that word; it was working then. He could see it. While the apostles were preaching the mystery of God, they could see the other mystery coming.

That other mystery did come; it was revealed; it stood before the world, professing to be Christianity; professing to be the representative of God to the world; professing to be the religion of Christ in the world; professing to be the mystery of God. Attention was called to that as Christianity, whereas there was no Christianity about it at all. God declared it to be "the mystery of iniquity;" "Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." And it was only hiding the mystery of God again from ages and from generations.

But thanks be to God! it was not to hide the mystery of God from *all* ages and generations. When the mystery of iniquity should have fully revealed itself, again the veil would be broken off, and the mystery of God would again be revealed. For I read: "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."

This everlasting gospel is the mystery of God which is again to be preached unto me; and that mystery is "Christ in you, the hope of glory." And that is the preaching that is *now* to go to the world, in the glorious threefold message which makes up the third angel's message. And now is the time when the gospel, the mystery of God, is to be preached and revealed in a power, a majesty, and a glory such as has never been known except in the time of the apostles, if it does not even surpass that. The power of the mystery of iniquity being broken off, the mystery of God is to be brought again before the world in *all* its glory; for I read that "in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God *should be finished*." Rev. 10:7. "And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen. . . . And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation. . . . Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:8-12.

Now mark the connection. There goes forth the angel with the everlasting gospel to preach. That everlasting gospel is the mystery

of God, and the preaching of it the preaching of Christ in men the hope of glory, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. This gospel is rejected, and there is the falling away spoken of as "Babylon is fallen, is fallen." Then out of that falling away comes that against which the third angel warns.

Now, what brought the mystery of iniquity?—The falling away from the mystery of God; for says Paul: "That day shall not come except *there come a falling away first*, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." And the mystery of iniquity is the beast, the papacy. When the mystery of iniquity has run its course, then comes the word of God announcing an angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel, the mystery of God, to preach to all the world, to every creature. Then from this also there comes a falling away, and out of that falling away there comes that against which the third angel warns,—the image of the beast, the image of the Papacy.

As out of that first falling away there came the mystery of iniquity, the beast, so out of the second falling away there comes the image of the mystery of iniquity, the image of the beast. Just as certain as the preaching of the gospel by the apostles was the preaching of the mystery of God, Christ in men, the hope of glory; just so certainly the second preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the same mystery of God, the same power of God, and the same wisdom of God, to make known the same Christ in men, the hope of glory. Then as certainly as out of that falling away there came the mystery of iniquity, the beast, the papacy; so certainly out of this falling away there comes the image of the mystery, the image of the beast, the image of the papacy. The two things are alike from beginning to end. And now the third angel's message—this threefold message—warns against the whole evil combination of the beast and his image. This threefold message has been more than forty years in the world. This little leaflet from which I have read before gives an excellent statement of this, as follows:—

The revelator says: "I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power, and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen." *This is the same message* that was given by the second angel,—Babylon is fallen. . . . When Jesus began his public ministry he cleansed the temple from its sacrilegious profanations. Almost the last act of his public ministry was to cleanse the temple again. *So in the last work* for the warning of the world, *two distinct calls* are to be made to the churches—the second



*angel's message*, and the voice heard from heaven, 'Come out of her, my people, . . . for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.'"

In 1840-1844, the first angel began his work. This message was rejected, and in 1844 the second angel's message announced the fall: "Babylon is fallen;" and out of that falling away there comes the image of the mystery of iniquity, the image of the beast; and the third angel's message is the warning against the worship of the beast *and his image*.

As the beginning of this was in 1844, *then began the time* when the mystery of iniquity was to be broken off, and the mystery of God once more to stand forth in all its glory in the world. But Ezekiel and the Laodicean message show that there was to be a time of dearth. But now even that time of dearth is past, *and the times of refreshing* have come from the presence of the Lord, and soon he will send Jesus.

Therefore, *now is the time* when that everlasting gospel, the mystery of God, is to be preached in all its fullness, which means Christ in men in all his completeness. And as the Sabbath of the Lord, in the fullness of its meaning, is but the sign

259

of what Christ in all his completeness is to those who believe in him; so when Christ in all his completeness is formed and found in us, there will stand the Sabbath as the witness, the sign, *the seal* of the blessed consummation.

And so this threefold message, revealing in its fullness the mystery of God, which is Christ in men, the hope of glory, thus puts upon the people of God the seal of the living God, and saves them from the evil and the ruin of the mystery of iniquity, the beast and his image, his mark, and the number of his name.

*(Continued next week.)*

**"Some Scraps of New England History" <sup>61</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 33 , pp. 259, 260.**

OF all the pests which so far the New England Puritans dreaded and hated, the Baptists or, as they were nicknamed, "the Anabaptists," were the greatest. It was not one of the least of the offenses of Roger William's that he was a Baptist. Not long after Roger Williams' banishment, that Thomas Shepard of Charlestown in the sermon before referred to entitled "Eye Salve," had told the

governor and the magistrates that "Anabaptists have ever been looked at by the godly leaders of this people as a scab;" and the president of Harvard College said that "such a rough thing as a New England Anabaptist is not to be handled over tenderly." According to these principles, therefore, the general court of Massachusetts in 1644—

ordered and agreed that if any person or persons, within this jurisdiction, shall either openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof, . . . and shall appear to the court willfully and obstinately to continue therein, after due time and means of conviction, every such person or persons shall be sentenced to banishment.

The next year, however, a strong petition was presented for the repeal of the law because of the offense that had been "taken threat by the godly in England, 'but many of the elders entreated that the law might continue still in force.'" The law remained, but the representative of the colony who went to England in 1646 explained to parliament that "'it is true we have a severe law, but wee never did or will execute the rigor of it upon any . . . But the reason wherefore wee are loath either to repeale or alter the law is because wee would have it . . . to beare witnesse against their judgment, . . . which we conceive . . . to bee erroneous.'" In pursuance of this law and in the same year, a Baptist by the name of Painter, for refusing to let his child be sprinkled, "was brought before the court, where he declared their baptism to be antichristian." He was sentenced to be whipped, which he bore without flinching.

And now, in 1651, three Baptist ministers, John Clarke, Obadiah Holmes, and John Crandall, went from the Providence plantation to Lynn, Massachusetts, to visit an aged Baptist. They arrived on Saturday, July 19, and the next day they worshiped together in his private house. While Mr. Clarke was preaching, two constables entered the house with a warrant to arrest "certain erroneous persons being strangers." The three ministers were carried off at once to the tavern, and were notified that they must attend worship at the parish church in the afternoon. They protested, saying that if they were forced into the meeting-house, they should be obliged to dissent from the service. The constable told them that was nothing to him. He was ordered to bring them to church, and to church they must go. As they entered the meeting-house, the congregation was at prayers, and the three prisoners took off their hats; but as soon as the prayer was

over, they put on their hats again, and began reading in their seats. The officers were ordered to take off their hats again.

When the service was over, Elder Clarke asked permission to speak. His request was granted on condition that he would not speak about what he had just heard preached. He began to explain why he had put on his hat, saying that he "could not judge that they were gathered according to the visible order of the Lord." He was allowed to proceed no further, and the three were shut up for the night. The following Tuesday they were taken to Boston and put in prison. July 31, they were tried before the court of assistants, and were fined, Clarke twenty pounds, Holmes thirty, and John Crandall five, "or each to be well whipped." At the beginning of the trial Elder Clarke had asked that they be shown the law under which they were being tried, and now he made the same request again, but Endicott broke in, "You have deserved death. I will not have such trash brought into our jurisdiction. You go up and down, and secretly insinuate things into those that are weak, but you cannot maintain it before our ministers; you may try a dispute with them."

As they were sent away from the court to prison, Elder Holmes says, "As I went from the bar, I exprest myself in these words: 'I blesse God I am counted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus; whereupon John Wilson (their pastor, as they call him) strook me before the judgment-seat, and cursed me, saying, 'the curse of God . . . goe with thee;' so we were carried to the prison."

The Baptists were ready to defend their doctrines as well as to attack the popish ceremonies of the Puritans; therefore Elder Clarke, as soon as they had arrived at the prison, wrote a letter to the court, and proposed to debate the Baptist principles with any of their ministers. He was asked in reply what the Baptist principles were that he would debate. Clarke drew up four propositions, the first stating their faith in Christ; second, that baptism, or dipping in water, is one of the commandments of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that a visible believer or disciple of Christ Jesus (that is, one who manifests repentance toward and faith in Jesus Christ) is the only person to be baptized or dipped

in water etc.; third, that every such believer in Christ may in point of liberty, and ought in point of duty, to improve that talent which the Lord had given him, and in the congregation may ask for information to himself; or if he can, may speak by way of prophecy, for edification,

and upon all occasions and in all places as far as the jurisdiction of his Lord extends, may and ought to walk as a child of light; and, fourth, "I testify that no such believer or servant of Christ Jesus hath any liberty, much less authority, from his Lord, to smite his fellow-servant, nor with outward force, or arm of flesh to constrain, or restrain, his conscience, nor his outward man for conscience' sake, or worship of his God, where injury is not offered to any person, name, or estate of others, every man being such as shall appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, and must give an account of himself to God; and, therefore, ought to be fully persuaded in his own mind for what he undertakes, because he that doubteth is damned if he eat, and so also if he act, because he doth not eat or act in faith, and what is not of faith is sin."

There was at first some talk, or rather a bluff, that Cotton would debate with him; but after consulting together, Cotton declined, and as Elder Clarke's fine had been paid by his friends, he was released, and ordered to go out of the colony as soon as possible. They all three refused to pay the fine that was imposed. Crandall was admitted to bail, but they resolved to hold Elder Holmes, and make him an example. What happened to him he himself tells in a letter to his brethren in London, as follows:—

I desired to speak a few words: but Mr. Nowel answered, "It is not now a time to speak," whereupon I took leave, and said. "Men, brethren, fathers, and countrymen, I beseech you to give me leave to speak a few words, and the rather because here are many spectators to see me punished, and I am to seal with my blood, if God give strength, that which I hold and practice in reference to the word of God and the testimony of Jesus. That which I have to say, in brief, is this although I am no disputant, yet seeing I am to seal with my blood what I hold, I am ready to defend by the word, and to dispute that point with any that shall come forth to withstand it." Mr. Nowel answered, now was no time to dispute; then said I, "I desire to give an account of the faith and order which I hold," and this "I desired three times; but in comes Mr. Flint, and saith to the executioner, "Fellow, do thine office, for this fellow would but make a long speech to delude the people," so I, being resolved to speak, told the people, "That which I am to suffer for is the word of God, and testimony of Jesus Christ." "No," saith Mr. Nowel, "it is for your error, and going about to seduce the people;" to which I replied, "Not for error, for in all the time of my imprisonment, wherein I was left alone, my brethren being gone, which of all your ministers came to convince me of error? And, when upon the governor's words, a motion was made for a public dispute, and often renewed upon fair

terms, and desired by hundreds, what was the reason it was not granted?" Mr. Nowel told me, it was his fault who went away and would not dispute; but this the writings will clear at large. Still Mr. Flint calls to the man to do his office; so before, and in the time of his pulling off my clothes, I continued speaking, telling them that I had so learned that for all Boston I would not give my body into their hands thus to be bruised upon another account, yet upon this I would not give an hundredth part of a wampum peague to free it out of their hands; and that I made as much conscience of unbuttoning one button, as I did of paying the thirty pounds in reference thereunto. I told them, moreover, that the Lord having manifested his love towards me in giving me repentance towards God, and faith in Christ, and so to be baptized in water by a messenger of Jesus, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, wherein I have fellowship with him in his death, burial and resurrection, I am now come to be baptized in afflictions by your hands, that so I may have further fellowship with my Lord, and am not ashamed of his sufferings, for by his stripes am I healed. And as the man began to lay the strokes upon my back, I said to the people. "Though my flesh should fail, and my spirit should fail, yet God would not fail;" so it pleased the Lord to come in, and to fill my heart and tongue as a vessel full, and with an audible voice I break forth, praying the Lord not to lay this sin to their charge, and telling the people that now I found he did not fail me, and therefore now I should trust him forever who failed me not; for in truth, as the strokes fell upon me. I had such a spiritual manifestation of God's presence, as I never had before, and the outward pain was so removed from me, that I could well bear it, yea, and in a manner felt it not, although it was grievous, as the spectators said, the man striking with all his strength, spitting in his hand three times, with a three-corded whip, giving me therewith thirty strokes. When he had loosed me from the post, having joyfulness in my heart, and cheerfulness in my countenance, as the spectators observed, I told the magistrates, "You have struck me with roses;" and said, moreover, "Although the Lord hath made it easy to me, yet I pray God it may not be laid to your charge."

When the whipping was over, two men, John Hazel and John Spur, went up to the suffering man, and shook hands with him, Hazel not speaking anything at all, and Spur simply saying, "Blessed be the Lord;" yet both were fined forty shillings, with the choice of paying the fine or being whipped. They both refused to pay the fine, but a friend paid Spur's, and after imprisonment for a week, another paid Hazel's. The whipping of Holmes was thirty lashes with a three-thonged whip of knotted cord wielded with both hands, and was so severe that when taken back to prison, his lacerated body could not bear to touch

the bed. For many days he was compelled to rest propped up on his hands and knees.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 33 , p. 264.**

IT would be well for statesmen, and political and social economists, and bankers, and capitalists, and directors of great moneyed corporations, to ask themselves why these men have risen against the present state and system of civilization as represented by the industrial interests of which they have been a part. It would be well for labor agitators, and master workmen, and workingmen, to ask themselves why they are in insurrection against the State, destroying the property upon the use of which they themselves, and others, are dependent, and threatening the peace of society. Is there any sufficient civil, social, or economic reason for this? There is not. From that point of view no sufficient cause can be affirmed. The cause arises farther back than civil, social or economic relations, it is in mutual, moral responsibilities which have been ignored, until not this reign of terror is developing. It is the natural and necessary result of mutual error and mutual wrong. Both parties are at fault.

THE established order of society is not at fault. The system of government is not at fault. The food supply is not insufficient. There is no stringency of currency. The origin of the whole matter is in the hearts of men. Both parties not only desire, but are determined to do by others as they would not be done by. The labor world, the financial world, the political world, the social world, the religious world, all are dominated at this time by that unrighteous spirit. Capital uses relentlessly the silent power of its inexorable tyranny to accomplish selfish ends. Labor is more than ready to appeal to brute force and violence to reach its own coveted purpose.

The Church, whose duty it should be to teach these members of the same body, which are antagonizing each other to their own destruction, that they should do to each other as they would be done by, is itself committed to the same unrighteous methods, and is by this not only disqualified from giving effective advice and counsel, but has even become an evil example. The Church makes use of unjust laws to attain its purposes. It does not hesitate to use moral compulsion to obtain legal action to effect injustice and to obtain the enactment of more extended statutes in the same line. It does not hesitate to use the illegal and unchristian boycott to further its

purposes. It does not hesitate to influence Congress by fraudulent and repeated petitions, and to attempt to intimidate the representatives of the people. Its accredited mouth pieces, from the platform and the pulpit, do not hesitate to suggest the same resort to violence as that adopted by the Amalgamated Association and the Switchmen's Union, if their claims are not granted. All are at fault. The origin of this is in the hearts of men. The remedy is in the gospel, pure and undefiled, nothing less.

NOW that the Government of the United States has invaded the domain of religious controversy it will dominate it; inasmuch as it has assumed jurisdiction to settle religious questions by act of Congress and by Supreme Court decisions it will surely never yield that jurisdiction. When Constantine had made Rome "Christian" it was only natural that he should seek an authoritative definition of Christianity; and when the Council of Nicea had given that definition in the shape of the creed which it adopted, nothing was more natural than that the emperor should require his subjects to subscribe to it. The Government of the United States has entered upon the same evil course. The Supreme Court has declared the Nation to be Christian. Congress has already taken sides in a religious controversy, and to be consistent must not the Government use all the power at its command to enforce that decision and to uphold the Sunday-Sabbath cause which it has espoused? A United States senator has well said, "The domain which government invades it dominates; the jurisdiction it takes it keeps." This is true whatever the domain or the jurisdiction; and it always has been true.

**September 1, 1892**

**"The Gospel: What It Is, and Its Work As Opposed to the Mystery of Iniquity" <sup>71</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 34 , pp. 267, 268.**

NOW let us take our bearings again, that we may fairly enter upon the examination of another point. Out of that first falling away came the mystery of iniquity. And as that mystery of iniquity was the Papacy, and is the Papacy, it is important for us to know how that thing came in, just what place it occupied there, when it appeared, and how it appeared. As the apostle says, there was a falling away. Self-exaltation of the bishopric and all kinds of different amusements and ceremonies were adopted, also the taking up with the heathen

philosophy and science, in order to facilitate the conversion of the heathen. These men had forsaken the mystery of God, had left the power of God behind; and when they found that they had lost the power of God, and could not influence men any longer to yield obedience to God, then they sought the power of earthly governments, by which they would compel men to yield obedience to the church.

In Constantine's time there was the working of this power; this apostate church, this formation of the mystery of iniquity, doing its utmost to secure control of the civil power and compel men to conform to the dogmas and the discipline of this apostate form of religion, which called itself Christianity. Now I want to call your attention to a few facts in connection with that. For just then there came in a series of events, a series of steps, that are worth considering now by every one who would know how to detect the rise of the image of the mystery of iniquity.

In the beginning of the fourth century there was in the Roman empire a powerful ecclesiastical organization, the leaders and managers of which were "only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves."—*Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, book 8, chap. 1*. While "it was the hope of every bishop in the empire to make politics a branch of theology," "it was the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics." In an intrigue therefore with Constantine, they succeeded in bartering to him their influence and power in theology for his in politics. As one of the very first-fruits of this, Constantine was established in the rulership of one half of the Roman empire. Jointly with Licinius, he then issued the Edict of Milan, reversing the persecuting edicts of Diocletian, and granting "liberty and full freedom to the Christians to observe their own mode of worship;" granting "likewise to the Christians and to all, the free choice to follow that mode of worship which they may wish;" "that each may have the privilege to select and to worship whatsoever divinity he pleases;" and commanding that the churches and the church property which had been confiscated by Diocletian, should be restored to "the whole body of Christians," "and to each conventicler respectively."—*Id., book 10, chap. 5*.

This was all just and proper enough, and innocent enough, in itself and on its face, *if that had been all there was to it*. But behind it there lay the *ecclesiastical organization*, ambitious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for itself, and that religio-political



intrigue which had been entered into to feed and satisfy this ambition. This ecclesiastical organization likewise claimed to be the legitimate and only true representative and depository of Christianity in the world,—it was the Catholic Church. And no sooner had the Edict of Milan ordered the restoration of property *to the Christians*, than it was seized upon and made an issue by which to secure the imperial recognition and the legal establishment of *the Catholic Church*.

The rule had long before been established that all who did not agree with the bishops of the Catholic Church were necessarily heretics, and not Christians at all; it was now claimed by the Catholic Church that therefore none such were entitled to any benefit from the edict restoring property *to the Christians*. In other words, the Catholic Church disputed the right of any others than Catholics to receive property or money under the Edict of Milan, by disputing their right to the title of Christians. And by this issue the Catholic Church forced an imperial decision as to who were Christians. And under the circumstances, by the power and influence which she held, and by what she had already done in behalf of Constantine, it was a foregone conclusion, if not the concerted plan, that this decision would be in favor of the Catholic Church. Consequently, Constantine's edict to the proconsul contained these words:—

"It is our will that when thou shalt receive this epistle, if any of those things belonging to *the Catholic Church* of the Christians in the several cities or other places, are now possessed either by the decurions or any others, these thou shalt cause immediately to be restored to their churches. Since we have previously determined, that whatsoever *these same churches* before possessed should be restored to them."

That was not what was said at all. It was not "the Catholic Church" to which the edict said the property was to be restored; it was to Christians alone, to "the whole body of Christians." But, mark you, just as quick as that was said, the Catholic Church made a turn upon that word "Christian," and forced a decision by the imperial authority as to who were the Christians intended. And as she had given him her influence in politics, he did not dare to say otherwise; because if he should, she would swing her influence over to Licinius or some other one, and he would become emperor. She had political power in her hands, and she used it.

Nor was it enough that the emperor should decide that all these favors were for "the Catholic Church of the Christians." Immediately there were two parties claiming to be the Catholic Church. Therefore,

the emperor was obliged next to decide *which was the Catholic Church*. This question was immediately raised and disputed, and in consequence an edict was drawn from Constantine, addressed to the same proconsul (of the province of Africa), in which were these words:—

"It is my will that these men, within the province intrusted to those in the Catholic Church *over which Cecilianus presides*, who give their services to this holy religion, and whom they commonly call clergy, shall be held totally free and exempt from all public offices," etc.

The party over which Cecilianus presided in Africa was the party which was in communion with the bishop of Rome. The other party then drew up a long series of charges against Cecilianus, and sent them to the emperor with a petition that he would have the case examined by the bishops of Gaul. Constantine was in Gaul at the time; but instead of having the bishops of Gaul examine into the case alone, he commissioned three of them to go to Rome and sit with the bishop of Rome in council, to decide the case. To the bishop of Rome Constantine sent a letter, with copies of all the charges and complaints which had been lodged with him, and in this letter to the bishop of Rome, with other things, he said this:—

"Since it neither escaped your diligence, that I show such regard for the holy Catholic Church, that *I wish you, upon the whole, to leave no room for schism or division.*"

This council of course confirmed the emperor's word that *the Catholic Church* in Africa, was indeed *the one over which Cecilianus presided*. And as this was the one which was in communion with the bishop of Rome, it followed that the Catholic Church was the one over which the bishops of Rome presided. The other party appealed from this decision, and petitioned that another and larger council be called to examine the question. Another council was called, composed of almost all the bishops of Constantine's dominions. This council likewise confirmed the emperor's word and the decision of the former council. Then the opposing party appealed from the decision of the council to the emperor himself. After hearing this appeal, he sustained the action of the councils, and re-affirmed his original decision. Then the opposing party rejected not only the decisions of the councils, but the decision of the emperor himself.

Then Constantine addressed a letter to Cecilianus, bestowing more favors upon what he now called "*the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion*," and empowering him to use the civil power to

compel the opposing party, the Donatists, to submit. This portion of his letter is in the following words:—

"CONSTANTINE AUGUST TO CECILIANUS, BISHOP OF CARTHAGE: As we have determined that in all the provinces of Africa, Numblia, and Mauritania, something should be granted to certain ministers of *the legitimate and most holy* Catholic religion to defray these expenses, I have given letters to Ursus, the most illustrious lieutenant-governor of Africa, and have communicated to him, that he shall provide to pay to your authority, three thousand dollars [about one hundred thousand dollars] . . . .

"And as I have ascertained that *some men*, who are of no settled min, *wished to diver the people from the most Holy Catholic Church*, by a certain pernicious adulteration, I wish thee to understand that I have given, both to the proconsul Anulinus and to Patricius, vicar-general of the prefects, when present the following injunctions: that, among all the rest, *they should particularly pay the necessary attention to this*, nor should by any means tolerate that this should be overlooked. Wherefore, *if thou seest any of these men* persevering in this madness, thou shalt, without any hesitancy, *proceed to the aforesaid judges, and report*

268

*it to them, that they may animadvert upon them, as I commanded them, when present.*"

Thus, no sooner was it decided what was "*the legitimate and most holy Catholic Church*," than the civil power was definitely placed at the disposal of this church, with positive instructions to use this power in compelling conformity to the new imperial religion. Persecution was begun at once. The Donatist bishops were driven out, and Constantine commanded that their churches should be delivered to the Catholic party. Nor was this done at all peacefully. "Each party recriminated on the other: but neither denies the barbarous scenes of massacre and license which devastated the African cities. The Donatists boasted of their martyrs; and the cruelties of the Catholic party rest on their own admission; they deny not, they proudly vindicate, their barbarities: 'Is the vengeance of God to be defrauded of its victims?' they cried."—*Milman, "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 1, par. 5 from the end.*

*And the government, by becoming a partisan, had lost the power to keep the peace. The civil power, by becoming a party to religious controversy, had lost the power to prevent civil violence between religious factions. The civil government was subordinated to the church, and was only a tool of the church.*

Nor was this thing long in coming. It all occurred in *less than four years*. The Edict of Milan was issued in the month of March, A.D. 313. Before that month expired, the decision was rendered that the imperial favors were for the Catholic Church. In the summer of 314 sat the second council on the same question. And in 316 the decree was sent to Cecilianus, empowering him to distribute the money to the ministers of "the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion," and to use the civil power to force the Donatists to submit to the decision of the councils and the emperor.

*(Continued next week.)*

**"Some Scraps of New England History" <sup>81</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 34 , p. 268.**

IN 1655 Thomas Gould, Baptist, of Charlestown, Mass., refused to have his baby sprinkled and christened. The regular preacher ordered the church "to lay him under admonition, which the church was backward to do." Not long afterward he was at church as the law required him to be, and when the time of sprinkling the children came, he went out. He was spoken to about it, but told them he could not stay because he "lookt upon it as no ordinance of Christ. They told me that now I had made known my judgment, I might stay. . . . So I stayed, and sat down in my seat, when they were at prayer and administering the service to infants. Then they dealt with me for my unreverent carriage." Their dealing with him was to admonish him and exclude him from the communion.

In October, 1656, he was accused before the county court for denying baptism to his child. Of course he was convicted. He was admonished and given till the next term to consider his ways. During this time they made it so unpleasant for him that he ceased attending the church at Charlestown, and went to church at Cambridge instead. But this, being an apparent slight upon the minister, was only a new offense. Although not actually punished, he was subjected to petty annoyances, being again and again summoned both to the church and to the court to be admonished, until in May 28, 1665, he withdrew entirely from the Congregational Church, and with eight others formed a Baptist church. This being "schismatical," was counted as open rebellion, and Gould and his brethren were summoned to appear before the church the next Sunday. They told the magistrates that they could not go at that time, but the following Sunday they

would be there; but the minister refused to wait, and in his sermon "laid out the sins of these men, and delivered them up to Satan."

They were called before one court after another, until their case reached the general court in October. Those among them who were freeman were disfranchised, and if they should be convicted again of continued schism, were to be imprisoned until further order. In April, 1666, they were fined four pounds, and were imprisoned until September, when they were ordered to be discharged upon payment of fines and costs. In April, 1668, they were ordered by the governor and council to appear at the meeting-house at nine o'clock on the morning of April 14, to meet six ministers who would debate with them. The debate, however, did not amount to much except that it gave to the ministers an opportunity to denounce the Baptists as they wished. The Baptists, asking for liberty to speak, were told that they stood there as delinquents, and ought not to have liberty to speak. Two days were spent in this way, when at the end of the second day, "Rev." Jonathan Mitchell pronounced the following sentence from Deut. 17:9-12:—

And thou shalt come unto the priests and the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire; and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment: And thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the Lord shall choose, shall show thee; and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee. According to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do; thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee, to the right hand nor to the left. And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die; and thou shalt put away evil from Israel.

May 27, Gould and two of his brethern as "obstinate and turbulent Anabaptists," were banished under penalty of perpetual imprisonment. They remained. Accordingly they were imprisoned. By this persecution much sympathy was awakened in the community, and a petition in their behalf was signed by sixty-six of the inhabitants of Charlestown, among whom were some of the most prominent citizens. The petition was to the legislature, and prayed for mercy upon the prisoners, saying, "They be aged and weakly men; . . . the sense of this their . . . most deplorable and afflicted condition hath sadly affected the hearts of many . . . Christians, and such as neither

approve of their judgment or practice; especially considering that the men are reputed godly, and of a blameless conversation. . . We therefore most humbly beseech this honored court, in their Christian mercy and bowels of compassion, to pity and relieve these poor prisoners." The petition was by vote declared scandalous and reproachful. The two persons who had taken the lead in getting it up, were fined, one ten and the other five pounds, and all the others who had signed the petition were compelled to sign a document expressing their sorrow for giving the court such just grounds of offense.

Report of these proceedings having reached England, thirteen of the Congregational ministers wrote, by the hand of Robert Mascall, a letter to their brethren in New England, in which they said:—

O, how it grieves and affects us, that New England should persecute! Will you not give what you take? Is liberty of conscience your due? And is it not as due unto others who are sound in the faith? Amongst many Scriptures, that in the fourteenth of Romans much confirms me in liberty of conscience thus stated. To him that esteemeth anything unclean, to him it is unclean. Therefore though we approve of the baptism of the immediate children of church members, and of their admission into the church when they evidence a real work of grace, yet to those who in conscience believe the said baptism to be unclean, it is unclean. Both that and mere ruling elders, though we approve of them, yet our grounds are mere interpretations of, and not any express scripture. I cannot say so clearly of anything else in our religion, neither as to faith or practice. Now must we force our interpretations upon others, pope-like? How do you cast a reproach upon us who are Congregational in England, and furnish our adversaries with weapons against us! We blush and are filled with shame and confusion of face, when we hear of these things. Dear brother, we pray that God would open your eyes, and persuade the heart of your magistrates, that they may no more smite their fellow-servants, nor thus greatly injure us their brethren, and that they may not thus dishonor the name of God. My dear brother, pardon me, for I am affected; I speak for God, to whose grace I commend you all in New England; and humbly craving your prayers for us here, and remain your affectionate brother,

ROBERT MAMSCALL.

*Finsbury, near Morefield, March 25, 1669.*

It seems that the imprisoned Baptists were by some means released after about a year's confinement, but the next year afterward Gould and Turner were arrested and imprisoned "a long time."

The cases which we have cited are not by any means all the persecutions and oppressions that fell upon the Baptists; but these are sufficient to show that the persecution was shameful enough, even had these been all the cases that ever occurred.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 34 , p. 272.**

THE political and national profession of Christianity by the United States, in its governmental capacity, if practically applied, is likely to produce some very unique international situations. If the Government, as a corporate person, can and does accept a religion, it must, as a governmental power, go forth and preach it to all the world.

THE Congress of the United States has undertaken to enforce a religious observance upon its own citizens, and the subjects of all other powers as well, at the city of Chicago, upon the occasion of the holding of the World's Fair. Is this the beginning of a world wide effort by this Government to evangelize all nations? He who professes a religious belief, is bound in conscience to preach the truth which he believes, and sacrifice himself, his time, his means, his labor to present it to the minds and impress it upon the hearts of all men.

**September 8, 1892**

**"The Gospel: What It Is, and Its Work As Opposed to the Mystery of Iniquity" <sup>91</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 35 , p. 274.**

THE Edict of Milan, March, 313, named "the whole body of Christians" as the beneficiaries without any qualification or any sectarian designation. Before the expiration of that month the provisions of the edict were confined to "the Catholic Church of the Christians" alone. In the autumn of the same year when the emperor wrote to the bishop of Rome, appointing the first council, he defined the established church as "the *holy* Catholic Church." The following summer, 314, when he called the second council, he referred to the doctrine of the Catholic Church as embodying the "*most* holy religion." And when it had been decided which party represented this "most holy religion," then in 316 his letter and commission to Cecilianus defined it as "the *legitimate and* most holy Catholic religion."

Nor was this all. While this was going on, also about the year 314, the first edict in favor of Sunday was issued, though it was blended

with Friday. It ordered that on Friday and Sunday "no judicial or other business should be transacted, but that God should be served with prayers and supplications;" and in 321 Friday observance was dropped, and Sunday alone was exalted by the famous Sunday-rest law of Constantine, all in furtherance of the ambition of the ecclesiastics to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves. <sup>102</sup>

Now there was another thing. When the Catholic Church had forced this decision in favor of itself in the matter of imperial favors, and the getting of property into their hands, then it sprung right back to the other part of that edict, and held Constantine to this point: that as it was the Catholic Church in the latter part of that edict, then it was certainly the Catholic Church in the first part of the edict. And that came in direct order, and in this way: In 323 by the direct and officious aid of the Catholic Church, Constantine succeeded in defeating Licinius and making himself sole emperor. No sooner was this accomplished than the "*religious liberty*" assured to "the Christians" by the Edict of Milan, like the provisions of the same edict restoring confiscated property to the Christians, *was by a public and express edict limited to Catholics alone*. This portion of that decree runs as follows:—

"VICTORY CONSTANTINUS MAXIMUS AUGUSTUS TO THE HERETICS: Understand now by this present statute, ye Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, ye who are called Cataphrygians, and all ye who devise and support heresies by means of your private assemblies, with what a tissue of falsehood and vanity, with what destructive and venomous errors, your doctrines are inseparably interwoven; so that through you the healthy soul is stricken with disease, and the living becomes the prey of everlasting death. . . .

"Forasmuch, then, as it is no longer possible to bear with your pernicious errors, we give warning by this present statute that none of you henceforth presume to assemble yourselves together. We have directed, accordingly, that you be deprived of all the houses in which you are accustomed to hold your assemblies: and our care in this respect extends so far as to forbid the holding of your superstitious and senseless meetings, not in public merely, but in any private house or place whatsoever. *Let those of you, therefore, who are desirous of embracing the true and pure religion, take the far better course of entering the Catholic Church*, and uniting with it in holy fellowship, whereby you will be enabled to arrive at the knowledge of the truth. . . .



"It is an object worthy of that prosperity which we enjoy through the favor of God, to endeavor to bring back those who in time past were living in the hope of future blessing, from all irregularity and error, to the right path, from darkness to light, from vanity to truths, from death to salvation. And in order that this remedy may be applied with effectual power, we have commanded (as before said) that you be positively deprived of every gathering point for your superstitious meetings: I mean all the houses of prayer (if such be worthy of the name) which belong to heretics, *and that those be made over without delay to the Catholic Church*; that any other places be confiscated to the public service, and no facility whatever be left for any future gathering; in order that from this day forward none of your unlawful assemblies may presume to appear in any public or private place. Let this edict be made public.

Thus in *less than eleven years*, from the issuing of the Edict of Milan, the Catholic Church stood in full and exclusive possession of the authority of the empire, both in the rights of property and the right to worship, under the profession of Christianity; and with a specific and direct commission to use that power and authority to compel the submission of "heretics." Thus *was made* the Papacy,—the beast of Rev. 13:1-10; and all that ever came in its career from that day to this, has been but the natural and inevitable outgrowth of the power and prerogatives which were then possessed and claimed by the Catholic Church.

*And it all came from the Edict of Milan, bestowing governmental favors upon "the Christians."* No man can fairly deny that in the Edict of Milan and the religio-political intrigue that lay behind it, there was contained the whole Papacy. No man can successfully deny that the Edict of Milan, though appearing innocent enough upon its face, contained the whole Papacy: or that the things that followed in the ten years up to 323, which we have sketched, were anything else than the logical and inevitable development of the evil that lay wrapped up in that. All this came out of that edict, and nothing came out of it that was not in it. Nothing *could* come out of it that was not in it.

Now I call your attention to the thought again, that all of that, the whole Papacy, and every step from that day forward, came out of that edict in favor of Christianity. Didn't it? now when the Supreme Court of the United States has issued a decree in favor of Christianity, what is coming out of that? What is in it?

What was in that edict of Constantine's in favor of Christianity?—The beast, the whole Papacy from that day to this. Then what is in this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in favor of

Christianity as the religion of this nation?—The image of the beast, the image of the Papacy, from this day and forward for all that will ever come. That is what is in it.

Just as certainly as that edict of Constantine in favor of Christianity there, produced the Papacy with all that it is; just so certainly this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in favor of the Christian religion here, as the religion of this nation, has in it the image of the beast, and will produce all that the prophecy has in it, or ever tells about. All this will come out of this decision, just as certainly as all that came out of that edict.

Disputes will arise here as to what Christianity is indeed, just as they arose there. Disputes will arise, I know not precisely in what form; it may be between Catholicism and Protestantism, or it may be between the different sects of Protestantism. But these disputes will certainly come. I know not how soon; but just as certainly as that decree of the Supreme Court of the United States that this is a Christian nation has been made, just so certainly a disagreement will arise one of these days, and the Supreme Court or some one else will have to decide who are Christians, and what class of Christians it is that is meant in that decision. That will have to come. And it will come.

*(Concluded next week.)*

**"Some Scraps of New England History" <sup>111</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 35 , pp. 276, 277.**

IN July, 1656, Mary Fisher and Anne Austin, two Quaker women, landed in Boston. By some means, news of their coming had preceded them. Before they were allowed to land at all, Richard Bellingham, the deputy-governor, Governor Endicott being absent, sent officers aboard the ship, "searched their trunks and chests, and took away the books they found there, which were about one hundred, and carried them ashore, after having commanded the said women to be kept prisoners aboard; and the said books were, by an order of the council, burnt in the market-place by the hangman." The women were soon taken from the ship, however, and at once "shut up close prisoners, and command was given that none should come to them without leave; a fine of five pounds being laid on any that should otherwise come at or speak with them, tho' but at the window. Their pens, ink, and paper were taken from them, and they not

suffered to have any candle-light in the night season; nay, what is more, they were stript naked, under pretense to know whether they were witches, tho' in searching no token was found upon them but of innocence. And in this search they were so barbarously misused that modesty forbids to mention it. And that none might have communication with them, a board was nailed up before the window of the jail." August 18, the following order was issued to the jailer:—

*To the Keeper of the Boston Jail:—*

You are by virtue hereof to keep the Quakers formerly committed to your custody as dangerous persons, industrious to improve all their abilities to seduce the people of this jurisdiction, both by words and letters, to the abominable tenets of the Quakers, and to keep them close prisoners, not suffering them to confer with any person, nor permitting them to have paper or ink.

Signed, EDWARD RAWSON,

*August 18, 1656. Sec. of the Boston Court.*

They were not only denied food by the authorities, but "liberty was denied even to send them provisions." "Seeing

277

they were not provided with victuals, Nicholas Upshal, one who lived long in Boston, and was a member of the church there," bought of the jailer for five shillings a week the privilege of furnishing them with food. September 7, another order was issued to the jailer, commanding him "to search as often as he saw meet, the boxes, chests, and things of the Quakers formerly committed to his custody, for pen, ink, and paper, papers and books, and to take them from them."

"After having been about five weeks prisoners, William Chichester, master of a vessel, was bound in one hundred pound bond to carry them back, and not suffer any to speak with them, after they were put on board; and the jailer kept their beds . . . and their Bible, for his fees." During the imprisonment they were frequently examined by the ministers with a view to getting some hold on them by which they might be dealt with for the heresy of schism, or some other such crime, but all in vain. It was well for the two women that they happened to be sent away when they were, for not long afterward Endicott returned, and was not a little displeased with Bellingham, the deputy-governor, for dealing so gently with them, declaring that if he had been there, he "would have had them well whipped," although as yet the colony had no law at all concerning Quakers.

These two women had not been long gone before eight other Quakers arrived in Boston. They were subjected to the same sort of treatment to which the other two had been. In the same month of September, the Commissioners of the United Colonies met at Plymouth, and the Boston court called upon them to stir up Plymouth Colony to vigilance, especially against the Quakers. The letter ran as follows:—

Having heard some time since that our neighboring colony of Plymouth, our beloved brethren, in great part seem to be wanting to themselves in a due acknowledgment and encouragement of the ministry of the gospel, so as many pious ministers have (how justly we know not) deserted their stations, callings, and relations; our desire is that some such course may be taken, as that a pious orthodox ministry may be restated among them, that so the flood of errors and principles of anarchy may be prevented. Here hath arrived amongst us several persons professing themselves Quakers, fit instruments to propagate the kingdom of Satan, for the securing of our neighbors from such pests, we have imprisoned them all till they be dispatched away to the place from whence they came.

"The commissioners gave advice accordingly," but Bradford, who was governor of Plymouth, would not take any such steps. After his death, however, severe measures were adopted.

October 14, 1656, the general court of Massachusetts enacted the following law:—

Whereas there is an accursed sect of heretics lately risen in the world, which are commonly called Quakers, who take upon them to be immediately sent of God and infallibly assisted by the Spirit, to speak and write blasphemous opinions, despising governments, and the order of God in the church and commonwealth, speaking evil of dignities, reproaching and reviling magistrates and ministers, seeking to turn the people from the faith, and gain proselytes to their pernicious ways: This court taking into consideration the premises, and to prevent the like mischief as by their means is wrought in our land, doth hereby order, and by the authority of this court be it ordered and enacted that what master or commander of any ship, bark, pink, or catch, shall henceforth bring into any harbor, creek, or cove, within this jurisdiction, any Quaker or Quakers, or other blasphemous heretics, shall pay, or cause to be paid, the fine of one hundred pounds to the treasurer of the county, except it appear he want true knowledge or information on their being such, and in that case he hath liberty to clear himself by his oath, when sufficient proof to the contrary is wanting. And for default of good payment, or good security for it, he shall be cast

into prison, and there to continue till the said sum be satisfied to a treasurer as aforesaid. And the commander of any catch, ship, or vessel, being legally convicted, shall give in sufficient security to the governor, or any one or more of the magistrates, who have power to determine the same, to carry them back to the place whence he brought them, and on his refusal to do so, the governor or any one or more of the magistrates, are hereby empowered to issue out his or their warrants to commit such master or commander to prison, there to continue till he give in sufficient security to the content of the governor, or any of the magistrates as aforesaid. And it is hereby further ordered and enacted, that what Quaker soever shall arrive in this country from foreign parts, or shall come into this jurisdiction from any parts adjacent, shall be forthwith committed to the house of correction, and at their entrance to be severely whipped, and by the master thereof to be kept constantly to work, and none suffered to converse or speak with them during the time of their imprisonment, which shall be no longer than necessity requires. And it is ordered, if any person shall knowingly import into any harbor of this jurisdiction any Quaker's books or writings concerning their devilish opinions, he shall pay for such book or writing, being legally proved against him or them, the sum of five pounds; and whosoever shall disperse or sell any such book or writing, and it be found with him or her, or in his or her house, and shall not immediately deliver the same to the next magistrate, shall forfeit or pay five pounds for the dispersing or selling of every such book or writing. And it is hereby further enacted that if any person within this colony shall take upon them to defend the heretical opinions of the Quakers, or any of their books or papers as aforesaid, being legally proved, shall be fined for the first time forty shillings; and if they persist in the same, and shall again defend it the second time, four pounds; if they shall again defend and maintain said accursed heretical opinions, they shall be committed to the house of correction till there be convenient passage to send them out of the land, being sentenced to the court of assistants to banishment. Lastly, it is hereby ordered that what person or persons soever shall revile the person of magistrates or ministers as is usual with the Quakers, such person or persons shall be severely whipped, or pay the sum of five pounds.

When this law was published, Nicholas Upshal, the kind and Christian old gentleman who had bought the privilege of feeding Mary Fisher and Anne Austin, when they were in prison, "publicly testified against it." The next morning he was summoned to answer before the general court. He told them that "the execution of that law would be a forerunner of a judgment upon their country, and therefore in love and tenderness which he bare to the people and the place, desired them

to take heed, lest they were found fighters against God." He was fined twenty pounds, although a member of one of the churches. And then having absented himself from church on account of these things, he was fined three pounds, and banished, although winter was now come, and he "a weakly, ancient man."

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 35 , p. 280.**

CERTAINLY "the State recognizes the right of man to a Sabbath, or a day of rest;" and it also recognizes the right of man to a great many other things which it does not undertake to guarantee to him, and, above all, which it does not undertake to force upon him. The State recognizes the right of man to sleep, but it does not for that reason provide that all men shall sleep at the same time. It simply provides that the right of man to sleep, but it does not for that reason provide that all men shall sleep at the same time. It simply provides that any man who wantonly and maliciously disturbs another at any time may be punished for breach of the peace, or for noisy and boisterous conduct. If some men choose to work at night and sleep in the day time, as thousands do, there is no law to prevent them from so doing. Why is not the same freedom of choice permitted in the matter of Sunday rest?

THE oft-repeated claim reiterated by the *Examiner*, that a regular seventh day of rest is essential to the physical well-being of man, is by no means well-established. Peoples, who, like the Chinese and Japanese, have no regular, weekly rest day, enjoy, other things being equal, quite as good health and live quite as long as do people in the United States and England. "The Sabbath was made for man;" but inasmuch as it was made and given to him before the fall, before the sentence: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," it is evident that its primary purpose was not physical rest but spiritual felicity. That this is so is evident also from the fact that in the redeemed state, the new earth, spoken of in 2 Peter 3:13, the Sabbath is still to be observed as a day of joy and worship: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. 66:22, 23. The Sabbath is God's memorial, made for man, not that he might rest from physical toil, but that by its constant

recurrence the creature might the better keep in mind the Creator. Sunday does not, however, serve this purpose, hence the necessity of finding some other reason for its observance.

**September 15, 1892**

**"Some Scraps of New England History" <sup>121</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 36 , pp. 283, 284.**

### **THE SUFFERINGS OF THE QUAKERS**

NOTWITHSTANDING these laws and penalties, and the spirit to inflict the penalties in the severest way, the Quakers continued to come. In fact, wherever such laws were, that was the very place where the Quakers wished to be, because they were opposed to every kind of soul-oppression and every form of the union of Church and State. Not only in this, but in almost everything else, their views made them objects of special hatred to the theocrats of Massachusetts. They recognized no such distinction among Christians as clergy and laity, and could neither be coaxed nor forced to pay tithes. They refused to do military service, and would not take an oath. They would not take their hats off either in church or in court. "In doctrine their chief peculiarity was the assertion of an 'inward light,' by which every individual is to be guided in his conduct of life." And "the doctrine of the 'inward light,' or of private inspiration, was something especially hateful to the Puritan." Another thing no less hateful to the Puritan than this, was their refusal to keep Sunday in the Puritan way. They called "in question the propriety of Christians turning the Lord's day into a Jewish Sabbath." They were denounced as infidels, blasphemers, agents of the devil, and were counted as easily guilty of every heresy and every crime in the Puritan theoretical catalogue.

Admission to the confederacy of the New England colonies had been absolutely refused Rhode Island, on account of its principles of liberty of conscience; but hatred of the Quakers led Massachusetts colony in 1657 to ask Rhode Island to join the confederacy in the endeavor to save New England from the Quakers. "They sent a letter to the authorities of that colony, signing themselves their loving friends and neighbors, and beseeching them to preserve the whole body of colonists against 'such a pest,' by banishing and excluding all Quakers, a measure to which 'the rule of charity did oblige them.'"

But Roger Williams was still president of Rhode Island, and, true to his principles, he replied: "We have no law amongst us whereby to punish any for only declaring by words their minds and understandings concerning things and ways of God as to salvation and our eternal condition. As for these Quakers, we find that where they are most of all suffered to declare themselves freely and only opposed by arguments in discourse, there they least of all desire to come. Any breach of the civil law shall be punished, but the freedom of different consciences shall be respected."

This reply enraged the whole confederacy. Massachusetts threatened to cut off the trade of Rhode Island. In this strait Rhode Island, by Roger Williams, appealed for protection to Cromwell, who now ruled England. The appeal presented the case as it was, but that which made it of everlasting importance, as the grandest and most touching appeal in all history, is the piteous plea, *"But whatever fortune may befall, let us not be compelled to exercise any civil power over men's consciences."*

In this year, October 14, another law was passed against Quakers, in which it was enacted that—

If any person or persons within this jurisdiction shall henceforth entertain and conceal any such Quaker or Quakers, or other blasphemous heretics, knowing them so to be, every such person shall forfeit to the country forty shillings for every such hour's entertainment and concealment of any Quaker or Quakers, etc., as aforesaid, and shall be committed to prison as aforesaid, till forfeiture be fully satisfied and paid: and it is further ordered that if any Quaker or Quakers shall presume, after they have once suffered what the law requires, to come into this jurisdiction, every such male Quaker shall for the first offense have one of his ears cut off, and be kept at work in the house of correction till he can be sent away at his own charge, and for the second offense shall have his other ear cut off: and every woman Quaker that has fulfilled the law here that shall presume to come into this jurisdiction, shall be severely whipped, and kept at the house of correction at work, till she be sent away at her own charge, and so also for her coming again she shall be alike used as aforesaid: and for every Quaker, he or she, that shall presume a third time herein again to offend, they shall have their tongues burned through with a red-hot iron, and be kept at the house of correction close to work, till they be sent away at their own charge. And it is further ordered that all and every Quaker arising from among ourselves, shall be dealt with, and suffer the like punishments, as the law provides against foreign Quakers.



The Quakers, however, not only continued to come, and to come again when imprisoned, whipped, and banished; but their preachings, and much more their persecutions, raised up others in the colonies. This result followed so promptly that May 20, 1658, the following statute was enacted:—

That Quakers and such accursed heretics, arising among ourselves, may be dealt with according to their deserts, and that their pestilent errors and practices may be speedily prevented, it is hereby ordered, as an addition to the former laws against Quakers, that every such person or persons, professing any of their pernicious ways by speaking, writing, or by meeting on the Lord's day, or at any other time, to strengthen themselves, or seduce others to their diabolical doctrines, shall, after due means of conviction, incur the penalty ensuing; that is, every person so meeting, shall pay to the country for every time ten shillings; and every one speaking in such meeting, shall pay five pounds apiece; and in case any such person, after having been punished by scourging or whipping for such, according to the former law, shall be still kept at work in the house of correction, till they put in security with two sufficient men, that they shall not any more vent their hateful errors, nor use their sinful practices, or else shall depart this jurisdiction at their own charges, and if any of them return again, then each such person shall incur the penalty of the law formerly made for strangers.

In 1658 "Rev." John Norton, supported by the rest of the clergy, circulated a petition praying that the penalty of death should be visited upon all Quakers who should return after having been banished. The Board of Commissioners of the United Colonies met in Boston in September. The petition was presented to the Board, which in response advised the general court of each colony to enact such a law. Accordingly, October 16, the general court of Massachusetts enacted the following law:—

Whereas there is a pernicious sect, commonly called Quakers, lately risen up, who by word and writing have published and maintained many dangerous and horrid tenets, and do take upon them to change and alter the received and laudable customs of our nation, not giving civil respects to equals, or reverence to superiors; whose actions tend to undermine civil government, and to destroy the order of the churches, by denying all established forms of worship, and by withdrawing from orderly church fellowship, allowed and proved by all orthodox professors of truth, and instead thereof, and in opposition thereto, frequently meet by themselves, insinuating themselves into the minds of the simple, or such as are least affected to the order and government of the church and

commonwealth, whereby diverse particular inhabitants have been infected, notwithstanding all former laws made, have been upon the experience of their arrogant and bold determinations, to disseminate their practice amongst us, prohibiting their coming into this jurisdiction, they have not been deterred from their impious attempts to undermine our peace and hazard our ruin.

For prevention thereof, this court doth order and enact that every person or persons, of the accursed sect of Quakers, who is not an inhabitant of, but is found within, this jurisdiction, shall be apprehended without warrant, where no magistrate is at hand, by any constable, commissioner, or selectman, and conveyed from constable to constable, to the next magistrate who shall commit the said person to close prison, there to remain (without bail) till the next court of assistants, where they shall have a legal trial: and being convicted [Note:—"For which conviction, it was counted sufficient that they appeared with their hats on and said 'thee' and 'thou'] to be of the sect of the Quakers, shall be sentenced to be banished upon pain of death: and that every inhabitant of this jurisdiction being convicted to be

284

of the aforesaid sect, either by taking up, publishing, or defending the horrid opinion of the Quakers, or stirring up of mutiny, sedition, or rebellion against the government, or by taking up their abusive and destructive practices, viz., denying civil respect to equals and superiors, and withdrawing from our church assemblies, and instead thereof frequenting meetings of their own in opposition to our church order, or by adhering to, or approving of, any known Quaker, and the tenets practiced, that are opposite to the orthodox received opinions of the godly, and endeavoring to disaffect others to civil government and church order, or condemning the practice and proceedings of this court against the Quakers, manifesting thereby their plotting with those whose design is to overthrow the order established in Church and State, every such person convicted before the said court of assistants, in manner aforesaid, shall be committed to close prison for one month, and then, unless they choose voluntarily to depart this jurisdiction, shall give bond for their good behavior, and appear at the next court, where continuing obstinate, and refusing to retract and reform their aforesaid opinions, they shall be sentenced to banishment upon pain of death; and any one magistrate upon information given him of any such person, shall cause him to be apprehended, and shall commit any such person, according to his discretion, till he comes to trial as aforesaid.

Nor were any of these laws in any sense a dead letter. They were enforced in the regular Puritan way.

**"The Gospel: What It Is, and Its Work As Opposed to the Mystery of Iniquity" <sup>131</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 36 , p. 284.**

(Concluded.)

THE National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and this whole ecclesiastical combination who have been working for this for these twenty-nine years. Will they stand silent and do nothing? Is there not here to-day an ecclesiastical organization anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for itself, just as there was then to raise a like dispute?

Then can any one doubt, or fail to see, that under the circumstances and in the condition of the times, in view of the position the church occupied at that time, just as certainly as that edict of Constantine in favor of Christianity as the religion of the Roman empire brought the Papacy, and out of that came all that the Papacy ever was, just so certainly under the like circumstances and the like conditions of church ambition, out of this Supreme Court decision making Christianity the religion of this nation,—just so certainly in this is the image of the beast, and out of it will come everything that the prophecy ever tells about.

We are not the only ones able to see these things. That was one of the things that was held in mind when this government was made. Before making the national Constitution, there was a movement in Virginia to establish the Christian religion—not the Catholic nor the Protestant, but "the Christian religion;" that is all. Let me read to you what James Madison saw in that:—

"Who does not see that the same authority can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease, any particular *sect of Christians* in exclusion of all other sects?"

Constantine favored Christianity at the first, just as a whole—"the whole body of Christians." And then he established a particular sect, the "Catholic Church of the Christians," just as easily as he did the first. Just so certain as the Supreme Court of the United States has established Christianity as the religion of this nation, in exclusion of all other religion of this nation, in exclusion of all other religions, just so certain will it, or some other power, have to establish one particular sect in exclusion of all other sects. The Supreme Court hints at Protestantism; but if that is it, somebody will have to decide which sect of Protestantism it is. I do not know who will decide it; whether

the Supreme Court, or Congress, or by national election campaign, I cannot say; but it will be decided in some way. It is bound to come.

Madison and those of his time knew just as certainly as they knew anything, that if Christianity was established as the State religion of Virginia, there must be a particular sect established, and everybody else be oppressed. Not only that, but he saw this:—

"Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution."

Now mark; they held this position; they had experienced this in their day. We have had some of it too in our day. They saw in the mere proposition to make Christianity the established religion of Virginia, "a signal of persecution." Just as certain as the proposition to make Christianity the established religion of the State of Virginia was the signal of persecution in that State, just so certainly this Supreme Court decision *making* Christianity the religion of this Nation, is a signal of persecution through all the Nation. But I read again from Madison's remonstrance against that:—

"Distant as it may be in its present form from the Inquisition, it differs from it only in degree."

In that proposition to establish "the Christian religion" in Virginia, *they* saw the Inquisition. What do *we* see in the actual establishment of the same religion by the Supreme Court of the United States? Again I read:—

"The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the career of intolerance."

That is what they saw, the makers of this Republic, when an attempt was made to establish "the Christian religion" as the State religion. What does this people see in this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which establishes "the Christian religion" as the national religion? Just as certainly as that back there was a signal of persecution, and persecution throughout the State, just so certain is this a signal of persecution, and persecution through all the nation. Just so certainly as that had in it the Inquisition, just so certain this has in it the same thing.

And just as certain as that edict of Constantine back there, had in it the papacy, just so certain this has in it all that the image of the Papacy is or will be. Controversies arose back there as to what was Christianity, and this brought the establishment of the Catholic Church and persecution of all kinds. Soon the next step was made, compelling them all to become Catholics—heretics to join the Catholic Church and hand over their property to the Catholic Church.

There arose still another difficulty and dispute as to what was the true Catholic *doctrine*, and this brought the Council of Nice, which established Trinitarianism as the true Catholic doctrine. This was soon followed by an emperor who, by a council, established Arianism as the true Catholic doctrine. This was soon followed by another emperor who, by a council, re-established Trinitarianism as the true Catholic doctrine. Thus one ruler and council decided one way, and another decided another way, as to what was the true Catholic religion. And thus it went on, controversy after controversy of all kinds, until the bishop of Rome was made the fountain of faith by earthly governments and human power, instead of the word of God through the Lord Jesus Christ, the power of God. Thus the mystery of iniquity hid and supplanted for ages the mystery of God.

Now, then, old controversies will be revived. Some of these controversies will rise right up again, as to what is the real true Christianity, Catholicism or Protestantism, Trinitarianism or Unitarianism, Calvinism or Arianism. These old controversies will be revived, which have apparently been hushed for a long time. These disputes will arise over hair-splitting theories that have no truth in them. They will dispute over these things. Atoms will be worlds, and worlds will be atoms; and these atoms that they will turn into worlds will be simply senseless disputes by which they can obtain control of the civil power, to force those who oppose them, and do not believe as they do, to act as *they* think or believe. "Old controversies will spring up," and here are new controversies: revelations of false science, evolution, probation after death, etc. "New and old will commingle, and THIS WILL TAKE PALCE RIGHT EARLY." Do you not believe it? Do you believe it? Is it not *time* to believe it, brethren? Well, then, I hope you will.

**"The Sabbath a Memorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 36 , pp. 284, 285.**

APROPOS of our notes in last week's paper upon the nature and design of the Sabbath, are the following paragraphs from "The Abiding Sabbath," published by the American Tract Society:—

Not to a single race, but to man; not to man alone, but to the whole creation; not to the created things alone, but to the Creator himself, came the benediction of the first Sabbath. Its significance extends beyond the narrow limits of Judaism, to all races, and perhaps to all worlds. It is a law spoken not simply through the lawgiver of a chosen people, but declared in the presence of a

finished heaven and earth. The declaration in Genesis furnishes the best commentary on the saying of Jesus: "The Sabbath was made for man." For man, universal humanity, it was given with its benediction.

The reason of the institution of the Sabbath is one which possesses an unchanging interest and importance to all mankind. The theme of the creation is not peculiar to Israel, nor is worship of the Creator confined to the children of Abraham. The primary article of every religious creed, and the foundation of all true religion, is faith in one God as the Maker of all things. Against atheism, which denies the existence of a personal God; against materialism, which denies that this visible universe has its roots in the unseen; and against secularism, which denies the need of worship, the Sabbath is therefore an eternal witness. It symbolically commemorates that creative power which spoke all things into being, the wisdom which ordered their adaptations and harmony, and the love which made, as well as pronounced, all "very good." *It is set as the perpetual guardian of man against that spiritual infirmity which has everywhere led him to a denial of the God who made him, or to the degradation of that God into a creature made with his own hands.*

The words which we have italicized express truth which, if rightly understood and accepted in its fullness, would forever put an end to the "civil Sabbath" plea for Sunday laws. The Sabbath was primarily made for man, not that he might rest but that he might worship his Creator in the beauty of holiness. It was to be to man a memorial of God's finished work, a monument erected at the end of each week to remind man of the time

285

"when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy," because "God saw everything that he had made and, behold, it was very good." Physical rest is an incident, not the object, of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 36 , p. 288.**

INSTEAD of entering a vigorous and manly protest against the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists, a Baptist paper in this city, enters upon a labored defense of Sunday laws, and incidentally remarks:—

If there are any whose consciences oblige them to rest from labor on some other day, they may be relieved from the hardship of a double Sabbath by being permitted to pursue their ordinary callings on Sunday—only so as not to disturb others in the enjoyment of their day of rest.

But what would constitute a disturbance of others? Some people are very much "disturbed" by the mere knowledge of that their neighbors rest on the seventh day while they work, and work on the first day while they rest. And in at least one State this annoyance has been held by the courts to amount to a public nuisance, and Christian men have been imprisoned as common criminals under this legal fiction. Such a permission as our Baptist contemporary proposes may mean something or nothing according to the whim of the courts.

BUT why should observers of the seventh day, or of any day other than Sunday be permitted to work on Sunday only provided they disturb no one any more than observers of Sunday should be permitted to work on Saturday only provided they disturb no one? Why should any more protection be thrown around the Sunday keeper than around the man who keeps another day? And if in order for one to rest all must rest at the same time, and if it is right and just to require the seventh day observer to rest on Sunday so that he shall not disturb the Sunday keeper, why should not the Sunday keeper be required to rest on Saturday so that he shall not disturb those who observe the seventh day?

BUT those who keep the seventh day ask no laws requiring others to keep it also. They are not disturbed because others are at work while they are resting. They simply ask to be let alone in the enjoyment of their natural right to work when they please and to rest when they feel tired or when their sense of duty to God moves them to rest. They ask no special legislation in their behalf, and they insist that there should be none in the interests of other religionists.

**September 22, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 37 , pp. 289-291.**

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is in the seventh year of its publication. From the first number that was ever issued, it has been telling the people that in this Government, though forbidden by the Constitution, there would be established a national religion; and that there would be national Sunday legislation at the demand of the churches.

ALL of this is now done by the United States Supreme Court decision of February 29, 1892, declaring this to be a Christian Nation,<sup>141</sup> and by Congress, in the act closing the World's Fair on Sunday. In

these two governmental actions there lies wrapped up, and only awaiting swift development, all that THE SENTINEL has been telling about, and warning against, these seven years. In thus establishing Christianity as the national religion, the United State is doing just what was done in the Roman Empire in the fourth century; and the result will be the same now that it was then, namely, persecution for conscience' sake.

IN the beginning of the fourth century there was in the Roman Empire, even as there is now in the United States, a powerful ecclesiastical organization, the leaders and managers of which were "only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves."—*Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, book 8, chap. 1*. While "it was the hope of every bishop in the empire to make politics a branch of theology," "it was the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics." In an intrigue therefore with Constantine, they succeeded in bartering to him their influence and power in theology for his in politics.

AMS one of the very first fruits of this intrigue, Constantine was established in the rulership of one half of the Roman Empire. Jointly with Licinius, he then issued the Edict of Milan, reversing the persecuting edicts of Diocletian, and granting "liberty and full freedom to the Christians to observe their own mode of worship;" granting "likewise to the Christians and to all, the free choice to follow that mode of worship which they may wish;" granting "likewise to the Christians and to all, the free choice to follow that mode of worship which they may wish;" "that each may have the privilege to select and to worship whatsoever divinity he pleases;" and commanding that the churches and the church property which had been confiscated by Diocletian, should be restored to "the whole body of Christians," "and to each conventicler respectively."—*Id., book 10, chap. 5*.

THIS was all just and proper enough, and innocent enough, in itself and on its face, *if that had been all there was to it*. But behind it there lay the *ecclesiastical organization*, ambitious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for itself, and that religio-political intrigue which had been entered into to feed and satisfy this ambition. This ecclesiastical organization likewise claimed to be the legitimate and only true representative and depository of Christianity in the world—it was the Catholic Church. And no sooner had the Edict of Milan ordered the restoration of property *to the Christians*, than it was



seized upon and made an issue by which to secure the imperial recognition and the legal establishment of *the Catholic Church*.

THE rule had long before been established that all who did not agree with the bishops of the Catholic Church were necessarily heretics, and not Christians at all; it was now claimed by the Catholic Church that therefore none such were entitled to any benefit from the edict restoring property *to the Christians*. In other words, the Catholic Church disputed the right of any others than Catholics to receive property or money under the Edict of Milan, by disputing their right to the title of Christians. And by this issue the Catholic Church forced an imperial decision as to who were Christians. Under the circumstances, it was a foregone conclusion that this decision would be in favor of the Catholic Church; and accordingly, Constantine's edict to the proconsul contained these words:—

It is our will that when thou shalt receive this epistle, if any of those things belonging to *the Catholic Church* of the Christians in the several cities or other places, are now possessed either by the decurions or any others, these thou shalt cause immediately to be restored to their churches.

BUT this did not settle the controversy. Immediately there were two parties claiming to be the Catholic Church. Therefore the emperor was obliged next to decide *which was the Catholic Church*. Later Constantine addressed a letter to Cecilianus, bestowing more favors upon what he now called "*the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion*." No sooner was it decided what was "*the legitimate and most holy Catholic Church*," than the civil power was definitely placed at the disposal of this church, with positive instructions to use this power in compelling conformity to the new imperial religion. And persecution was begun at once.

NOR was this long in coming. It all occurred in *less than four years*. The Edict of Milan was issued in the month of March, A.D. 313. Before that month expired, the decision was rendered that the imperial favors were for the Catholic Church only. In the autumn of the same year, 313, the first council sat to decide which was the Catholic Church. In the summer of 314 sat the second council on the same question. And in 316 the de-

cree was sent to Cecilianus, empowering him to distribute the money to the ministers of "*the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion*," and to use the civil power to force the Donatists to submit to the decision of the councils and the emperor.

## FOLLOWED INEVITABLY

The first step taken in the union of Church and State in the Roman Empire, subsequent steps followed, not only easily and naturally, but inevitably. Constantine favored Christianity at the first, just as a whole—"the whole body of Christians." And then he established a particular sect, the "Catholic Church of the Christians," just as easily as he did the first. Just so certainly as the Supreme Court of the United States has established Christianity as the religion of this Nation, in exclusion of all other religions, just so certainly will it, or some other power, have to establish one particular sect in exclusion of all other sects. The Supreme Court hints at Protestantism; but if that is it, somebody will have to decide which sect of Protestantism it is.

Madison and other statesmen of his time knew just as certainly as they knew anything, that if Christianity was established as the State religion there must be a particular sect established, and everybody else be oppressed. Of the attempt to establish Christianity in Virginia, Madison wrote:—

Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians.

And of such action he said:—

Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution.

Now mark: Madison and his compatriots held this position; they had experienced this in their day. We have had some of it too in our day. They saw in the mere proposition to make Christianity the established religion of Virginia, "a signal of persecution." Just as certainly as the proposition to make Christianity the established religion of the State of Virginia was the signal of persecution in that State, just so certainly this Supreme Court decision *making* Christianity the religion of this Nation, is a signal of persecution through all the Nation. But read again from Madison's remonstrance:—

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.

In that proposition to establish "the Christian religion" in Virginia, Madison and other lovers of liberty saw the Inquisition. What does the reader see in this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States,

which establishes "the Christian religion" as the national religion, and in the act of Congress which establishes as an essential part of Christianity the dogma that Sunday is the Sabbath? Just as certainly as that, back there, was a signal of persecution, and persecution throughout the State, just so certainly are these a signal of persecution, and persecution through all the Nation. Just so certainly as that had in it the Inquisition, just so certainly these have in them the same thing. And just as certainly as that edict of Constantine had in it the Papacy, just so certainly have these in them an image or likeness to the Papacy—an American papacy, distinct from, but no better than, the Roman Papacy.

### **KNEW IT WAMS COMING**

We knew it was coming. And this is why for years we so continuously and so earnestly protested, and warned the people, against it. We knew not exactly *how* this union of Church and State, or as some prefer to call it, of religion and the State, would be brought about; we only knew *that* it would come; but we knew enough about the evil thing, to be able to recognize it when it should be formed. We have protested against this great evil; and we still protest against it. We protest against the evil principle itself, and we protest and shall continue to protest against any and all the consequences of the principle.

We had the right to protest against the establishment of a national religion; and we have the right to protest against this national religion now that it is established. In short, we have the divine and everlasting right to dissent from any and every religious organization on earth; and when the Government joins a religious organization, we have the same right still; even to the extent of refusing obedience to the Government itself, *in so far* as it is joined to the religious organization.

The one great object of the grand movement of the churches to secure governmental recognition of religion was to secure legislation by which Sunday observance could be enforced throughout the Nation, backed up by national power and influence. We protested against their movement, and disputed their right, to use the governmental power for any such purpose. Now that they have secured it, we still dispute their right to use it. We had the right to dissent from their claim of right to use the Government for any such purpose; and we have still the right to dissent from their use of the

governmental power for this purpose. We had the right to refuse to keep Sunday when it was required by the churches without the aid of the Government; and we have the same right to refuse to keep it when it is required by the churches *with* the aid of the Government. In other words, governmental aid of churches in enforcing their dogmas and ordinances can not take away any man's right to dissent from those dogmas and ordinances. The Government does wrong in aiding the churches; and men do right in dissenting from both churches and Government in the things wherein they are allied.

### **WHY THEY SOUGHT AID**

It was lack of power to convince the people that they ought to keep Sunday as the Sabbath, that caused the churches to demand the governmental power to aid in compelling the people to do this. Lacking the power to persuade the people, the churches resorted to power to compel the people to observe the ordinance of the Church. The religious controversy, as to whether Sunday is a sacred day or not, has been going on in the United States longer than has the movement to secure the recognition or declaration of the Government that it is sacred. Those who demand that Sunday shall be observed have admitted over and over again that there is no divine command for it. And the effort of these churches to secure the alliance and aid of the Government was only an effort to get the national Government to take their side of this controversy. They now have the Government committed to this. In the effort to gain this they have been boastful, and arrogant, and insolent, enough, in all conscience, as has been abundantly shown by their own words all these years. If any one is inclined to think they will be any less so, now that they have their wish, then the writer only wishes that that one could have sat where he did, in the gallery of the House, when the final vote was taken by which Congress committed the Government to their side of the controversy, and could have seen and heard their exultation.

In this act of closing the World's Fair on Sunday, Congress has distinctly taken sides in a theological controversy. Congress in this, and the Supreme Court in its decision, have committed the Government of the United States to the decision of a religious question. Neither the act of Congress nor the decision of the Supreme Court, will convince the Jew, or the Christian who observes the seventh day, that Sunday should be observed. No more will the

National Reformers be able to convince these with the aid of the power which these acts give, to inflict pains and penalties upon dissenters. We disagreed with the National Reformers before; we disagree with them now. We denied before that Sunday should be observed; we deny now that it should be observed. We refused before to keep Sunday; we refuse now to keep Sunday. We denied before, the National Reform claim of right to use the governmental power to compel anybody to keep Sunday; and although they have secured the use of the power, we deny now their right to use it.

### **COMMITTED TO A FALSEHOOD**

All these years we have denied the right of Congress to legislate in behalf of Sunday or any other religious rite or institution. We denied this wholly upon *principle*. We protested against Sunday legislation because it is religious legislation. We would have protested equally if it had been proposed to legislate in behalf of any other religious day. We can appeal to the life of THE SENTINEL as clear evidence that this has always been the one prominent feature and reason of our protest against Sunday legislation. And as long as the question had maintained this standing only, so long would this have still been the prominent feature of our protest. But now Congress has legislated upon the subject. Congress has now decided, and has committed the Government to the decision, that Sunday is the Sabbath and shall be observed. And now we protest against it, not only because it is religious legislation, but also, *because it is not true*. In this act Congress has committed itself and the Government to a falsehood.

Sunday is not the Sabbath. Sunday is not the Lord's day. Sunday is not in any sense a sacred day. As before stated, the chiefest advocates of this Sunday legislation admit in writing that there is no divine command for the observance of Sunday in any way. They know that the only authority for it is the authority of the Church. And if they do not know, they, and everybody else who will look into the question, may learn that "the church" which is authority for Sunday sacredness is *the Catholic Church*, and that alone. And they may likewise know that professed Protestants who keep Sunday, are following the authority of the Catholic Church, and that alone, for there is no other authority for Sunday observance whether by church rulers or governmental statute. And Congress in requir-

ing the observance of Sunday, is requiring submission and obedience to the authority of the Catholic Church, for there is no other authority for Sunday observance. It was therefore perfectly fitting that in the chief speech that was made in favor of the Sunday bill in the Senate (the speech of Senator Hawley of Connecticut), the chief place in the speech should be given to the views of Catholic archbishops upon the subject. But the authority of the Catholic Church is no authority at all; it is only usurpation and fraud, and its Sunday sacredness is a falsehood. Therefore it is that the Congress of the United States, in legislating in behalf of Sunday observance, has committed itself, and the Government of the United States, to a falsehood. And not only to a falsehood, but to a *papal* falsehood. And we refuse to recognize it or yield any respect to it as either true or right.

The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, and Sunday is not the Sabbath. The seventh day is the Lord's day, and Sunday is not. The seventh day is the sacred day and the only sacred day, and Sunday is not at all a sacred day. For thus saith the Lord:—

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, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, 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.—Ex. 20:8-11.

And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.—Gen. 2:3.

This is the position and the protest of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL now and always.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 37 , p. 296.**

A DENIAL that persecution is intended, or that it will result from the passage of religious laws in this country, is of no avail in the face of existing facts. It is a political maxim that "the domain that government invades it dominates; the jurisdiction it takes it keeps." And this Government having invaded the domain of religion and assumed jurisdiction in religious questions, will inevitably dominate that domain and retain that jurisdiction. Moreover, those who are clamoring for

governmental recognition of religious dogmas and institutions, have shown that they are not slow to avail themselves of any advantage afforded by legislative action, whether State or national.

"REVOLUTIONS never go backward," especially when they are in the wrong direction; and a most wonderful religio-political revolution has taken place in this country in the last decade. By this revolution, persecution for conscience' sake has been inaugurated in several different States of the Union; the First Amendment to the Federal Constitution has been practically swept away by the Supreme Court decision of Feb. 29, 1892; and the Government has been made a party to a religious controversy by the act of Congress conditioning the World's Fair appropriation on the Sunday closing of the Columbian Exposition. And the promoters of this religio-political movement themselves declare that these are only the beginnings. What then will the end be?—Clearly, anything except the continuance of the liberty of conscience hitherto enjoyed by a free people.

THAT the spirit of bigotry and intolerance is not dead, nor even sleeping, in this the closing decade of the nineteenth century, is proven beyond a doubt by the fact that honest, God-fearing men, members of a Christian church, and conscientious observers of the Sabbath enjoined by the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, have been fined and imprisoned in several different States, *at the instigation of members of other churches*, and that for no other offense than doing quiet farm work on Sunday after having, according to their faith, observed the day of their choice. And not the least significant feature of this persecution is that it has elicited practically no protest from the religious press of the country. The facts have been published broadcast, and special pains have been taken to bring them to the attention of the press everywhere. The silence is not due therefore to ignorance but to indifference and approval. Thus by silence, the religious press of this country has given assent to persecution for conscience' sake, and by giving assent, is has become partaker in the evil deeds of the persecutors.

THE facts in the most recent of these persecutions are briefly as follows: Near Springville, Henry County, Tenn., there is a church of nearly sixty Seventh-day Adventists. They are, as even their persecutors admit, honest, God-fearing people. They observe the seventh day of the week by rest and worship. On Sunday they ordinarily go quietly about their secular pursuits, choosing on that day only the more quiet and less conspicuous kinds of farm labor. For

this, "five of the leading members of the church" were, not at the instigation of their immediate neighbors, but on complaint of Sunday-keeping church members of adjoining neighborhoods, indicted for maintaining a nuisance by their Sunday work; were tried and convicted, notwithstanding the fact that their immediate neighbors testified that they were not annoyed by the work, and were actually imprisoned in the common jail, and though not chained themselves, were worked in the chain gang with common criminals, in this 1892nd year of grace, and in "free America;" and that without protest from the churches or from the religious press.

THE Constitution of Tennessee declares "that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship;" yet the courts of the State hold that this provision of the Constitution is not to be understood as permitting dissenters from the prevailing religion to disregard laws made in aid of the religion of those having control of legislation, but only as guaranteeing to every man freedom to hold and practice his own religion without molestation. The same view of the matter was taken by Judge Hammond, of the United States District Court, in the Case of R. M. King, indicted and fined for Sunday work. The case was brought before Judge Hammon on writ of *habeas corpus*. The Judge said:—

Sectarian religious belief is guaranteed by the Constitution, not in the sense argued here, that King, as a Seventh-day Adventist, or some other, as a Jew, or yet another, as a Seventh-day Baptist, might set at defiance the prejudices, if you please, of other sects having control of legislation in the sense that he himself should not be disturbed in the practices of his creed; which is quite a different thing from saying that in the course of his daily labor . . . he might disregard laws made in aid, if you choose to say so, of the religion of other sects.

That is to say, a man may belong to a sect; that sect may have a creed; they may practice according to that creed, and may not be disturbed in such practice; but at the same time, they must conform to the laws made in aid of the religion of other sects, that have control of legislation.

ACCORDING to this interpretation of Tennessee law, if a man be a Baptist he may practice the precepts of the Baptist creed, but if the Methodists should have control of legislation, they could oblige the Baptists by law to conform to the precepts of the Methodist creed. Or



one company of people might be Methodists, another Baptists, another Quakers, and so on; but if the Roman Catholics only had control of legislation, and should enact laws enforcing Roman Catholic doctrines and precepts, then the Baptists, Methodists, Quakers, etc., would all be obliged to conform to the Roman Catholic precepts, as by law required. And although protected in the undisturbed practice of *their own* creeds, none of these dissenting sects would be in any wise at liberty to disregard the laws made in aid of the religion of the Roman Catholic sect! And such, according to the courts, is the freedom of religious belief guaranteed by the Constitution of Tennessee! And the Supreme Court decision of February 29, of the present year of grace, and the act of Congress closing the World's Fair on Sunday, show that practically nothing more than this is guaranteed by the Federal Constitution.

IN view of the facts cited, and very many more might be given, does not THE SENTINEL do well to sound an alarm; to say that the United States is following in the footprints of Rome; that already our fancied constitutional guarantees of religious liberty have been swept away; and that liberty of conscience in America rests now not on a substantial basis in our fundamental law, but upon the whim of the majority, or even worse, upon the forbearance of an arrogant and aggressive minority?

UNITED STATES senators have declared it to be "not wise statesmanship" to disregard the demands of the churches for legislation deciding a religious controversy as to whether Sunday is the Sabbath, or not. Now why shall not this principle apply in other cases? Why shall not the Spiritualists now work up some issue by which they can demand legislation which will decide the question as to whether or not people are alive when they are dead? There are as many Spiritualists as there are church members; and, of course, it would not be "wise statesmanship" to disregard their demands. Besides this, they would have the unanimous and hearty support of all the "evangelical churches" in the country. And as Congress has granted the demands of the churches alone on this Sunday-Sabbath question, how much more would the same body grant the demands of the same ones over again with largely increased numbers with them. For such would only be "wise statesmanship," according to the latest definition of the term. What queer ideas these gentlemen have of what statesmanship is! The truth is that it is not statesmanship at all. It is sheer demagogism; and that of the worst sort. These

gentlemen should be told that statesmanship goes not pander to the selfish and arbitrary demands of classes; it creates sound and healthy public opinion.

**September 29, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 38 , pp. 297, 298.**

THE Government of the United States as our fathers made it, as they intended, and as they by the Constitution established it, is now a thing of the past. It is gone. Both by the Supreme Court and by Congress the intention of the fathers has been disregarded, the principles of the Government have been subverted, and the Constitution has been over-ridden.

THE action of the Supreme Court has been reviewed, and the words in which the Court did its part have been given in these columns. The action of Congress in which it did its part in this thing has also been referred to and largely discussed in THE SENTINEL. We are asked however to give more fully the actual words and proceedings in which Congress did this thing. With this request we gladly comply, for the evidence is not only important but conclusive, and should be placed before all the people.

ALTHOUGH Congress is forbidden by the Constitution to make any law on the subject of religion, yet this matter was discussed, and the law was enacted, solely from the standpoint of religion. Senator Hawley, who had the principal part in carrying this thing through the Senate, said plainly:—

Everybody knows what the foundation is. It is founded in religious belief.

And so entirely was the discussion a religious one that Senator Peffer said of it:—

To-day we are engaged in a theological discussion concerning the observance of the first day of the week.

And the chaplain of the United States Senate, in reporting the matter to the New York *Independent*, July 28, 1892, said of it these words:—

While there were differences of opinion as to *how* the Sabbath should be honored, every man who spoke protested against any purpose to dishonor the fourth commandment. During this debate you might have imagined yourself in a general council or assembly or synod or conference, so pronounced was one senator after another.

SUCH is the impression received by an official onlooker. And that the impression is not at all strained is evident from the speeches that were made, as any one may see who will read the *Congressional Record* of July 12 and 13, 1892. The three principal advocates of the Sunday closing bill were Senators Colquitt, Hawley and Hiscock. As Senator Colquitt is a National Reformer nothing else was to be expected of him, and he fully sustained this character in his speech, about half of which was made up from extracts from a sermon by Father Hyacinthe, Old Roman Catholic of France. The rest of his speech was National Reform sentiment of his own manufacture. Altogether it was of such a sort that he himself began to see how incongruous it was in that place, and halted with these words:—

But I shall continue this no further, Mr. President, for it may to some sound like cant, like preaching, as though we were undertaking to clothe ourselves in overrighteous habiliments and pretend to be better than other man.—*Congressional Record*, 52nd Cong., p. 6755.

SENATOR HISCOCK both preceded and followed Colquitt; and the sum of all his speech is contained in the words of surrender and servitude to the churches, to which we have before referred, as follows:—

If I had charge of this amendment in the interest of the Columbian Exposition *I would write the provision for the closure in any form that the religious sentiment of the country demands* and not stand here hesitating and quibbling about it. Rather than let the public sentiment against the Exposition being opened on Sunday be re-enforced by the opposition in the other House against any legislation of this kind in the interest of the Exposition, I say to the junior senator from Illinois [Mr. Palmer] *he had better yield to this sentiment* and not let it go out to the country that there is the slightest doubt that if this money shall be appropriated, the Exposition will be closed on Sunday.

It if were interested in this measure, as I might be interested if it were to be located in my own State, I should make this closure provision *satisfactory to those petitioners who have memorialized us against the desecration of the Lord's day*. . . . I would not have it uncertain whether the Government might engage in business or not upon the Sabbath day. In my judgment, doubt upon this question carries with it more peril to your appropriation than it can encounter from any other cause whatever. I have nothing more to say.—*Id.*, p. 6755.

SENATOR HAWLEY both preceded and followed, both Colquitt and Hiscock. And as his speeches were longer than the others, so

also were they more rabidly religious and more cringing and cowardly. Yet for all this he was not able to reach that height of religious enthusiasm and eloquence to which for this particular occasion his longing soul aspired, and so he very pertinently exclaimed:—

I wish, Mr. President, that I were the most eloquence clergyman, the most eloquent of those stanch old sturdy divines who have honored American citizenship as well as American Christianity, that I might give something more than this feeble expression of my belief in the serious importance of this vote.—*Id.*, p. 6700.

But as he could not have all his wish, as he could not be one of "those stanch old sturdy divines," such as John Cotton or John Davenport, or Cotton Mather, he made up this lack by presenting the views of Archbishop Ireland, Archbishop Gross, and Archbishop Riordan, of the Catholic Church, and followed this in order with the views of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church both North and South.

BUT although Senator Hawley could not have his wish to be one of "those stanch old sturdy divines," he could be a demagogue—and that seemingly without any particular effort. By the census of 1890 he estimated 13,000,000 members of churches in the United States. Then by

398

adding to this number "the people who are also attendants, associates, and sympathizers, who go to church and send their wives and children and subscribe for it, and have a profound respect for it whether they believe in it or not,"—by this method of counting he got up "from forty-five to fifty millions of the people of this country who have more or less of religious profession or sympathy." Then upon this calculation he argues thus:—

There is no use in endeavoring to escape the responsibility. If the Senate to-day decides that it will not close that Exhibition on Sunday, the Exhibition will be opened on that day, and you will have offended more than 40,000,000 of people—seriously and solemnly offended them. No wise statesman or monarch of modern times, no satrap of Rome would have thought it wise to fly in the face of a profound conviction of the people he governed, no matter if he thought it was a profound error. It is not wise statesmanship to do it.

Now, if gentlemen repudiate this, if they desire to reject it, if they deny that this is in the true sense of the word a religious Nation, I should like to see the disclaimer put in white and black and proposed by the Congress of the United States. Write it. How would you write it? How would you deny that from the foundation of the

country, through every fiber of their being this people has been a religious people. Word it, if you dare; advocate it, if you dare. *How many who voted for it would ever come back here again?* None, I hope.—*Id.*, p. 6759.

So, then, the chief duty of a United States senator, or member of Congress, is to "come back here again." The height of the ambition of such is to "come back here again." And now it is the perfection of "wise statesmanship" so to play into the hands of threatening, boycotting, and unprincipled religious partisans, as to be sure that they can "come back here again." No matter though the thing demanded be subversive of every principle of the Government, we must yield to it, or we can't "come back here again." No matter though the thing demanded be positively forbidden by the Constitution it must be granted or else we can't "come back here again." No matter, though to yield to the demand we must violate the solemn oath which we took to maintain the Constitution of the United States—that oath is nothing, the Constitution is nothing, the principles of the Government are nothing, in the presence of the awful alternative, conveyed in the threats of religious bigots, that we can't "come back here again."

Was there ever on earth a more cowardly or more contemptible surrender than this of the Senate of the United States, as proclaimed by its representatives—Senators Frank S. Hiscock, of New York, and Joseph R. Hawley, of Connecticut?

And the Church managers know that it is a surrender to them. The chaplain of the Senate in the article before referred to says:—

Say not that the former days were better than these, for the Congress of the United States never numbered abler, truer, nobler men than fill the chambers to-day! And never more surely than now would avowed hostility to God, his day and word and house and kingdom, remand a public servant to private life.

This is just what these senators told the churches that they were afraid of. And this is now a public notice that henceforth a religious test will be required as a qualification for office under the United States. H. H. George, who labored for months to secure this legislation, said:—

I have learned that we hold the United States Senate in our hands.

They would be very dull indeed not to have learned it, when the Senate openly told them so. Of course they hold it in their hands, and they will use it, too. For did not that other preacher, J. D. Sands, in

Pittsburg, declare that as the Senate had listened to the voice of the Church,

This grand, good fact suggests to the Christian's mind that if this may be done, so may other equally needful measures. The Church is gaining power continually and its voice will be heard in the future much oftener than in the past.

Thus the evidence is complete and the proof conclusive, that the Government of the United States as it was established and as it was intended to remain is no more. It has been given into the hands of the combined churches, and is there now only a tool to be used by them to enforce upon all the decrees of the Church at her arbitrary will. And thus there stand in the United States to-day the living image of the Papacy, instead of the glorious Government which our father established and hoped would remain.

The "new order of things" to which this Nation stands pledged by the Great Seal of the United States is reversed; and the old order of things which has always been a curse to the world is restored.

A. T. J.

**"A Fine Scheme, Truly!" *The American Sentinel* 7, 38 , pp. 298, 299.**

SOME eight years ago an organization known as the "Boys' Brigade" was formed in Scotland, its subject being "to promote Christ's kingdom among the boys and train them in habits of reverence, self-respect, and Christian manliness."

Three years ago the organization was introduced into this country by way of San Francisco; and not a brigade has been organized at Willimantic, Conn. In a sermon in that city on the 18th inst., Rev. C. A. Dinsmore thus explains the scheme for keeping the boys under church influence and interested in church work:—

The boys are equipped in the uniform and drilled in the tactics of the United States Army. They have breech loading Springfield rifles and are

299

as well furnished as the State militia. Every Sunday they march into their Bible class to receive religious instruction, and are under strict military discipline. Every boy pledges himself to attend the weekly drill and Bible class. If he is willfully absent two consecutive weeks without reasonable excuse, he is dishonorably discharged from the company. Boys are appointed to the offices for proficiency in drill and in Bible lessons. Each boy furnishes his own uniform [*sic*], costing about five dollars. If a boy is unable to do this, the church will provide him one. The guns are owned by the church. Only boys

who attend this church or who have no other church connection are admitted. Great care will be taken not to encroach upon other denominations. With these qualifications the company is open to any boy between the ages of twelve and twenty-one.

To buy the guns and provide for incidental expenses we shall need two hundred and fifty dollars. Next Sunday we shall take a collection for this purpose, and we are confident you will contribute the amount needed. This is not a new experiment and can not fail, if wisely managed, because it is founded on the ineradicable instincts of a boy's nature.

Certainly it can not fail in stimulating and developing the natural instincts of the human heart. It is an easy matter to teach boys to love applause and to labor for it; but it is quite another thing to teach them to "be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honor preferring one another." Nevertheless that is the lesson that Christ would have all both old and young to learn; and it is the lesson that the Church should teach. As a means of cultivating pride, the Boys' Brigade is doubtless a marked success; as a means of grace, it must ever be a dismal failure.

**"Is God In It?" *The American Sentinel* 7, 38 , p. 300.**

UNDER the heading, "Exposition Poetry," the *Christian Cynosure* has the following:—

The closing stanzas of Prof. John K. Paine's "Columbian March and Chorus," to be performed at the dedication of the Exposition buildings at Jackson Park, next month, is as follows:—

All hail and welcome nations of the earth!  
Columbia's greeting comes from every State.  
Proclaim to all mankind the world's new birth  
Of freedom, age on age shall consecrate.  
Let war and enmity forever cease,  
Let glorious art and commerce banish wrong.  
The universal brotherhood of peace  
Shall Columbia's high, inspiring song.

What we would like to know, Is God in it? If not, we prefer the older couplet,—

Praise God from who *all blessings* flow:  
Praise him, all creature here below.

Really, we would like to know what is meant by "the world's new birth of freedom," and what is the use of trying to unite all nations in "the brotherhood of peace" without the aid of Christianity? Will some one, not a pagan, tell us.

It is not our purpose to explain the meaning of the expression, "The world's new birth." Mr. Paine could probably do that better than any one else. Neither do we purpose answering any question; but rather to ask one. The *Cynosure* implies that God is not in the "Columbian March and Chorus;" would he be in it any more if it contained the couplet:—

Praise God from who *all blessings* flow:

Praise him, all creature here below.

To be more explicit would a formal recognition of God by a godless poet and a godless choir be pleasing to the Creator? Must not all acceptable service be inspired by faith? Is it not still true as it was eighteen hundred years ago that "he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him"? Would God be in the familiar words,—

Praise God from whom all blessings flow, if they did not come welling up from hearts full of praise to him, any more than he was in the same words sung by the thoughtless reporters when Congress adjourned?—Certainly not. Then why does the *Cynosure* insist upon hypocrisy?

**"Some Scraps of New England History" <sup>151</sup> *The American Sentinel* 7, 38 , pp. 300, 301.**

### **THE SUFFERING OF THE QUAKERS**

THE last article closed with the statement that the laws against the Quakers were not allowed to become a dead letter but were enforced in the regular Puritan way. Just what that way was will appear from the following order issued in 1657 by Governor Endicott:—

To the marshall general of his deputy: You are to take with you the executioner, and repair to the house of correction, and there see him cut of the right ears of John Copeland, Christopher Holder, and John Rouse, Quakers, in execution of the sentence of the court of assistants for the breach of the law instituted, "Quakers."

In the latter of the same year the following order was issued by the court:—

Whereas Daniel Southwick and Provided Southwick, son and daughter of Lawrence Southwick, *absenting themselves from the public ordinances*, have been fined by the courts of Salem and Ipswich, pretending they have no assistance, and resolving not to work, the court, upon perusal of the law, which was made upon account of the dates, in answer to what should be done for the



satisfaction of the fines, resolves that the treasurers of the several counties are and shall be fully empowered to sell said persons to any of the English nation, at Virginia or Barbadoes, to answer the said fines.

With this latter sentence there is connected an important series of events. As stated in this order, these two persons were son and daughter of Lawrence Southwick. Lawrence Southwick and his wife Cassandra, were an aged couple who had been members of the Salem church until about the close of 1656. They had three children, Joseph, who was a man grown, and the two mentioned above, who were but mere youth. The old gentleman and his wife were arrested at the beginning of the year 1657, upon a charge of harboring Quakers. The old gentleman was released, but as a Quaker tract was found upon his wife, she was imprisoned seven weeks and fined forty shillings. If they were not Quakers before, this made them such, and likewise some of their friends. A number of them now withdrew from the Salem church, and worshiped by themselves. All were arrested. Lawrence and Cassandra Southwick and their son Joseph, were taken to Boston to be dealt with. Upon their arrival there, February 3, without even the form of a trial they were whipped and imprisoned eleven days, the weather being extremely cold. In addition to this, they were fined four pounds and thirteen shillings, for six weeks' absence from church on Sun days, and their cattle were seized and sold to pay this fine.

The following summer two Quakers, William Leddra and William Brend, went to Salem. They with five others, among whom were the Southwicks who before had suffered, were arrested for meeting together. They were all taken to Boston, and put all together in a room in the prison, of which the windows were boarded up close. Food was denied them unless they would work to pay for it. "To work when wrongfully confined, was against the Quaker's conscience." They therefore went five days without anything to eat. This, however, was only a part of their sufferings, for on the second day of their imprisonment, they all were severely whipped, and then with raw wounds were thrown back into the close dark room, in the July heat, with nothing to lie upon but the bare boards. On the second day afterwards they were informed that they could go if they would pay the constables and jail fees. They refused to pay anything. The next day the jailer, in order to force them to yield, took Brend, and with irons bound his neck and heels together, and kept him that way for

sixteen hours, from five o'clock in the morning till me nine o'clock at night.

The next day Brend was put to the mill and ordered to work. He could not have worked if he would, as he could scarcely move; but he would not have worked if he could and so he refused. Then in a rage "the gaoler took a pitched rope, about an inch thick, and gave him twenty blows over his back and arms with; all his strength, till the rope untwisted; then he fetched another rope, thicker and stronger, and told Brend that he would cause him to bow to the law of the country, and make him work. Brend thought this in the highest degree unreasonable, since he had committed no evil, and was wholly unable to work, having been kept five days without eating, and whipped also, and now thus unmercifully beaten. Yet in the morning the gaoler relented not, but began to beat again with his pitched rope on the poor man's bruised body, and foaming at the mouth like a madman, with violence laid four score and seventeen more blows upon him, as other prisoners, who beheld this cruelty with grief and passion reported. And if his strength and his rope had not failed him, he would have laid on more. He thought also to give him the next morning as many blows more . . . . To what condition these blows must have brought the body of Brend, who had nothing on but a serge cossack over-shirt, may easily be conceived. His back and arms were bruised and bleeding, and the blood hanging, as it were, in bags under his arms, and so into one was his flesh beaten that the sign of a particular blow could not be seen. His body being thus cruelly tortured, he lay down upon the boards so extremely weakened that the natural parts decaying, and his strength failing, his body turned cold; there seemed, as it were, a struggle between life and death; his senses were stopped, and he had for some time neither seeing, feeling, nor hearing; till at length a divine power prevailing, life broke through death, and the breath of the Lord was breathed in his nostrils."

The people now, horrified at the outrage, would bear no more. A cry was raised, they rushed to the jail, and rescued the tortured prisoner. This rather frightened the government. Endicott sent his own family doctor to succor Brend, but the surgeon pronounced the case hopeless—that the flesh would "rot from off his bones," and he must die. The cry of

the people grew louder, and their indignation more fierce. They demanded that the barbarous jailer should be brought to justice. The magistrate posted up on the church door a promise that he should be brought to trial, but here the "Rev." John Norton stepped forth, declaring: "Brend endeavored to beat our gospel ordinances black and blue; if he then be beaten black and blue, it is but just upon him and I will appear in his behalf that did so." He rebuked the magistrates for their faintness of heart, and commanded them to take down the notice from the church door. They obeyed, and the cruel jailer was not only justified, but was commanded to whip the Quakers who were yet in prison "twice a week if they refused to work, and the first time to add five stripes to the former ten, and each time to add three to them."

The other prisoners now presented a petition to the court praying to be released. Their petition was dated, "From the House of Bondage in Boston, wherein we are made captives by the wills of men, although made free by the Son (John 8:36), in which we quietly rest, this sixteenth of the fifth month, 1658." They were brought into court for examination. They made so strong a defense that there appeared some prospect of their acquittal; but the preachers rallied in force. The "Rev." Charles Chauncy, in "the Thursday lecture," preached as follows:—

Suppose you should catch six wolves in trap [there were six Salem Quakers], . . . and ye cannot prove that they killed either sheep or lambs: and now ye have them, they will neither bark nor bite; yet they have the plain marks of wolves. Now I leave it to your consideration whether ye will let them go alive; yea or nay?

By their diligence the preachers not only prevented any acquittal, but succeeded in forcing through the law of 1658, inflicting capital punishment upon all the Quakers who remained, or returned after sentence of banishment.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 38 , p. 304.**

"ACTIVE and powerful agencies," says the "Pearl of Days," "are constantly at work in Great Britain, as well as in America, to break down the Sabbath." However this may be in England, it is certainly true in this country. And among these agencies none are more active or more powerful than is the so-called American Sabbath Union whose sole mission is to exalt a pagan holiday at the expense of the Sabbath of the Lord.

BUT it is urged that the essence of Sabbath observance is not in the particular day observed, but in observing by rest and worship one seventh part of time in regular succession; and that the particular day is a matter of indifference. This is the theory; the practice is that it is a matter of indifference as to the particular day—*provided always that Sunday is observed*. But that the particular day *is an essential element* of Sabbath observance is seen when we come to examine the institution itself, and to understand its significance.

THE Sabbath is a memorial of the finished creation: "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." This can never be true of any other day; and it must always be true of the seventh day. Says Rev. Mr. Elliott, in his prize essay, "The Abiding Sabbath," published by the American Tract Society, "While the reason remains, the law remains. The reason of the Sabbath is to be found in the fact of creation; it is God's one monument set in human history to that great event; and so long as the truth of creation and the knowledge of a Creator have any value to human thought, any authority over the human conscience, or make any appeal to human affections, so long the law and the institution of the Sabbath will abide with lasting instruction and undiminished obligation."

IT follows from the statement made by Mr. Elliott, that to change the day necessarily involves a change of reason for observing the day; in short, it is to change the institution; and so we see in the Sabbath and the Sunday, not two phases of the same institution, but two rival institutions. The one commemorating creation, the other, it is claimed, the resurrection; the one sacred to Jehovah, the other, it is claimed, equally sacred to his Son; the one stigmatized as "Jewish," the other called "Christian;" the one clearly of divine origin, the other set apart confessedly by the Church, and that in an age when corruptions already perverted the gospel of Christ.

TO illustrate this matter, let us suppose that the Irish people were in a majority in this country, and that instead of celebrating the Fourth of July they were to substitute the Seventeenth of March; and suppose further that they were to call it "Independence day," and celebrate it much as we now do the Fourth of July; and further suppose that their influence was such that they should cause their day to almost entirely take the place of our national holiday; could it ever become the same institution? Could it ever be truthfully said that

the American Independence day had been transferred to the Seventeenth of March? and could the laws which now make the Fourth of July a legal holiday ever be made to apply without change to the day which had been introduced in opposition to the Fourth of July? In short, under such conditions would not everybody say that the American Independence day had been supplanted by the Irish Saint Patrick's day? Certainly they would. And this is exactly the case of the Sabbath of the Lord; it has been supplanted by a rival institution. Not indeed as is claimed by a day set apart by the Son of God, but by a heathen festival brought into the Church with other pagan corruptions, and foisted upon it by a foreign influence hostile to the spirit and intent of the Sabbath institution, and bent on its destruction.

AT a recent Sunday School Association meeting at Meridian, Mich., it became necessary because of lack of time to omit one topic which was to have been discussed. The choice lay between two, "Christ's Method of Teaching the Example for Sunday-school Teachers," and "Sunday-schools the Hope of the Nation." The latter topic was selected as being the more important theme, and a paper was read on it by Rev. G. H. Hudson (Baptist), who took the position that inasmuch as this is a Christian Nation only a Christian is competent to stand at its head; and as Christians are developed largely in the Sunday-school, therefore the Sunday-school is the hope of the Nation. That is, upon the Sunday-school devolves the work of training the future presidents of the United States! Truly the preachers of this country are getting ahead of the bishops of Constantine's time. The bishops only sought to make politics a branch of religion; the preachers are seeking to make religion and politics identical. It matters little about the example of Christ if only the *Sunday-school* can train the presidents!

ABOUT as disingenuous a plea for Sunday laws as we have seen for some time, appeared a week or two since in the Baptist *Examiner*:—

The prohibition for one day in the week of all labor save works of necessity and mercy is on the one hand no infringement of any man's liberty, nor on the other is it a recognition of the Church by the States. . . . Nor does the State undertake to say how the day of rest shall be spent.

But what reason has the *Examiner* for thinking, or rather for saying, that "the prohibition for one day of the week of all labor, save works of necessity and mercy, is on the one hand no infringement of

any man's liberty"? This city is strongly Roman Catholic, and tens of thousands of people in it observe Saint Patrick's day by refraining from labor and business. Suppose the aldermen were to pass an ordinance requiring all to rest on Saint Patrick's day, except those who conscientiously and regularly celebrate the battle of the Boyne, what would the *Examiner* think? and what would it say? Would it not say that the liberty of every Protestant in the city was infringed by the ordinance? It certainly would, and justly so too. But if the civil law may rightly require the observance of Sunday, why may it not do the same thing for other religious festivals? For while the *Examiner* denies that Sunday laws are a recognition of the Church by the State, the fact remains that Sunday laws exist solely for the reason that Sunday is a religious institution. Were it not so there would be no such thing as a Sunday law.

BUT the sophistry of the *Examiner* is more apparent when we place side by side two statements which appeared in the same article in its columns, but separated by several paragraphs:—

The State does not undertake to say how the day of rest shall be spent.

When the Sunday holiday begins to nullify the Sunday rest day, the State should interfere.

This is, the State does not pretend to say how the day shall be spent, but it does say that it shall be spent neither as a working day nor as a holiday. The State leaves every man perfectly free to do just as he pleases on Sunday, provided he neither works nor plays! Wonderful freedom, which out of a possible three excludes two and leave the subject "free" to "choose" the third! But such is the freedom enjoyed under Sunday laws.

**October 6, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 39 , pp. 305, 306.**

THAT challenge of Senator Hawley's on the question of religion and the Government, referred to in these columns last week, is worth considering for itself alone. Here is the challenge:—

Now if gentlemen . . . deny that this is in the true sense of the word a religious Nation, I should like to see the disclaimer put in white and black and proposed by the Congress of the United States. *Write it. How would you write it?* . . . Word it if you dare; advocate it if you dare.

HOW would we write it? We would write it as President Washington wrote it in the supreme law of the land—"The Government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion."

WE would write it as our fathers wrote it in the Constitution of the United States—"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;" and, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

WE would write it as James Madison spoke it—"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."

WE would write it as Thomas Jefferson wrote it—"The impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time. The prescribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to the offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow-citizens, he has a natural right; and tends also to corrupt the principles of that very religion it is meant to encourage, by bribing, with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments, those who will externally profess and conform to it."

WE would write it as both Madison and Jefferson wrote it, when, in the State of Virginia, another combination of religious bigots demanded legislation in favor of what they called "the Christian religion." And this is how *they* wrote it—"We remonstrate against the said bill: Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence. The religion, then, of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable, because the

opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated in their own minds, can not follow the dictates of other men.

"Because the bill implies either that the civil magistrate is a competent judge of religious truths, *or that he may employ religion as an engine of civil policy*. The first is an arrogant pretension; the second, an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

"Because during almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. More or less, in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry, and persecution.

"Because the establishment in question is *not* necessary for the support of civil government. What influence, in fact, have ecclesiastical establishments had on civil society? In some instances they have been seen to erect *a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of civil authority*; in many instances they have been seen *upholding the thrones of political tyranny*; in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty may have found in established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it, needs them not.

"Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy which, offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every nation and religion. What a melancholy mark is this bill, of sudden degeneracy! Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens all those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those the legislative authority. 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.

"Because, finally, either, then, we must say that the will of the Legislature is the only measure of their authority, and that in the plenitude of that authority, they may sweep away all our fundamental rights, or that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred. Either we must say that they may control the freedom of the press, may abolish the trial by jury, may swallow up the executive and judiciary powers of the State—nay, that they may despoil us of our very rights of suffrage, and erect them-

306

selves into an independent and hereditary assembly, or we must say that they have no authority to enact into a law the bill under consideration.

"We say that the General Assembly of this Commonwealth have no such authority. And in order that no effort may be omitted on our



part against so dangerous a usurpation, we oppose to it this remonstrance."

WE would write it as Roger Williams wrote it—"Magistrates are but the agents of the people or its trustees, on whom no spiritual power in matters of worship can ever be conferred, since conscience belongs to the individual and is not the property of the body politic. The power of the civil magistrate extends to the bodies and goods and outward estate of men."

WE would write it as Martin Luther wrote it for Protestantism, in the memorable Augsburg Confession—"The civil administration is occupied about other matters, than is the gospel. The magistracy does not defend the souls, but the bodies and bodily things, against manifest injuries; and coerces men by the sword and corporal punishments, that it may uphold civil justice and peace. Wherefore the ecclesiastical and the civil power are not to be confounded. The ecclesiastical power has its own command, to preach the gospel and to administer the sacraments. Let it not by force enter into the office of another; let it not transfer worldly kingdoms. . . . Let it not prescribe laws to the magistrate touching the form of the State; as Christ says, 'My kingdom is not of this world.' Again: 'Who made me a judge or a divider over you?' And Paul says, 'Our conversation [citizenship] is in heaven.' 'The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations.' In this way ours distinguish between the duties of each power, one from the other."

WE would write it as Jesus Christ commands it to be written—"If any man hear my words *and believe not*, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." "Render therefore unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's; and to God the things that are God's."

THUS would we "write it." And thus would any man write it who cared for principle rather than policy. But although it might thus be written, so easily, so truly, and so forcibly, yet it stands as a literal fact that not a man in the Fifty-second Congress, either in the Senate or in the House dared to accept the challenge, and so to write it. Those who opposed it, did so in such an apologetic way, and so compromised the principle at stake, that their opposition seemed hardly more than a pretense. So that it stands literally true that the Fifty-second Congress did sell itself and the Government of the United States, both bodily, into the unholy hands of the threatening,

boycotting, and unprincipled churches of the United States. And is it any wonder that they boast that they hold the Senate of the United States in their hands?

BUT let everybody know that to oppose it, to reject it, to utterly refuse to submit to it or respect it, is sound American principle; is sound American constitutional principle; is sound Protestant principle; and is sound Christian principle. The evil thing is anti-American, anti-Protestant, and anti-Christian. Opposition to it in any and all its forms, is Christianity. And he who has most of the spirit and love of Christianity will be the most uncompromisingly opposed to it. A. T. J.

**"Pertinent Questions" *The American Sentinel* 7, 39 , p. 309.**

[CD-ROM Editor's Note: This article has no initials attached to it; however Jones was the sole editor for that date so it is attributable to him.]

REV. W. F. CRAFTS, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, makes these remarkable assertions in a sermon:—

Our institutions are so inextricably entwined with God that no infidel plot can unravel them into secular weakness. This can never be a sectarian Nation with a State-established religion, but must always remain a Christian Nation. Not only is the Nation, by compact and Constitution, a Christian Nation, but the several States are equally so. Clearly in sentiment and Constitution at least we are a Christian people, and our duty is to keep it so by better laws and better lives.

What special service does such a man expect to accomplish for reform as editor of the *Christian Statesman*? If the Nation is already Christian "by compact and Constitution," and in perfect harmony with the requirements of God's law, then why are we exhorted "to keep it so by *better laws* and *better lives*?"

Can a perfect thing be made better? This is a strange position and remarkable logic for a man who is trying to reform the Nation. Certainly there is "confusion of thought" somewhere. It is news, indeed, that our Constitution is already Christian.—*Christian Nation*.

This criticism pass upon Mr. Crafts by the *Christian Nation* is both just and pertinent; but is not our contemporary in the same condemnation? The demand of the *Christian Nation* is that the Nation shall be constitutional amendment declare itself Christian. But would it then be any more Christian than it is now? If the decision of the Supreme Court that the Nation is Christian did not make it so would a constitutional amendment make it Christian? Is it possible that the

*Christian Nation* is beginning to see that all such profession, whether by decree of court or by constitutional amendment, is only hypocrisy?

**October 20, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 41 , pp. 321-323.**

MANY a time in the life of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL have we told the people that the union of Church and State with national Sunday legislation would surely come. In fact THE SENTINEL never existed for any other purpose than to tell that this was coming, and to awaken the people to the danger and the evil of it.

EXCEPT in a general way, however, we have never told in THE SENTINEL *how* we knew that this was coming. We have demonstrated over and over, by parallels of historical and ecclesiastical procedure that this evil thing must inevitably come as the result of existing conditions and of the efforts and aims of the churches; but our knowledge that it was coming antedated by many years both the existing conditions and the efforts and aims of the churches to bring it about.

THE first thing that was ever done by the churches to bring this about was *twenty-nine* years ago last February; while on our part we have known for more than *forty* years that it was coming. The religious denomination that now publishes THE AMERICAN SENTINEL published more than forty years ago that there would be formed in this Government, though prohibited by the Constitution and the fundamental principles of the Government, a union of Church and State, with national legislation establishing Sunday as the Sabbath, and with the churches in possession of the governmental power to enforce Sunday observance. More than forty years ago this denomination put this announcement in print, and then, and through all the years since, this people have preached everywhere that this was coming and would surely be done. And now that it has been done, and exists before our eyes, we see exactly and only what we have been looking for all this time.

HOW then did we now that it was coming? We knew it by the Word of God, in the scriptures of the prophets. The prophecy that announces it is in the thirteenth chapter of the book of Revelation; and there all may read it. In the first two verses of that chapter there is given a description of the rise and career of a certain power under

the symbol of a beast. Then from the eleventh to the eighteenth verse inclusive, there is given the description of another power under the symbol of "another beast" and "the image of the beast." The first of these powers is also designated as "the first beast" and "the beast which had the wound by a sword." The full description of the first one is as follows:—

And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed; and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshiped the dragon which gave power unto the beast; and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity; he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.

EVERY person not a Catholic, who knows the A B C of history knows that this is a vivid sketch of the Papacy and its career up to 1798 A.D. Every such person knows that the one great power to which all the nations have done homage the most and for the longest time is the Papacy. Every such person knows that the most blasphemous power that was ever on the earth is the Papacy. He likewise knows that the one power that has made war with the saints of God and has overcome them the most cruelly, and has persecuted them the most widely and for the longest time, is the Papacy. We know that to say this is not considered as proper Protestantism for these days; but proper Protestantism it is nevertheless. For all this is true of the Papacy, and has been true of it for ages. And everybody,

Catholic or non-Catholic, knows that the Papacy is the union of Church and State with the Church in possession of the power of the State to use in enforcing her decrees, and compelling men to submit to her dictation.

The description of the "other beast," or the image of the beast, is as follows:—

And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his

322

name. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six.

THIS prophecy says that it would be said unto them, that "they should *make* an image to the beast." This would be to make an image to the Papacy. The Papacy being a union of Church and State with the Church using the power of the State to enforce the doctrines of the Church and to compel submission to her decrees, the making of an image of this would be only to make or establish an order of things by which a union of Church and State would be created, with the civil power in the hands of the Church to compel submission to Church doctrines, and observance of church institutions. But in order for this to be *made*, it must be that before this there was no union of Church and State in the place where this is to be done. As it is necessary to say "that they should *make* an image" of the Papacy—that is, union of Church and State—it is plain on the face of it that this is said, and

must be said, in a place where there is no union of Church and State, and where the Church has no control of civil affairs and no connection with the civil power.

NOW where was there ever a place or a nation on earth in which there was no union of Church and State except in the United States alone? With the single exception of the United States Government, there never was a government on earth, pagan, papal, or profession Protestant, in which from the beginning of its existence, as such, until this day, there was no union of religion and the State, in which the religious power had no control of, or connection with, the civil power. This is the truth, and any one may satisfy himself of it by thinking, whether little or much. This being the truth, it follows that in the United States is the only place on earth where it could be said that they should *make* a union of Church and State. Consequently in the Government of the United States alone could the image of the beast—the image of the Papacy—be made. There are many other points corroborative of this, but this is sufficient for this place.

IT was because of this prophecy of Rev. 13:11-18 that it has been preached and published, for more than forty years that there would be formed in the United States a union of Church and State with National Sunday legislation—that there would be made here an image of the Papacy. For instance: Thirty-nine years ago last January—January, 1853—a little pamphlet of about seventy-five pages, perhaps 2½x5 inches in size, was published, giving a brief exposition of Revelation 13, and especially that part in verses 11-18. On this point there was then written and printed the following:—

The two horned beast says to *them that dwell on the earth*. "Make an image." The dwellers on the earth, or territory of this beast, it seems, have a part to act in this work. This clearly marks the United States as the scene of action. This is the manner in which laws are made here—by the representatives of the people. As all men by the Declaration are declared to be equal; it became necessary that some course should be taken by which all could have equal privileges in the construction of the laws. If the whole mass were called together, there would be an endless discussion and no laws made. Therefore the people were to elect such representatives as would carry out their principles; and they were to meet and make laws, which, when passed, should be considered the laws of the people. The image is to be formed by the people or their representatives.

It appears probable to us that this Sunday institution is the very point on which this union will finally be effected. Here is a point on

which nearly all the Protestant sects can unite. A point which we may safely say is the important item in the faith of Protestants is their Sunday worship.

Verse 15. "And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." From this text we may draw two conclusions:—

1. The image of the beast is to be made in the same territory where the two-horned beast rules; for the two-horned beast can exercise that authority in no territory but its own.

2. That it already has it in its "power to give life to the image of the beast," or cause the decree to be made and executed. Is it not in the power of the United States to pass such laws? They declare by their constitution, "all men shall be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of their own consciences." We see the mass hold the first day of the week as a holy day. If a memorial should be sent into congress with 1,000,000 names signed to it, declaring that their rights were infringed upon, and praying them to pass a solemn enactment that the first day should not be profaned by labor, how soon the result would be a law upon the point:

Were the United States as a body to pass a law that Sunday should be kept holy, or not profaned by labor, there would be, I conceive, an image to Papacy; for the law would then be in the hand of the church, and she could inflict penalties on those who did not obey the Sunday institution.

NOW bear in mind that on the strength of that scripture prophecy, this was printed thirty-nine years ago. And no man can deny that in this present year the very things have been done which in this exposition of the prophecy were said would be done. The churches did this year memorialize Congress, with threats, in behalf of Sunday sacredness; and as the result Congress responded as expressed by Senator Hiscock:—

I would write the provision for the closure in any form that the religious sentiment of the country demands, and not stand here hesitating and quibbling about it. . . . I should make this closure provision satisfactory to those petitioners who have memorialized us against the desecration of the Lord's day.

And as expressed by the representative "Christian lobbyist" of the churches:—

I have learned that we hold the United States Senate in our hands.

Yes, they have the Senate, and Congress, and the law, and the Government in their hands by which to sustain Sunday as a sacred day and prevent its desecration. By the prophecy we knew forty years

ago that it was coming. And by the *facts* we know now that it *has* come. The prophecy is fulfilled.

AGAIN: Eight years ago this same denomination printed the following on the same prophecy of Rev. 13:11-18:—

By this first beast is represented the Roman Church, an ecclesiastical body clothed with civil power, having authority to punish all dissenters. The image of the beast represents another religious body clothed with similar power. The formation of this image is the work of the beast whose peaceful rise and mild professions render it so striking a symbol of the United States. Here is to be found an image of the papacy. When the churches of our land, uniting upon such points of faith as are held by them in common, shall influence the State to enforce their decrees and sustain their institutions, then will Protestant America have formed an image of the Roman hierarchy.—*Great Controversy, Vol. 4, page 278.*

This has been done. The churches of our land *have* united upon the Sunday issues, and then united with the Catholic Church itself, and in this unity they have influenced the State to enforce the Church decree, for Sunday observance and to sustain the Church institution of Sunday. They have done it, but in the doing of it, they have the living image of the Papacy in this land. Eight years ago we published that this would be done; and now *it has been done*. On the strength of the prophecy we published that it would come; and on the strength of *facts*, everybody may know that it *has* come. This beast is made, and lives, in the United States to-day.

ONCE more: Seven years ago this same people published on the same subject these words:—

To secure popularity and patronage, legislators will yield to the demand for a Sunday law.—*Testimony 32, page 207.*

This present year the churches made their demand for a Sunday law. They presented their memorials and petitions backed up with such persuasive words as follows from Presbyterian churches in Brighton, N. Y.; Parma Centre, N. Y.; and Rochester, N. Y., and recorded in *Congressional Record*, May 25, 1892, thus:—

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

To secure the popularity and patronage which were thus put up at public auction by the churches, our Nation's legislators assembled in



Congress *did* yield to the demand for a Sunday law, and did enact such a law in three distinct ways and places; and for the reasons as stated by themselves, thus:—

If I had charge of this amendment in the interest of the Columbian Exposition, I would write the provision for the closure in any form that the religious sentiment of the country demands, and . . . I say to the junior senator from Illinois [Mr. Palmer] *he had better yield* to this sentiment, and not let it go out to the country that there is the slightest doubt that if this money shall be appropriated, the Exposition will be closed on Sunday. . . . I should make the closure provision satisfactory to those petitioners who have memorialized us against the desecration of the Lord's day.—*Senator Hiscock, Congressional Record, July 13, 1892, page 6755.*

And again upon this demand for Sunday law, it was said:—

Now, if gentlemen repudiate this, if they desire to reject it . . . I should like to see the disclaimer put in white and black and proposed by the Congress of the United States. Write it. How would you write it? . . . Word it, if you dare; advocate it, if you dare. How many who voted for it would ever come back here again. None, I hope. . . . You endanger yourselves by opposing it.—*Senator Hawley, Id., page 6759.*

In the light and upon the strength of the prophecy, we published seven years ago that they would do it. And now in their own words we can publish and do publish that they *have done* it. The prophecy is fulfilled. The image of the beast is made, and lives, in the United States to-day.

AND this is how we have *known* all these years that there would be a union of Church and State formed in the United States with national Sunday legislation. This is why we have been telling the people by voice and pen, in THE SENTINEL and out of THE SENTINEL, all these years that this was coming. Now it is hers and no man can deny it. Here are the words which we published years ago that *it would come*, and no man can deny that.

323

Men may disbelieve it, but they can not deny it; they may reject it, but they can not disprove it. Many would not believe it and said it would never come. We knew it would never come. We knew it and published that it would come. Now it has come. It is here. And this demonstrates unmistakably that we were right and they were wrong. To all these we now say, Come now and stand with us that you may be in the right now on this great question.

And there are other things yet to come of this which has come, which are to be told and we are going to tell these things as we have told the others; for they are true.

A. T. J.

**October 27, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 42 , pp. 329, 330.**

THE leaders and managers of the Sunday law cause, evidently, take great pride in advertising themselves as "the best people of the land," and "the law abiding people of the country." This is evident from the fact that they take occasion to announce themselves as such by preamble and resolution, and speech, in their mass-meetings. They never lose any such opportunity to exalt themselves as "the best people," and "the law-abiding portion" of the community or the whole country even.

THE fact is, however, that this claim is as much of a fraud as is all the rest of their claims. It is of the same piece as all the rest of their boasts. It is absolutely fraudulent. The fact is that these very men are the least law-abiding people in the United States. They have no respect for any law but such as their own arbitrary will demands and approves. Without the slightest hesitation, they disregard and override the supreme law of the Government of the United States and of the government of the universe.

THE supreme law of the Government of the United States, the Constitution, positively prohibits any legislation on the subject of religion. Yet, in spite of this, in utter disregard of the supreme law of the land, these men by threats of force—threats of the loss of votes, the only force at their command—obliged Congress to legislate upon a religious subject, to decide a religious question, and take their side in a great religious controversy. And in this they have plainly overridden the Constitution, and violated the supreme law of the land. *And they know it.*

THEY know it, and we know that they know it. The National Reform Association is the ring leader in this whole religious combination for political purposes. This Association has been working for nearly thirty years for national Sunday legislation. But knowing that Sunday is religious, and religious only, they argued from the first that such legislation would be unconstitutional as the Constitution

stands; and therefore they, for more than twenty years, advocated and demanded an amendment to the Constitution which should declare this to be "a Christian Nation," and so create a basis for national Sunday legislation as "the Christian Sabbath.

THUS, by their own arguments of more than twenty years, we know that they know that Sunday legislation by Congress is unconstitutional. Yet, in conflict with their own continued arguments, these men take the lead in petitioning and threatening Congress for Sunday legislation. One of their own number, who had argued for years the unconstitutionality of such legislation, spent the whole of the late session of Congress at the capitol as "a Christian lobbyist" to secure this very unconstitutional legislation. And now, having secured this legislation which they know to be unconstitutional, having thus knowingly violated the supreme law, having thus subverted the Constitution, these very men take the lead in getting up and managing mass-meetings to endorse their unconstitutional action, and vote themselves the law-abiding people of the Nation.

WHY, their action is as much worse than that of the average law-breakers, as the supreme law of the land is greater and more important than the local statutes. The average law-breaker damages the *individual*; these supreme law-breakers damage *the whole Nation*. The average law-breaker invades the rights of the *individual*; these supreme law-breakers have invaded, and even swept away, the rights of *all the people*. The average law-breaker disregards social order only in the locality where he is; while these supreme law-breakers strike at the very existence of social order by breaking down the chief governmental safeguard. For the average law-breaker, there is always a ready remedy in the regular forms of governmental order; but for these supreme law-breakers who have broken down the established safeguards of governmental order itself, where is the remedy?

Ah! there is a remedy for this too. *It is in the hands of God, the Author of governmental order*. Against all their attempts to do this great evil, we ever appealed to the Constitution, the grand charter and safeguard of the rights of mankind—the embodiment of the true principles of governmental order. And now that they have done the evil, and in the doing of it have overridden the Constitution, broken down this safeguard of the rights of mankind, and smitten the very citadel of governmental order—now we appeal to the Author of

governmental order itself. And our appeal is heard. We wait in perfect confidence. The just judgment will be rendered in due time.

THESE facts demonstrate that instead of their being truly the law-abiding portion of the people, these men are the chiefest law-breakers in the land—the most lawless of all the Nation. Nor is this at all to be wondered at. For in order to accomplish this their bad purpose, they "gladly joined hands" and hearts with the Papacy—that power which the Lord designates as "the lawless one" and as the very "mystery of lawlessness" itself. 2 Thess. 2:3, 7, (revised version). For eight years continuously, the National Reformers advertised themselves as ready "to make repeated advances, and

330

gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they [the Roman Church] may be willing to exhibit it." After eight years of such endeavor, their wishes were rewarded by the following pronunciamento of the Catholic Lay Congress in Baltimore, Nov. 12, 1889, which, as it passed the inspection of the hierarchy, before it was presented to the public, is the official response of the Papacy in the United States, to the National Reform overtures:

There are many Christian issues to which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics *and shape civil legislation* for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice, and overlooking zealotry, we should seek an alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judaic Sabbath, we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday.

And this, as the American Sabbath Union branch of the National Reform combination announced at the time, was done "*after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union.*" The whole statement is in these words:—

The National Lay Congress of Roman Catholics, after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union, passed its famous resolution in favor of co-operation with Protestants in Sabbath reform.

Then in the same connection, this was announced as "a proposal of courtship." Following this Archbishop Ireland in a public meeting in this city in May, 1891, thanked God that "Protestants and Catholics" "stand together in demanding the faithful observance of Sunday." And as the "advances," the "proposal," and the standing together were all to secure "civil legislation" for the faithful observance of Sunday, the longed-for union was finally accomplished when they succeeded in forcing the Fifty-second Congress into the now famous and no less infamous Sunday legislation.

NOR is it to be considered at all strange that they should show themselves so lawless as to disregard and override the supreme law of the Nation, and join themselves to the very "mystery of lawlessness" to accomplish this lawless purpose. For, for all these years they have openly, both in actions and words, disregarded and overridden the supreme law of the universe—the law of God which he proclaimed with a voice that shook the earth and wrote with his own finger of fire on the tables of stone—and they have followed the preaching, the precedent and the authority of the mystery of lawlessness in the doing of it.

ALL these years they and the people have been told in the words of God that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord." But instead of believing it, or allowing the people to believe it, they have disregarded it and declared that it is not so. They have taught the people that it is not so. They have put difference between the holy and the profane (Eze. 23:36) by telling the people that it is no difference what day they keep. Thus they disregard the law of the living God, and teach the people to disregard it. Then after teaching the people to disregard the plain word of the law of God as to the observance of the day which he has commanded; and telling all that there is no command of God for the observance of Sunday; they join heart and hand with the mystery of lawlessness which has established Sunday instead of the Sabbath of the Lord and set its own word and heathen customs above the law of God. Having thus forsaken the Lord, and all true allegiance to his law, and gone over bodily and heartily and "gladly" to the mystery of lawlessness—having gone to such lengths as this in despising the law of the living God, it is not at all to be wondered at that they would despise the supreme law of the Government of the United States, nor that they should compel Congress in violation of its solemn oath, to join in their high-handed enterprise and establish their lawless purpose, by the surrender of the power of the national Government into their hands to be used at their lawless will, to enforce upon all their lawless decrees.

AND these are they who pose before the American people as "the best people," and "the law-abiding people" of the land! Such self-trumpeted glory is completely becoming. Such modesty fits them exactly.

A. T. J.

**November 3, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 43 , pp. 337, 338.**

THERE is a phase of the Sunday legislation by Congress that has not been set forth as it deserves to be outside of the record of the proceedings of Congress itself. We refer to that phase of the subject in which Congress assumed the position of interpreter of the divine law.

IN the *Congressional Record* of July 10, 1892, page 6614, is the following:—

MR. QUAY.—On pages 122, line 13, after the word "act" I move to insert:

"And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the Sabbath day."

The reasons for the amendment I will send to the desk to be read. The Secretary will have the kindness to read from the Book of Law I send to the desk, the part enclosed in brackets.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—The part indicated will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"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 manservant, nor thy maidservant, 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."

THE foregoing is all that was said or done in relation to the question that day. The next legislative day, however, the question was taken up and discussed. The debate was opened by Senator Manderson of Nebraska. And in the *Record* of July 12, pages 6694, 6695, 6701, we read as follows:—

The language of this amendment is that the Exposition shall be closed on the "Sabbath day." I submit that if the senator from Pennsylvania desires that the Exposition shall be closed upon Sunday, this language will not necessarily meet that idea. The Sabbath day is not Sunday. . . .

The words "Sabbath day," simply mean that it is a rest day, and it may be Saturday or Sunday, and it would be subject to the discretion of those who will manage this Exposition, whether they

should close the Exposition on the last day of the week, in conformity with that observance which is made by the Israelites and the Seventh-day Baptists, or should close it on the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath. It certainly seems to me that this amendment should be adopted by the senator from Pennsylvania, and, if he proposes to close this Exposition, that it should be closed on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday. . . .

Therefore I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I hope may be accepted by the senator from Pennsylvania, to strike out the words, "Exposition on the Sabbath day," and insert "mechanical portion of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." . . .

MR. QUAY.—I will accept the modification so far as it changes the phraseology of the amendment proposed by me in regard to designating the day of the week on which the Exposition shall be closed.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—The senator from Pennsylvania accepts the modification in part, but not in whole. . . .

MR. HARRIS.—Let the amendment of the senator from Pennsylvania, as modified, be reported.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—It will be again reported.

THE CHIEF CLERK.—On page 122, line 13, after the word "act" it is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by inserting:

"And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday."

This amendment was afterward further amended by the insertion of the proviso that the managers of the Exposition should sign an agreement to close the Fair on Sunday before they could receive any of the appropriation; but this which we have given is the material point.

ALL of this the House confirmed in its vote accepting the Senate amendments. Besides this, the House had already, on its own part, by a vote of 131 to 36, decided that Sunday is the "Christian Sabbath;" and by a vote of 149 to 11 that the seventh day is not the Sabbath. And thus did the Congress of the United States, at the dictate of the churches, not only take sides in a religious controversy and discuss and decide a religious question, but put itself in the place and assume to itself the prerogative of authoritative interpreter of the divine law. For, from the official record of the proceedings there appears these plain facts:

1. The divine law was officially and in its very words, adopted as containing the "reasons" and forming the basis of the legislation. In other words, the legislation proposed only to enforce the divine law as quoted from the Book.

.2. Yet those to whom the legislation was directed and who were expected to execute its provisions were not allowed to read and construe the divine law for themselves; and this for the very reason that there was a possibility that they might take the divine word as it reads and as it was actually quoted in the official proceedings, and shut the Exposition on the day plainly specified in the divine word which was cited as the basis and authority for the action taken.

3. Therefore to preclude any such possibility, Congress assumed the prerogative of official and authoritative interpreter of the divine law, and declared that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment of the divine law—that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the meaning of the word of the Lord which says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

THIS is what the Congress of the United States has done. And in the doing of it, has violated every rule and every principle that governs in the interpretation of law. A leading rule for the interpretation of law is this:—

In the case of all law, it is *the intent* of *the* lawgiver that is to be enforced.

What then was the intent of the Lawgiver when the Sabbath commandment was given? Did the Lawgiver declare, or show in any way, his intention? He did. He declared in plain words that the *seventh* day is the one intended to be ob-

338

served. Nor did he leave them to decide for themselves which day *they* would have for the Sabbath. He did not leave it to the people to interpret his law for themselves, nor to interpret it at all. By three special acts every week, kept up continuously for forty years, the Lord showed his intent in the law. The people were fed on the manna in their forty years' wanderings between Egypt and Canaan. But on the seventh day of the week no manna ever fell. On the sixth day of the week there was a double portion; and that which was gathered on the sixth day would keep over the seventh day, which it could not be made to do on any other day of the week. By this means the Lawgiver signified his intent upon the subject of the day mentioned in the law quoted by Congress. And by keeping it up so continuously



and for so long a time he made it impossible for the people then to mistake his intent; and has left all future generations who have the record of it, without excuse in gathering anything else as his intent than that the seventh day is the Sabbath. Therefore when Congress decided that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the meaning of the divine law which says "the seventh day is the Sabbath," it plainly set itself in contradiction to the word and intent of the Most High.

ANOTHER established rule is this:—

"When words are plain in a written law, there is an end to all construction; they must be followed." And, "Where the intent is plain nothing is left to construction."

Are the words of this commandment quoted by Congress, plain words? They are nothing else. There is not an obscure nor an ambiguous word in the whole commandment. Then under the rule there is no room for any construction; much less is their room for any *such* construction as would make the expression "the seventh day" mean "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." Fitting to the point the New Testament has given us an interesting and important piece of narrative. In Mark 16:1, 2, are these words:—

And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.

These people arose *very early in the morning* of the first day of the week; yet *the Sabbath was past*. Now Congress has legislated to secure respect for the Sabbath on "the first day of the week." Such a thing can never be done however; because Inspiration has declared that the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes. It matters not how early our illustrious and devout Congress and the World's Fair Commission, may get out and around "on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," they will be too late to find the Sabbath there, for the Lord says that *then* it is "*past*."

AND it is the Sabbath according to the commandment, too, that is past when the first day of the week comes—the Sabbath according to this very commandment which Congress has officially cited. Here is the record:—

And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first

day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. Luke 23:56 and 24:1-3.

Here is the plain word of the Lord stating plainly and proving conclusively that "the Sabbath day" according to the very commandment which Congress has officially cited, is the day *before* "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," and that the Sabbath day, according to this commandment *is past* before "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," comes at all, no matter how early they may get up the first day of the week.

IT is true that the churches are at the head of all this, and that Congress did it at the dictation and under the threats of the churches. It is true that the churches have put this false interpretation upon the commandment, and then saddled it off thus upon Congress. This is all true, but that does not relieve Congress from one white of the guilt of perverting the law of the Most High, of forcing into that law a meaning that was never intended to be there, and of putting itself in the place of God and assuming the office of interpreter of his laws. Congress had no business to allow itself to be forced into such a position. Judge Cooley—"Constitutional Limitations," page 67—says:—

A court or legislature which should allow a change of public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written Constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders, would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty.

The theologians gave to the Sabbath commandment a construction which was not in any sense warranted by the intention of the Author of the commandment. They then went to Congress and demanded with threats that it allow itself to be influenced, by these theological sentiments and political threats, to give to the written Constitution of the Government of the living God, a construction which is not in any sense warranted by the intention of the founder of that Constitution. And our national Legislature did allow this sentiment to influence it into doing that very thing. Such a thing done to a human Constitution, an earthly statute, being justly chargeable to reckless disregard of official oath and public duty, what must be chargeable against such an action with reference to the divine Constitution and the heavenly law? The national Legislature—the Congress of the United States—has allowed the churches to draw it

into the commission of an act with reference to the Constitution and laws of the living God, which if done only with the laws of men would be reckless disregard of official oath and public duty. And both Congress and the churches are without excuse in the doing of it.

BY this legislation, at the dictate of the churches, Congress has distinctly and definitely put itself and the Government of the United States into the place where it has established, and proposes to enforce, the observance of an institution as sacred, and as due to the Lord, which not only the Lord has neither established nor required, but which is directly contrary to the plain word of the Lord upon the subject of this very institution and its observance as due to the Lord. And in the doing of this Congress has also been caused to assume to itself the prerogative of authoritative interpreter of Scripture for the people of the land and for all who come into the land; and puts itself in the place of God by authoritatively deciding that an observance established and required by the State, and which it calls the Lord's, is the Lord's indeed, although the Lord plainly declares the contrary.

IN thus submitting to the dictates of the churches, and making itself the official and authoritative mouthpiece for the theological definitions and interpretations of the divine law, the Congress of the United States has given over the Government of the United States into the hands of the combined churches. A forcible American writer has long ago stated the principle thus:—

To permit a church—*any* church— . . . to dictate, beforehand, what laws should or should not be passed, would be to deprive the people of all the authority they have retained in their own hands, and to make such church the governing power, instead of them. <sup>161</sup>

This is precisely what has been done before the eyes of the people of the United States in this Sunday legislation of the Fifty-second Congress. The combined "evangelical" churches, including the Catholic Church, as a united body on this question, did dictate under threats that this law should be passed. Congress did permit it, and did yield to the dictation. And in so doing it did deprive the people of the governmental authority which they had retained in their own hands by the Declaration and the Constitution; and did make the churches the governing power in the Government, instead of the people. "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people," is gone; and there has been established in its stead, the subjection of the people, by the churches, and for the churches.

This the Congress of the United States has been led by the churches to do. And in the doing of it, it has caused this enlightened

Nation, the example and glory of the world, to assume the place and the prerogatives of the governments of the Middle Ages in enforcing the dogmas and the definitions of the theologians, and executing the arbitrary and despotic will of the Church. And it is a burning shame.

A. T. J.

**"Organizing to Enforce Sunday in California" *The American Sentinel*  
7, 43 , p. 340.**

[CD-ROM Editor's Note: This article has no initials attached to it, however Jones was the sole editor for this date so it is attributable to him.]

A CORRESPONDENT writes from Santa Barbara, Cal., of the formation there, on October 11, of a County Sabbath Union. In the course of the meeting these resolutions were adopted:—

*Resolved*, 1st, That this organization be called "The Santa Barbara County Sabbath Union," and be auxiliary to the American Sabbath Union.

2nd. That it is our conviction, that in the absence of a State Sunday law, immediate efforts ought to be made to secure a county closing ordinance.

3rd. We pledge our hearty co-operation with all good people to secure a Sunday law for our State.

4th. We urge upon pastors the necessity of making the doctrine of the Lord's day more prominent in the presentation of gospel truth.

5th. We urge upon Sunday-school teachers and parents the importance of giving larger attention to instruction regarding the Lord's day.

6th. This organization will use its utmost endeavor to prevent the desecration of the Lord's day by ball playing and other forms of popular amusement.

7th. This Union pledges to aid the civil authorities in the enforcement of the existing Sunday ordinance and such others as may be enacted hereafter.

Short addresses were made by different ministers present, in favor of the resolutions, in which it was said by one, in effect, that unless California should soon have a Sunday law on her statute book the work of the gospel would come to a standstill in California. Another said: "Our movement has many opposers, and the worst class of opposition comes from Seventh-day Adventists. The Jews are willing to submit to the law, but Seventh-day Adventists persist in carrying on

their business in open defiance to the law of the land. *We must have an effective Sabbath-law.*"

The matter of exemption clauses was raised by this question, which was handed in and read: "If we allow an exemption clause in favor of those who conscientiously keep another day as the Sabbath, will not this be used by some who are not Christians, and the law, in a measure, be ineffective?" To this the answer was made that no trouble need be anticipated on that score, "because it can be readily shown, through the people of the community in which such people live, whether they are conscientious in profession or not."

Another minister thought the discussion of that question useless, for, "As for these Seventh-day Adventists—why there is only a handful of them any way, and as for me, I waste no time on them. I don't regard them as worth the powder and shot to blow them up." All present were not of this opinion, for a Presbyterian gentleman arose and said: "I want to say in behalf of these seventh-day people that I know them to be honorable citizens, and just as good Christians as we are. I want to see fair dealing with everybody."

This called out from the minister who had already been most prominent in the meeting a dissertation upon the Sabbath question, in which he attempted to show that Sunday was really the seventh day, prefacing his argument by the assertion that it was through ignorance that many were deceived in this matter.

At this point a Seventh-day Adventist, who was present, surprised the assembly with a short exposition of the principles of civil and religious liberty, but this same minister, who had advocated the resolutions the most zealously, replied promptly: "It is a fact that Church and State have a nearer relation than most people are aware, in the enforcement of Sunday laws, but the constitutionality of Sunday laws *are now no longer a matter of argument. The Supreme Court has settled that question in its late decision.*" He then read extracts from the opinion of Justice Brewer in the trinity Church case holding that this is a Christian Nation, etc.

That there was considerable dissent from the positions taken by the resolutions, and those who spoke in their behalf, was shown by the remarks of laymen, and also of some ministers, in conversation after the close of the meeting, when they acknowledged that they believed it an error to attempt any coercion in matters of religion.

Meetings and discussions similar to this which our correspondent has recounted are occurring all over the country. They are very

significant. It is worthy to be noticed that Justice Brewer's decision has now become the canon law of the Church and of the land, beyond which it is already impiety to inquire. The tide is rising rapidly.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 43 , p. 344.**

SUNDAY slavery is a favorite theme of the Chicago ministers just now. The time was when, if a man was converted to God, he turned away from following the world, and became a servant of his new and divine Lord to do his will and pleasure regardless of the customs and opinions of the time-serving and money-loving people around him. But not so nowadays according to the statement of some of the leading divines. But on the contrary, after the church has converted them, then it has to undertake a work of liberating them by removing every cross so that the convert will have no sacrifice to make in becoming a Christian and taking upon him the obligations of church membership.

SOME of these church members are clerks, and are employed by men who are Jews and Liberals, who keep their places of business open on Sunday. They have been induced to join the church, but they have not left off their Sunday work, although they know it is contrary to the law of the land, and the church teaches that it is contrary to the law of God. When men who happen to be Liberals or secularists do the same things, they are called Anarhists; but when the members of the church are involved, they are "slaves to a custom."

AN eminent clergyman of the city of Chicago recently in his Sunday evening discourse said, "There are many worthy members of my charge who never hear their pastor preach, except occasionally on Sunday evening they get excused by their employers at eight o'clock so that they can attend church." He said that it has been suggested to him that discipline would be a good thing in their case, but said he, "Before I would resort to that I would go out of the church myself, body, soul, and breeches." So these violators of the laws of God and man will be retained in the church until the proprietors can be compelled to release them by closing their places of business on Sunday, for the only remedy suggested by the reverend gentleman was agitation and boycott until these "slaves" should be released.

PERTINENT to this subject is the following notice which the *Pittsburg Dispatch* of October 10, makes of a sermon delivered on the previous day in that city:—

Rev. J. H. Patterson supplied the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church yesterday. Taking, "Be thou faithful unto death," as his text, he delivered an eloquent plea for Christian steadfastness and faithfulness to duty. Illustrating his theme with the example of constancy, he related how, when the Roman emperor came to the throne he issued an edict that the subjects in his employ should either resign their positions or renounce the Christian religion. The larger part resigned. The next day he reappointed all those who had done so to their old positions and banished those who had disclaimed their faith in the hope of winning his favor. He went on to state that Christians are to be faithful to their vows and that it is a Christian's highest privilege to be persecuted. This was the Christian's reward, and was the distinguishing feature of Christianity. No other religion was to be compared with it. God's light could illumine a mountain as easily as a mole hill.

IT is not easy to see how Mr. Patterson could reconcile his sermon with the demand of the churches for Sunday laws. One ground on which such laws are demanded is that those who desire to keep Sunday may be enabled to do so without loss of position or business. In other words, the State is asked to so arrange things that not only will it require no self-denial to keep Sunday, but that the Sunday-keeper will have a positive advantage. The Sunday-keepers evidently do not want any of the blessings promised to those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; they want no cross-bearing with their religion; the self-denial must be reduced to the minimum and be limited in fact to abstaining from those hurtful things which are eschewed by the mere moralist as well as by the Christian.

THE Sunday people are, however, determined that there shall be persecutions, and that somebody shall get the blessing for enduring them; and not only that crosses shall be borne but that they shall be heavy enough to be felt; and so they insist upon Sunday laws and then enforce those laws, as they are doing in Tennessee, and as they threaten to do elsewhere, upon those who conscientiously dissent from the prevailing religion; and thus Christians are persecuted by other Christians, so-called.

**November 10, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 44 , pp. 345, 346.**

AN interesting question in connection with the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, is, What attitude should they

now assume toward the law which forbids them to follow their usual vocations on Sunday? Should they yield to the law and thus secure immunity from further persecution? or should they violate the law as they have done hitherto, and suffer the penalty?

MANY will unhesitatingly answer that it is the duty of all men, and especially of all Christians, to obey the civil law; and that the Adventists are no exception; that they ought to obey the law as it exists; and if they think it unjust they have the privilege of endeavoring to secure its repeal or modification. This is substantially the position taken by the judge before whom the four men convicted in Henry County last May, were tried; and it would probably be the position taken by a large majority of men who have given the subject little thought. But is it the correct one?

MAN is not only a social being, having social relations and social duties, but he is likewise a moral being, having moral duties and moral obligations. In their social relations—that is in all things pertaining solely to their relations with their fellow-men,—the Creator has made men responsible to one another, not ultimately nor in a way to release them from moral responsibility, but in a way to enable men, by combination and organization, to secure, each at the hands of his fellows, the rights with which nature has endowed him. This is civil government; and the preservation or securing of natural rights is the extent of its legitimate jurisdiction. And in every age we find godly men refusing to yield obedience to civil rulers when they exceed their proper jurisdiction.

A NOTABLE instance of resistance to, or rather disobedience of, civil law when it conflicted with moral duty, is recorded in the third chapter of the prophecy of Daniel. The king, having set up a great image, commanded all the people to fall down and worship it. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, three Hebrews whom the king had set over the affairs of the province of Babylon, refused to worship the image or even to bow to it, and at the king's command they were cast alive into a burning, fiery furnace, from which God miraculously delivered them; thus fully justifying their disobedience to civil authority.

ANOTHER instance of disobedience to a civil law which invaded the domain of conscience, is recorded in the sixth chapter of the book of Daniel. In this instance the prophet himself, though prime minister of the kingdom, was the offender. The king, at the instance of "the presidents and princes" of his realm, made a decree that no man



should ask any petition of any man or God, save of the king only, for a period of thirty days, upon penalty of being cast alive into a den of lions. It had long been Daniel's custom to pray at his open window three times a day. The record tells us, "Now when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." For this violation of civil law, Daniel was deposed from office and cast into a den of lions; but the angel of the Lord delivered him.

JEREMIAH, too, another prophet of the Lord, repeatedly disobeyed the king, and was on several occasions imprisoned for his temerity. But it is in the New Testament that we find the most noteworthy examples of disregard of civil law when it came in conflict with divine authority. In the third chapter of Acts we have the record of the miracle of healing wrought upon the cripple at the Beautiful gate of the Temple. This miracle caused a great commotion, insomuch that it greatly excited the jealousy of the rulers of the people. They therefore commanded Peter and John that they should teach no more in the name of Jesus. "But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we can not but speak the things which we have seen and heard." In accordance with their word, the apostles disobeyed the rulers and were again arraigned. "And when they had brought them, they set them before the council: and the high priest asked them, saying, Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us. Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 5:27-29.

IN the light of the facts related in the various scriptures quoted, the question arises, Did these godly men violate any correct principle of civil government? Civil government is ordained of God for the good of his creatures, and did he in these cases vindicate men for disregarding principles which he himself had laid down?—Most assuredly not. God ordained civil governments, but he also ordained their proper sphere; and outside of that they are without rightful authority; and not only are men at liberty to disobey them, when to obey would be to violate their consciences, but they must disobey, or prove disloyal to God and to their own souls.

Christ did not state a new truth, or lay down a new principle, when he said,

346

"Render unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." He only stated the underlying principle of all government; and it is upon this principle that the followers of Christ in every age have acted. In all civil things they have yielded cheerful and implicit obedience, but they have gone to the block and to the stake rather than yield to Cesar the things that belong to God. And the Tennessee Adventists can do neither more nor less than the followers of Christ have ever done; they must, if they retain their Christian integrity, remain loyal to God at any cost. It is admitted by the State of Tennessee, that in every thing except the matter of Sunday observance they are good citizens. It was likewise the testimony of Daniel's enemies that they could find no fault with him except as "concerning the law of his God." The Tennessee Adventist can, like Daniel, submit to whatever penalty the law imposes upon them; but they can not violate their conscientious convictions of duty toward God, and remain Christians.

**"Note" *The American Sentinel* 7, 44 , p. 350.**

IT is an error to suppose that the majority has an unqualified right to rule. In civil things the majority has a right to rule, but the majority has no more right to invade the domain of conscience than has the single individual whom custom, fraud, or force has placed at the head of a government. Such power is illegitimate no matter by whom it may be exercised. Governments are instituted to secure natural right, and any government that fails to do this has no right to exist, whether it be a government by one, by the few, or by the many.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 44 , p. 352.**

THE decision of the General Term of the City Court that a contract for streamer transportation to be carried out on Sunday is void, emphasizes the fact that Sunday is more than a merely civil day, and that the purpose of the Sunday law of the State of New York is to recognize that day as more than a holiday. The courts would not think of voiding a contract made for service to be rendered on the Fourth of July or on Thanksgiving Day. A transportation company failing to furnish transportation on either of those days, as stipulated, would be

mulcted in heavy damages. This shows that Sunday stands alone and pre-eminent among days in our civil statutes; and that, because of its religious character.

BUT perhaps the most peculiar feature of this decision is that while the transportation company was released from its contract because of the moral character of the day, there was no redress for the men who had expended their money to go on the excursion. It thus appears that in the eyes of the courts of this State and city, the observance of Sunday is a matter of much more importance than honesty between man and man.

When the Saviour, the Son of God, was asked which was the great commandment in the law, he replied: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The Lord Jesus Christ thus placed the two divisions of the law on an equality, as is also done in James 2:10, where it is declared that "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all;" for he has broken the divine law. But the courts of New York are more wise(?), and in their attempt to administer the divine law, as construed by the law-makers of the State, have ascertained that though a steamboat company defraud some Germans who do not regard the first day of the week, yet, if by so doing the company refuses to run its boat on Sunday it is guiltless!

**November 17, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 45 , pp. 353, 354.**

THERE is almost an entire misapprehension in the public mind as to the Sunday law of Tennessee.

SEEING the despotic and persecuting proceedings of the State authorities in Henry County, Tennessee, as regards Sunday work by those who keep Sabbath, the public have gathered the idea that the Sunday law of that State is a rigid, fierce, and fire-breathing thing. This is a mistake.

OF course all Sunday laws are bad. But as a matter of fact that Sunday law of Tennessee is about as mild as any Sunday law could be. And as a further fact the Sunday law of Tennessee is entirely

innocent, so far as the persecutions on this subject in that State are concerned.

THE truth is that the persecuting prosecutions that have been carried on by the authorities of the State of Tennessee, as regards Sunday work, for the last eight years, have been, and are, without any statutory authority whatever. The statute in relation to Sunday work is ignored, and has been ignored these eight years, and all these cases, and extra-statutory measures have been applied and carried through. This the public should understand.

THE Sunday law of Tennessee, the only statute on this subject in that State, provides only for prosecution "*before any justice of the peace of the county;*" and provides there, only that the person duly convicted (of performing any of the common vocations of life on Sunday), "*before any justice of the peace of the county, shall forfeit and pay three dollars, one half to the person who shall sue for the same, the other half for the use of the county.*"

THIS is the only provision of law on this subject in the State of Tennessee. And it is clear as words can say it, that there is in that State no provision of law for any prosecution for Sunday work, in any court but that of a "*justice of the peace;*" and no provision of law for any fine or penalty, but "*three dollars.*" Yet every case of prosecution for Sunday work in that State for the last eight years, has been before the Circuit Court, and the fine placed at whatever figure the jury or the Circuit Judge has chosen to levy. That is, the proceedings, instead of being an enforcement of the law, are simply an infliction of the arbitrary will of the court. And such procedure has been solemnly pronounced by the Circuit Court of the United States, to be "due process of law."

THIS lawless course was begun in the case of W. H. Parker in the year 1885. Parker was tried before the Circuit Court, and duly convicted and imprisoned. Then nothing more was done in this line until the noted case of R. M. King in the summer of 1889. King was first prosecuted according to the law, and the fine provided in the law, was assessed and collected. A simple fine of three dollars, however, was not sufficient to satisfy the religious zeal of those who would prohibit the observance of any day but Sunday. Accordingly, these extra-statutory measures were adopted; the law was ignored; and Parker, King, and all others since, have been prosecuted before the Circuit Court, for the crime of "public nuisance," whereby the jury can

assess any fine they see fit *above* fifty dollars; under that sum the amount being left to the discretion of the judge.

BY this method, not only can the fine be assessed at any amount, but the court can convict without any evidence. This is precisely what was done last May in the cases of Dortch, Moon, Stem, and Lowry. They were prosecuted for the crime of public nuisance, committed by working on Sunday. And though not a soul had made any complaint against any one of them, and though not a single witness testified that anybody in the community had been disturbed by any one of the accused, or had complained of any one of them; yet all four were found guilty of having done that which "was and is a disturbance in the community in which done, was offensive to the moral sense of the public, and was and is a public nuisance." And the fines were such as to keep them in jail from forty-five to sixty-four days.

Of course, as we have shown, there is no law in Tennessee making work on Sunday a public or any other kind of nuisance. That turn was made in this way: Some years ago the Supreme Court of that State set forth the doctrine that "Christianity is part of the common law" of Tennessee, and that offenses against Christianity were properly indictable, and punishable as common law offenses. This is the doctrine that was confirmed by the Circuit Court of the United States, which said that though there is "not any foundation for the ruling that it is a common law nuisance to work in one's fields on Sunday;" that King was "wrongfully convicted;" and the court "wrongfully decided;" yet it was all "due process of law." And this decision of the Circuit Court of the United States establishing as "due process of law," the "wrongful decision" of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, which confirmed the "wrongful conviction" of a man, under a ruling for which there was "not any foundation"—this is to-day the authority, the only authority, and the only authority that is claimed, for the crusade in behalf of Sunday, that is now being carried on in the State of Tennessee.

354

It is a mistake therefore to speak as some have of Tennessee's "rigid Sunday law." Tennessee has no rigid Sunday law. On the contrary she has a very mild law for a Sunday law, and even that is not enforced. It is somewhat wide of the mark also to call, as some papers have, for Tennessee to repeal her Sunday law. This is not the need just now; for Tennessee's Sunday law is not hurting anybody. It

is the Sunday law that she *hasn't* that is doing the mischief—and that can't be repealed.

What is urgently needed just now in that State is a rigid reform of her courts. There needs to be secured a set of judges who will have some respect for the laws, both constitutional and statutory; and who will be content to set forth the law as it is written, and not take it upon themselves to set forth their own arbitrary will for the law. Judges are wanted there who will keep within the bounds set by the Constitution for the judiciary, and who will not attempt to exercise also the prerogative of the legislative branch of the State government. This is a reform, too, that is sadly needed not only in Tennessee but clear from the Circuit Courts of that State all the way up to the Supreme Court of the United States. But lo! in this very fact of the widespread and deep-seated need, lies the hopelessness of any reformatory remedy ever being successfully applied.

Tennessee also needs attorneys-general who will be content to be prosecuting attorneys, without turning themselves into persecuting attorneys after the manner of that one down in Henry County—attorneys-general and not inquisitors-general.

A. T. J.

**"Christianity and the Common Law" *The American Sentinel* 7, 45 , pp. 355, 356.**

IN another place in this paper it has been pointed out how that in Tennessee that statute is ignored and the theory of "Christianity as the Common law" is used as the authority for the persecutions there for Sunday work. This doctrine of "Christianity as the Common law" is worth of some attention on its own account; and as this Tennessee history furnishes a living example we take this opportunity to show what the doctrine really amounts to.

It is an undeniable principle of the law that the common law is superseded by the written law. A statute repeals the common law on the same subject: and a Constitution supplants the common law on all points upon which the Constitution speaks.

1. As a statute takes the place of the common law on the same subject, and as the State of Tennessee has a statute on the subject of Sunday work, it follows that any indictment or prosecution, at common law, for Sunday work, is therefore precluded, and is void.

2. As a Constitution supplants the common law in all points upon which the Constitution speaks; as the Constitution of Tennessee expressly declares that "no preference shall ever been given *by law* to any religious establishment or mode of worship;" and as Christianity is in its every intent and purpose a mode of worship; it follows that when the Supreme Court of Tennessee recognized and established Christianity as a part of the common *law* of that State, that court did thereby positively give preference *by law* to that religion and its modes of worship. But this, being in violation of the express provision of the Constitution, is in itself void.

It may be well to give some citations upon this point. The Constitution of California contains substantially the same provisions as does that of Tennessee. And upon this same question the Supreme Court of that State spoke as follows:

We often meet with the expression that Christianity is part of the common law. Conceding that this is true, it is not perceived how it can influence the decision of a constitutional question. The Constitution of this State will not tolerate any discrimination or preference in favor of any religion; and *so far as the common law conflicts with this provision, it must yield to the Constitution*. Our constitutional theory regards all religions, as such, equally entitled to protection, and all equally *unentitled to any preference*. Before the Constitution they are all equal. When there is no ground or necessity upon which a principle can rest, but a religious one, then the Constitution steps in and says that you shall not enforce it by authority of law.—9 Lee 513.

The Constitution of Ohio has the same provisions, almost word for word, as has the Constitution of Tennessee. And likewise upon this same question the Supreme Court of that State spoke thus:—

The Constitution of Ohio having declared "that all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of conscience; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; that no man shall be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent; and that no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious society or mode of worship, and no religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office of trust or profit," it follows that neither Christianity nor any other system of religion is a part of the law of this State. We sometimes hear it said that all religions are tolerated in Ohio; but the expression is not strictly accurate; much less accurate is it to say that one religion is a part of our law, and all others only tolerated. It is not mere toleration that every individual

here is protected in his belief or disbelief. He reposes, not upon the leniency of government, or the liberality of any class or sect of men, but upon his natural, indefeasible rights of conscience, which, in the language of the Constitution, are beyond the control or interference of any human authority.—2 *Ohio Rep.*, 387.

The Constitution of New York is substantially the same; and the Supreme Court of that State annihilates the proposition that Christianity is part of the common law, in the following masterly reasoning:—

The maxim that Christianity is part and parcel of the common law has been frequently repeated by judges and text writers; but few have chosen to examine its truth or attempted to explain its meaning. We have, however, the high authority of Lord Mansfield, and his successor, the present Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, Lord Campbell, for stating as its true *and only sense*, that the law will not permit the essential truths of revealed religion to be ridiculed and reviled. In other words, that blasphemy is an indictable offense at common law. The truth of the maxim in this very partial and limited sense may be admitted. But if we attempt to extend its application, we shall find ourselves obliged to confess that it is unmeaning or untrue. If Christianity is a municipal law, in the proper sense of the term, *as it must be if a part of the common law*, every person is liable to be punished by the civil power, who refuses to embrace its doctrines and follow its precepts. And if it must be conceded that in this sense the maxim is untrue, it ceases to be intelligible, since a law without a sanction is an absurdity in logic and a nullity in fact.

Let it be admitted, however, that Christianity is a part of the common law, *in any sense* of the maxim *which those who assert its truth may choose to attribute to it*. The only effect of the admission is to create new difficulties, quite as impossible to overcome as those that have already been stated. How, we would then ask. . . . are we to apply the test which Christianity is said to furnish? It will not be pretended that the common law has supplied us with any definition of Christianity. Yet without a judicial knowledge of what Christianity is, how is it possible to determine whether a particular use, alleged to be pious, is or is not consistent with the truths which Christianity reveals?

No religious use has been or can be created, that does not imply the existence and truth of some particular religious doctrine; and hence, when we affirm the validity of a use as pious, we necessarily affirm the truth of the doctrine upon which it is founded, In a country where a definite form of



Christianity is the religion established by law, the difficulty to which we refer is not felt, since the doctrines of the established church then supply the criterion which is sought; *but with us* it can readily be shown that *the difficulty* is not merely real and serious, but *insurmountable*.—4 *Sandford's Superior Court Reports*, pp. 181, 182.

All of this Judge Cooley confirms in these words:—

It is frequently said that Christianity is a part of the law of the land. . . . But the law does not attempt to enforce the precepts of Christianity on the ground of their sacred character or divine origin. Some of these precepts, though we may admit their continual and universal obligation, we must nevertheless recognize as being incapable of enforcement by human laws. That standard of morality which requires one to love his neighbor as himself, we must admit is too elevated to be accepted by human tribunals as the proper test by which to judge the conduct of the citizen; and one could hardly be held responsible to the criminal laws, if in goodness of heart and spontaneous charity he fell something short of the good Samaritan. The precepts of Christianity, moreover, affect the heart and address themselves to the conscience; while the laws of the State can regard the outward conduct only; and *for these several reasons Christianity is not a part of the law of the land in any sense which entitles the courts to take notice of and base their judgments upon it*, except so far as they can find that its precepts and principles have been incorporated in and made *a component part of the positive laws of the State*.—*Constitutional Limitations*, p. 584.

3. This provision of the Constitution of Tennessee is a part of the title, "Bill of Rights." Now another principle of law and government is, that—

Everything in the declaration of rights contained, is excepted out of the general powers of government, and all laws contrary thereto shall be void.—*Idem.*, p. 46.

As, therefore, the "Declaration of Rights" of the State of Tennessee has provided that "no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship;" as all matters of conscience, religion, and worship are thereby "excepted out of the general powers of government;" and as "all laws contrary thereto shall be void," it is clearly demonstrated that the preference given to Christianity as by common law is the State of Tennessee, is void.

There is yet another defect in this theory that Christianity is part of the common law. The theory is drawn from the English courts. But "even in England, Christianity was never considered as a part of the common law so far as that for a violation of its injunctions, independent of the established laws of man, and without the sanction

of any *positive act of Parliament made to enforce these injunctions*, any man could be drawn to answer in a common law court," as was done in this case by the courts of the State of Tennessee.

But Judge Hammond himself goes even further than this, and in a communication printed in the *Appeal-Avalanche*, Aug. 30, 1891, shows that "in one of the latest cases in England the Lord Chief Justice pronounced former expressions that Christianity is part of the law of the land, as *dicta*, and not true now."

True enough! It is not true now, and it never was true by any principle of justice or right. We have not space here to go into the details of this matter. It must suffice here simply to observe that it was introduced by fraud, it was established by falsehood, and it has been perpetuated by imposture. And query: As it is "not true now" *in England* that Christianity is part of the law of the land, how can it be true that it is true now *in Tennessee*, which professedly derives the doctrine from England? And further and doubly, How can it be true now in Tennessee in face of the State Constitution, which expressly prohibits it in the declaration that "no human authority can *in any case whatever* control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and no preference shall ever be given *by law* to any religious establishment or mode of worship?"

Thus it is demonstrated by the living principles of American law and government, that the procedure of the Tennessee courts in the case of Mr. King instead of being of absolute authority, as the United State Circuit Court decided, is absolutely void and of no valid authority at all. And the demonstration is complete, the decision of the United States Circuit Court to the contrary, notwithstanding, that King, and Dortch, and Moon, and Stem and Lowry, were *deprived of their liberty and property* "WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW."

A. T. J.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 45 , p. 352.**

THE President, in his role of official high priest of this "Christian" Nation, has issued the following proclamation:—

The gifts of God to our people during the past year have been so abundant and so special that the spirit of devout thanksgiving awaits not a call, but only the appointment of a day when it may have a common expression. He has stayed the pestilence at our door; he has given us more love for the free civil institutions, in the creation of which his directing providence was so conspicuous; he

has awakened a deeper reverence for law; he has widened our philanthropy by a call to succor the distress in other lands; he has blessed our schools and is bringing forward a patriotic and God-fearing generation to execute his great and benevolent designs for our country; he has given us great increase in material wealth, and a wide diffusion of contentment and comfort in the homes of our people; he has given his grace to the sorrowing.

Wherefore, I Benjamin Harrison, President of the United States, do call upon all our people to observe, as we have been wont, Thursday, the twenty-fourth day of this month of November, as a day of thanksgiving to God for his mercies and of supplication for his continued care and grace.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 4th day of November, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-two, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and seventeenth.

*By the President,* BENJAMIN HARRISON.

JOHN W. FOSTER, *Secretary of State.*

IT is a little strange that while such proclamations are issued, professedly, because this is a "Christian" Nation, this particular proclamation, like many others before it, bears no internal evidence of being a Christian document, or that it is issued by a Christian ruler. The veriest pagan might be the author of such a proclamation. Deioces or Cyaxares might have issued a proclamation in the exact words of this one issued by the President of this "Christian" Nation, and nobody would have even suspected that it was not designed to honor the god of Persia.

If this is, as the Supreme Court holds that it is, a "Christian" Nation, the President certainly ought to issue Christian proclamations; if it is a pagan Nation, the proclamation in question will answer every purpose; but if the Nation is simply a civil government, organized for civil purposes, and as President Washington asserted, "is in no sense founded upon the Christian religion," we should at once and forever be done with the force of professing something which only a small percentage of the people really feel, and which causes a professedly Christian man, an elder in a Christian church, to deny his Lord by issuing as a Christian act, a proclamation which fails to recognize our Lord even in the date which it bears.

**November 24, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 46 , pp. 361, 362.**

IT is worth serious inquiry as to what will be the effect upon the churches of taking the Government of the United States in their hands, as they have done.

WHEN we find what will be the effect upon the churches, it can easily be seen what the effect will be upon the State. And seeing the effect on both Church and State, it will be easy to know what the effect will be upon society, as a whole.

NOR is this at all difficulty. The results of this procedure have already begun to appear in such measure as to present a perfectly safe criterion. The outcome may be known without any theorizing at all. All that is necessary is candidly to consider *facts* as they stand before the people at the present moment.

THE manner in which the churches succeed in getting the Government into their hands—this in itself contains a volume of instruction as to what the effect will be upon those churches. The complete history of this has already been given in these columns. We shall not repeat this any further than to print again the resolution that was sent up to Congress from the "evangelical" churches in all parts of the country, which, after prescribing what Congress should do with respect to the World's Fair, runs as follows:—

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

AMS is now universally known these threats succeeded, and both Senate and House yielded to this demand rather than to risk the threatened loss of votes and jeopardize their "coming back again." It is likewise well known that those who thus secured this legislation have repeatedly announced since that this demonstrates that they can have anything they want, if they will only stand together in demanding it; and that they do intend to make such demands for further favors and further subjection of the Government. Now here are some questions worthy of the candid attention of every honest church-member in the land. If those who are already in Congress will thus play into the hands of the churches in order to "come back" there, then will not those who want to go there play likewise into the

hands of the churches in order to get there? When, from this universal advertising, it is understood that the churches hold within their gift the offices and places of trust of the Nation, then will not these same churches become the chiefest objects of the courtship and solicitation of the office-seekers of the land, and especially of the most unprincipled ones? Everybody knows that the only fair answer that can be made to these questions is, *Yes, they will.*

THEN, in order to make their courtship and solicitation for office most effectual, these men will become church-members themselves. And having joined the Church for political purposes they will use their membership for political purposes. And so far as they are concerned the churches will be but so many political clubs and coteries to be "worked" for all that can be made out of them. This is not theory, nor is it far-fetched. It is the plainly stated calculation of the leaders of the Sunday-law movement. For years it has been one of the standing principles of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union that "now when it is a question of preserving the Sabbath itself, and guarding the homes which are the sanctuaries of Christ's gospel, we women believe that *no day is too good, no place too consecrated, for the declaration of principles and the determining of votes.*" And in an editorial notice of a Sunday-law meeting in this city, *The Examiner* (Baptist) said:

Congress may change its mind; the present is no time for jubilation; but is (and we beg pardon for the phrase) a time for wire-pulling and hard fighting.

NOW when it is so openly and so brazenly announced by those who are occupying the leading positions in the churches, that their "holy day" and their sacred places shall be turned into political hustings, and that they will devote themselves to "wire-pulling and hard fighting"—when these take the lead in this, is it not inevitable that the office-seekers who would court their influence and votes will do the same thing? In fact what else are these declarations of theirs but an open bid for such procedure on the part of just such classes as those?

NOR is political favor the only bid which these same churches hold out for the purpose of securing Sunday observance. The churches have financial as well as political gain at their disposal. In congratulating himself and his followers upon the success of their threatening efforts upon Congress, the president of the American Sabbath Union exclaimed:—

The form of the law is happy. It gives a premium of \$2,500,000 on doing right. It proves in a concrete way that godliness hath great gain.

As these churches have it in their power thus to put a money premium upon doing the will of the Church, it is self-evident that in the nature of things they will speedily secure large accessions to their numbers in such "right" doing. When the Church is enabled thus to prove so readily in a concrete way, to her own

362

satisfaction, that "godliness hath great gain," it is inevitable that there will be speedily added to her numbers those who will be able to prove just as readily to their own satisfaction that "gain is godliness." And the deduction of these latter will be just as true and as honest as is this boast that the Church has already made.

NEITHER have they stopped with this attempt upon Congress, and the World's Fair Directory. They are applying the principle in general practice. Witness the financial bargain—to give their moral and financial support—which the churches of Englewood, Chicago, made with the Marlowe Theatre to secure Sunday observance by the theatre; and the boycotting combination which the churches of the West Side, in the same city, entered into to secure Sunday observance by the dealers. This latter effort speedily bore living fruit which is significant of the whole line of things which we are here pointing out. This boycotting resolution to deal with nobody that opened on Sunday, was passed September 25. On October 11, another meeting of the same kind was held in another part of the city. The announcement and programme were printed on a large leaflet which was about half filled with advertisements, among which we find one put up in this style:—

MILLINERY A———& B———

**FURNITURE Clothing, Dry Goods, Hats, Caps, Boots, Shoes**

CARPETS Ladies' and Gents' Furnishing Goods.

TRUNKS 4— to 4— M——— Avenue.

BAGS

ETC., ETC. We believe in the closing of shops and stores on Sunday, and have

Always practiced it.

Another one runs thus:—

**PIONEER ADVOCATES OF SUNDAY CLOSING.**

Z———— & CO.,  
CLOTHIERS,  
Hatters and Furnishers,  
NORTHWESTCORNER————AND————STREETS.

P—NOT OPEN ON SUNDAY.—

MORE than this; we know of an instance wherein only last month, a money bribe was actually offered by the churches in a certain place, and the proposition was conveyed through a preacher, to secure the closing of a certain institution on Sunday. And in perfect consonance with this, if not actually suggestive of it, the *Union Signal* of October 20, 1892, publishes editorially, from Joseph Cook, the statement that "there is more wealth behind the churches and the respectable portion of society than behind all the opponents" of Sunday closing. The statement is worth reprinting in full as it is made in the very connection in which we have used it. It is as follows:—

In view of the vigor with which the right of petition is exercised by the opponents of Sunday closing [of the World's Fair], we believe that it should continued to be exercised vigorously by the friends of Sunday observance, especially if there should prove to be the slightest danger of the reversal of the action of Congress. We urge alertness at all points of the compass, for our opponents are not likely to sleep, and portions of the press of the country favor them from obvious mercenary motives. So does the immense wealth behind the saloon. *But there is more wealth behind the churches and the respectable portion of society than behind all the opponents.* The forces of the churches are in this case substantially united, and are already triumphant in the preliminary contest.

YET more than this; they are actually coddling the saloons to secure Sunday observance by them. The *Michigan Sabbath Watchman* (local organ of the American Sabbath Union) for October, 1892, reprints an article from the *American Sabbath Union* (the national organ of the association of that name), entitled, "The Rochester Experiment," in which the Sunday observing saloon is flatly declared to be "reputable" and even of "good repute." It seems to be a report to the paper, from Rochester, in this State, giving a flattering account of the progress of Sunday observance by the saloons. The article is long, and we can present only a few extracts. Here is one:—

If liquor sellers can make as much, or nearly as much, by working six days as they can in seven, they will be foolish to deny themselves that extra day of rest.

And here is another:—

A more important and controlling consideration is that the liquor closing movement is an effort to place this business under the protection of law instead of making it contraband, as the opposite policy has done. It is incredible that reputable men, as the large proportion of liquor sellers are, shall prefer voluntarily to place themselves under the ban of legal as well as popular disapproval.

And here is yet another, and stronger, too:—

The effect of Sunday closing has been to sharply discriminate the reputable from the disreputable saloon, and certainly to the advantage of the former. How many of the reputable liquor sellers would wish to weaken the good repute of their establishments for the paltry patronage that disregard of their license obligations might secure?

True he states that "there is considerably more liquor sold Saturday night and used at home on Sunday than before the saloons were closed on that day." Nevertheless he declares, "It is better every way for these customers to get their supplies the day before, and keep their business closed."

AND all these things are being done by the leaders and managers of the churches in the United States—and professed Protestant churches at that. How much worse could they do if they made no pretensions to religion at all? But when these things are all being done, not only by professed religionists, but by the very ones who set themselves forth as the representatives of Christianity itself, how infinitely worse it is than if done by persons making no pretensions of religion! This is where the opposers of Sunday laws and Sunday observance are at a disadvantage. These Sunday law workers can, and do, and will, employ measures and resort to means that no man of any principle would ever think of. They will literally stop at nothing. With them the end justifies any and every means. The observance of Sunday, however secured, sanctifies every possible means that can be employed to secure it. This is evident from the facts which we have here set down—and that they *are* facts is patent to the whole people of the United States.

HOW exactly do these declarations and actions of these churches fulfill the prophecy that was spoken concerning them long ago—that they, as fallen Babylon, would "become the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird!" Rev. 18:2. That hold is now prepared. That cage is set. Its doors are open. And she is to-day holding forth the luring baits that will inevitably draw into her every foul spirit and every unclean and hateful bird. And how much longer can the Christians stay in these churches and under these leaders



and managers without being partakers of their sins. There are Christians in these churches who are sighing and crying because of the evil and the abominations that are being wrought in them. And to these now God sends the call, "Come out of her my people that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. 18:4. There is but another step to take before her sins shall reach unto heaven and God shall remember her iniquities. Rev. 18:2, 5.

THERE is another scripture that describes this whole situation and system of things as it exists to-day. It is 2 Tim. 3:1-5 and runs as follows:—

This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away.

Think of it: a list of nineteen such dark iniquities as these, and all carried on by people having a form of godliness, a people making pretensions to Christianity. And, horrible to tell, they "shall wax worse and worse deceiving and being deceived." Verse 13. And the things which are to accomplish it are being done before the eyes of the people to-day. Is it not high time that whosoever would fear God should "from such turn away?" May Heaven help the people to see.

A. T. J.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 46 , p. 368.**

EXCEPT for the selfishness of professed Christians, all the world would long since have been compelled to admit the mild and benign character of the religion taught by the Lord Jesus Christ. But for centuries the course of the Church, both Protestant and Catholic, has been such as to fasten upon the minds of men the idea that intolerance exists as the legitimate fruit of Christianity, instead, as is really the case, in spite of the beneficent teachings of its Author, and in utter disregard of the plainest principles and precepts of his gospel.

WE are not sure after all but that the term "American Sabbath" is properly applied to Sunday. It is certainly not the Sabbath of the Lord, neither is it the Lord's Sabbath. It is true that as a holiday, Sunday is

very ancient; but as a rival of the Lord's day—the true Sabbath—it is comparatively modern. As a first-class fraud it is indebted more to America than to any other country in the world, and America ought to have the credit. There is also a fitness in the term "American" used in this connection, for it is a confession that Sunday is not *the* Sabbath. The very use of the terms, "American Sabbath," "Christian Sabbath," "Weekly Independence Day," etc., mark the contrast between the day to which they are applied and that which inspiration designates simply as the Sabbath.

**December 1, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 47 , pp. 369-371.**

IN the Scriptures the Christian's relationship to Christ is described under the symbol of the marriage tie: "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." Rom. 7:4. "I have espoused you to one husband." 2 Cor. 11:2. And the individual Christian is in this represented as having been espoused "as a chaste virgin to Christ."

SUCH individuals gathered in fellowship form the Church of Christ. And the relationship to Christ of such collection of individuals is also described under the symbol of the marriage tie: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it. . . . So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church. . . . For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: *but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.*" Eph. 5:25-32.

IN accordance with this idea the Church of Christ is represented in the Scriptures as the purest and fairest of women, leaning upon the arm of her beloved; drawn to him with the drawings of his love; her only thought being of her beloved; to her the chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely, whose banner over her is love and who would present her to himself "a glorious church not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without

blemish." Such is the Church to Christ; such is Christ to his Church; and such is the relationship between Christ and his Church.

TO such a church as this Christ committed his gospel to be by her made known to every creature. It is only such a church as this that can make known the gospel of Christ. That gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1:16. No one can make known that power who does not know that power for himself and in himself. And the Church could make known the power of God only by knowing the power in and for herself. And that power being known only by faith, in the nature of things it is only by abiding faithful to her Lord that the Church could fulfill the work of the gospel committed to her trust.

AGAIN: The gospel is Christ in men the hope of glory. Col. 1:27. This is what the Church of Christ is to make known to men. No one can make known Christ in men who for himself does not know Christ in men who for himself does not know Christ in himself. It pleased God "to reveal his Son *in me* that I might preach *him*." Gal. 1:16. But Christ dwells in men only by faith: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." Eph. 3:17. It is evident, therefore, that the only way in which the Church can make known Christ in men the hope of glory, is to have, and to know, Christ revealed in herself. And as this is only known by faith it is evident that it is only by abiding faithful to Christ that she can know Christ in herself or make him known in men.

ONCE more: In the gospel the righteousness of God is revealed; and the righteousness of God only. And it is the righteousness of God only which the Church of Christ is to know, and which she is to make known to all the world. This is the ministry of the gospel which is committed to the Church of Christ. This righteousness is known only by faith, and revealed only to faith. "Therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." Rom. 1:17, and 3:22. As, therefore, this righteousness is known only by faith, and is revealed only to faith, it is plain that it is only by abiding steadfast in faithfulness to Christ that the Church can know or make known the righteousness of God which is revealed in the gospel. And the sum of all these counts, and of many more that might be given, is simply to demonstrate over and over that it is only by abiding wholly in Christ, by trusting in him entirely, by depending upon him completely, by perfect faithfulness to him, that the Church can be what she must be in order to do what she is established to do.

SUCH was the Church of Christ in the beginning. Such is always the Church of Christ indeed. But such neither is nor has been the professed Church of Christ. For there has been an apostasy from Christ and from the true Church of Christ. In the apostles' days the warning was given, "Of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:30. And there shall come "a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. . . . For the mystery of iniquity doth already work." 2 Thess. 2:3-7.

THE Lord exalted his Church, and clothed her with the beautiful garments of salvation and righteousness, and the power of godliness, before the eyes of all the nations. He made her exceeding beautiful, and she prospered, and her renown went forth to all the world for her beauty; for it was perfect through *His* comeliness which *He* had put upon her. But not satisfied

370

with the exaltation which the Lord gave, which could come and remain only through her own humility, the Church grew haughty and exalted *herself*. Not content with the beauty of the Lord, which he had put upon her, she prided *herself* upon her own beauty; and instead of trusting in him for her beauty, she trusted in herself. Not content that God alone should be glorified in her, she glorified *herself*, and lived deliciously. Then, trusting in herself, priding herself upon her own beauty, magnifying her own merit, and satisfied with her own sufficiency,—this in itself was to put herself in the place of God. Then it was natural enough that she should seek to draw disciples to herself rather than to the Lord. Not only this, but having exalted herself, and magnified herself, and trusting in herself, it was impossible for her to draw disciples to anybody but herself. Thus came the apostasy. And thus, instead of remaining the Church of Christ in truth, manifesting to the world the mystery of God and of godliness, she became, though still professedly the Church of Christ, only the manifestation to the world of the mystery of *self* and of selfishness, which is the very mystery of iniquity.

### THE CHURCH AT ROME

Pre-eminent in both phases of this career was the church at Rome. She was pre-eminent in apostasy, insomuch that this likewise

has been spoken of throughout the whole world, and for nearly eighteen hundred years. As she had been so highly exalted and honored *by the Lord*, correspondingly low did she fall, and correspondingly dishonored did she become, when she exalted *herself*. As high as was her privilege while abiding in the faith, so correspondingly low was her degradation in her apostasy. As she had been perfect in beauty through the comeliness which the Lord had put upon her, so she became frightful in the ugliness of her own uncomely self-conscious pride of her own accomplishments, which were only evil.

### **POWER SHE MUST HAVE**

As she was now trusting in her own merit and her own sufficiency, and seeking to draw disciples to herself, she was left to her own inventions to attract them. She accommodated herself to the ways of the sun-worshiping heathen; she perverted the right way of the Lord, and spake perverse things. She decked herself in gold and jewels and costly array. By such means her adherents multiplied greatly. But lo! just here she encountered a serious difficulty: she found it impossible of herself to hold her converts in subjection to her bidding. The chiefest trouble in this respect was in securing conformity to her will in the matter of the observance of Sunday as a holy day, which she had set up as the sign of her authority to command the obedience of men. To accomplish this she realized the want of a power beyond herself, a power other than her own. The power of God was not open to her in this; nor, in fact, in anything else that she commanded, for none of these things had the Lord required. It is the Church's duty to obey God, not to command men. True, the power of God was still for her, and free to her, but the way to it lay only through sincere repentance, through humbling herself, and confession of sins, and separating from her heathen customs and from all iniquity. This she would not do. But power she must have and power she would have, even though it were illegitimate. Having forsaken the heavenly power she now sought for earthly power. Having forsaken the arm of the Lord, she sought the arm of man. Having disconnected herself from the kingdom of heaven, she would now connect herself with kingdoms of earth. Still trusting in her own beauty, and her own bedecking of silk and gold and precious stones and pearls, and holding in her hands the proffer of rich gifts to any lover that would

receive her pernicious advances and form an alliance with her, she finally succeeded, through Constantine, in gaining imperial favor and forming an adulterous connection with an earthly lord. The now unholy Church formed an unholy connection with the unholy State. And the very first fruit of it was an imperial law enforcing her will in Sunday observance; and the next was the definite placing of the imperial authority at her disposal with which to compel conformity and to punish obstinate heretics.

### **FORMED AN ADULTEROUS UNION**

Thus did she who had been espoused as a chaste virgin to Christ; she who had been joined in the bonds of pure and holy marriage to him who is perfect in power, in love, and purity; she who had known the blissful delights of his love—thus did she violate her virgin vows, break her marriage ties, and become a bloody, murderous harlot, and the very symbol of confusion. Accordingly, the next view that is given of her is this: "I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. 17:3-6.

### **THE LORD WOULD HAVE HEALED BABYLON**

And though in the course of time she had scattered her pernicious ways to all the heathen, and had indulged her lascivious propensities with every kingdom on earth, even yet the Lord would have healed Babylon. In the Reformation he sent a balm for her, if so be that she might be healed. But she would not. Therefore such as loved the Lord were obliged to forsake her. But lo! these that had forsaken her to join themselves to the Lord, instead of remaining faithful to him, followed her evil example, and forsook him and joined themselves also to the kingdoms of the earth in illicit connection. Thus it was with every professed Protestant church, except the Baptist, that ever had a chance, from the Reformation to the founding of the National Government of the United States. This Government, by utterly

prohibiting to itself any connection with the Church or religion, intended to shut off all opportunity for any church to follow here the Romish-Babylonish example of joining itself to the national Government, though even then and ever since it was sorely against the will of some.

### **FOLLOWING THE SAME OCURSE**

Yet in spite of this national principle of government, and in the face of the warnings of the history of eighteen hundred years, the churches of the United States for the last fifty years have been gradually drifting into the course of the original apostasy, and in the last fifteen years their progress in this way has been most rapid, until its culmination in the present year. We might here give representative facts showing the progress of this apostasy all the way; but what is the use of it when the final step has been taken the present year before the eyes of all the world. Everybody knows that for several years the professed Protestant churches of the United States have boasted of the greatness of their numbers, but yet have openly and repeatedly—by pulpit, platform, and press—confessed their lack of power to maintain the observance of Sunday as the "Christian Sabbath" by their own adherents. But what have they done to recover this loss of power? Did they resolve to insist upon strict conformity to discipline on the part of these disloyal adherents? No, no; instead of this, one prominent preacher lately expressed the sentiment that has pervaded all upon this subject, when he declared that he himself would go out of the Church, as he stated it, "body, boots, and breeches," before he would discipline a single one of them. Did they resolve to preach the gospel fervently in the demonstration of the Spirit and power of God? No; for in this they experienced the same difficulty that was met in the original apostasy—they were compelled to confess that there is no "thus saith the Lord" for Sunday observance. There was therefore no authority of God to which they could appeal to arouse the conscience, no word of the Lord through which they could invoke the agency of the divine Spirit to touch the heart. Did they then act upon this confession of no "thus saith the Lord" for the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, and turn about and seek to conform their ways to what the Lord has indeed spoken with his own voice and written with his own finger with respect to the

day which shall be observed? No; they did not do this, either. What, then, did they do?

### THEY DID THIS

*Resolved*, That we give our votes and support to those candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the civil Sabbath.

For several years they offered themselves upon this bid to all takers. But until the present year no opportunity was presented upon which they might act positively and decidedly upon the resolution which they had formed. The World's Fair enterprise, however, when it was taken up by Congress, presented the very chance for which they had been looking. Consequently, at this they acted together as one body in demanding the Nation's recognition and support of Sunday sacredness, in this way:—

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

The grand condition was that the gates should be closed on Sunday, so that the "Lord's day" might not be desecrated.

### THEY FOUND IT

God has said that he "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all

371

the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; *that they should seek the Lord*, if haply they might feel after him, and find him." Acts 17:26, 27. Here are these churches who find themselves sorely in need of a power beyond themselves, and other than their own. But instead of meeting the Lord's mind and seeking him, and so setting a bright example to all men, they turn their backs upon the Lord and seek the Government of the United States, and feel after it,—*and they found it, too*. The Church of Christ is the Lord's appointed agency through which he would call men unto himself that they may find in him deliverance from this present evil world. Now here are these



*professed* churches of Christ who find themselves overloaded with worldly influences and worldly practices. But instead of seeking the Lord for deliverance from this burden of evil, they seek by the chiefest of worldly means a closer alliance with the highest source of worldly influences and worldly practices! For deliverance from an evil which they know, they seek the very source of that evil!! For deliverance from the power of the world, they enter by force into the possession of the greatest worldly power!!! Was there ever a more complete apostasy than this? Could the example of the original apostate church be more exactly followed than it has been in this procedure? And in this even the Baptist Church is in large measure included. Even she who had always kept herself clear of such an illicit connection has been carried away in this evil tide of apostasy; and all together joined hands with the original apostate church to make successful their determination to secure the power of earthly government.

### **VIOLATED VOWS AND BROKEN PLEDGES**

Thus again have these, who had been espoused to Christ, who had been joined to him in the bonds of heavenly alliance, violated their vows and broken their marriage bonds to Him who is perfect in power, in love, and purity. Once more these have forsaken the heavenly power and sought for earthly power. They have forsaken the arm of the Lord and have put their confidence in the arm of flesh. They have forsaken the heavenly Husband and have formed an adulterous connection with an earthly lord. Once more the unholy Church has formed an unholy connection with the unholy State. And once more the very first fruit of it is a national law expressive of her will in the matter of Sunday observance: and the rest of the baleful fruit of such illicit connection will inevitably follow. Is it at all strange, therefore, that the following passage should have been printed, even some time ago, by a leading D.D. in one of the leading "Protestant" papers of the country? Discussing the question of the reunion of Christendom, he argued for it against certain ones thus:—

You would exclude the Roman Catholic Church, *the mother of us all*, the church of scholars and saints, such as Augustine, and Aquinas, and Bernard, and Fenelon: the church of all races, ranks, and classes, which already gives signs of becoming American as well as Roman. . . . You would exclude also the Protestant Episcopal Church, the beautiful *daughter of a beautiful mother*.

That was printed February 9, 1888, in the *Evangelist*, New York City, one of the two leading Presbyterian papers of the country. And from that time to this, never have we seen or heard a single word of protest or dissent from any of the professed evangelical Protestant churches of the country. This states their relationship to "Babylon, the mother of harlots," as that of daughters; and even beautiful daughters, after the "beautiful mother." Their silence is consent that the relationship is correctly stated. And their action in forsaking their rightful Lord and entering into this illicit union with another is positive demonstration the relationship is herein correctly given. For just as certainly as the original apostasy created "Babylon the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," just so certainly this apostasy in our day and in our country has created the harlot daughters of "Babylon the mother." She is the mother only of "harlots and abominations." By positive statement it has been said of them and for them that they are her daughters. By silence they have confessed it, and by action they have demonstrated it. And it is so. We are sorry; but so it is.

A. T. J.

**December 8, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 48 , pp. 377, 378.**

THAT the "evangelical" churches of the United States have taken possession of the governmental authority of the United States, is plain to every one who will candidly consider the subject. That they purpose to keep this power and use it, they have plainly and repeatedly declared.

WE are inquiring what effect this course will have upon the churches, and through them upon the State? So far, we have found that the effect upon the churches has been, stating it briefly, to commit them to open apostasy from the Lord and from his gospel; to make them the chiefest law-breakers in the Nation, even the destroyers of government itself; and to form them into the grandest system of bribery that this Nation ever saw—bribery in politics, bribery in business, and bribery in amusements. And all this, that they may be confirmed in their effort to make void the law of the Most High.

THE churches profess that the course which they have taken is essential to the preservation of the State, and in this the salvation of

the Nation. What effect, then, can such a course have, and only have? We have before shown how that it was to help her bear an overweight of worldliness and worldly influences, that she grasped the arm of the State and formed this illicit connection with worldly power. We there pointed out the utter incongruity of seeking deliverance from an evil, by a positive alliance with the chiefest source of that evil; and how the only effect this could have upon the churches would be infinitely to increase the burden which they already found themselves unable to bear alone. How can *that* save the Nation?

THE Church of Christ is the divinely-appointed means through which God would call the nations to seek the Lord that they might find him and be delivered from this present evil world; what, then, when these professed churches of Christ themselves seek to the power of this present evil world, join themselves to it, and put their dependence upon it? How can *that* save the Nation?

THE Church of Christ is the divinely-appointed agency to "*persuade* men" to join themselves to the Lord: what, then, when these professed churches of Christ *threaten* congressmen in order that they themselves may succeed in joining themselves to the Government? How can *that* preserve the State or save the Nation?

THE Church of Christ is the divinely-appointed agency to persuade men to send up their petitions to *the Lord* for help, and for deliverance from every burden and from every evil: what, then, when the professed churches of Christ themselves send up their petitions to *men*, even though the men be congressmen, and though the petitions be backed up with threats? How can *that* save the Nation?

BOTH society and the State are already cursed with the unsatiable demand for office, or position of trust, in return for political service rendered: what, then, when the professed churches of Christ make this the very chosen channel through which they would make successful their aims upon the State? What effect, then, can this have upon society and the State, other than to increase this curse even to ruinous depths?

BRIBERY is already become so common as easily to frustrate the will of the people: when, then, when these churches take the lead "bribing with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments," all whom they can seduce to compliance with their arbitrary will, regardless of the will of the people whether expressed in the supreme law or in the direct voice of the people? What can be the effect of this

upon the State, other than to increase in untold ratio the already too general corruption?

BY the enactment of wholesome laws, the people have been doing their best to protect themselves from the rule of the tyrannical spirit of the boycott. But how can the people protect themselves from this despotism, when the churches control the law-making power for the general community, and make the boycott in all business relations their chosen means by which to force submission to their will in the local community. What, then, can be the effect of this, other than to so cultivate the spirit of spying and treachery as to destroy mutual confidence and individual integrity; set every man's hand against his neighbor; and fill the land with deceit and violence?

LAWLESSNESS is already so prevalent as almost to threaten the existence of a republican form of government: what, then, when the professed churches of Christ at one leap land themselves in the lead in this, by disregarding the *supreme* law, overriding the Constitution, and taking the governmental authority out of the hands of the people and into their own lawless hands? In this they have accomplished their long-announced "object" "to change that feature of our fundamental law" which declares that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." But how can this preserve the State? How can this save the Nation? What effect indeed can it possibly have other than to produce here that condition of lawlessness and confusion, yet of ecclesiastical despotism, that is always created by attempts of the Church to rule?

HERE, then, are these churches profess-

378

sing to be the churches of Christ, yet having gone away from him, their rightful Lord, and joined themselves to another; professing to minister the power of God, yet depending upon the power of man; professing to minister the *gospel* of *Christ*, they actually minister the *laws* of *men*; professing to *persuade* men with the message of *justification* by *faith* in *Christ*, they actually *compel* men by the *condemnation* of the *law* of *men*; professing to lead in the way of righteousness, uprightness and sincerity, they actually lead in the way of unrighteousness, corruption, and deceit; professing themselves to be models of Protestantism, they have actually joined hands with Romanism and follow her customs and require all to receive the signs of her authority; professing to be the example in all things good, they actually set the example in the chief things that are bad.

THERE is but one thing more that they can possibly do in this direction, and even this they will do, that is, enter into alliance with Satanic power itself, by joining hands with Spiritualism. This they will do as certainly as they have done that which they have done. Then will be completely fulfilled the prophecy which *now* is but partly fulfilled—Rev. 18:2, 3. We have already shown how these churches have presented themselves as "a cage of every unclean and hateful bird;" but *then* the whole of the verse will be fulfilled and the world will hear that cry of the angel of the Lord which comes "mightily with a strong voice saying, 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. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth have waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies."

AT the same time there is "heard another voice from heaven, saying, 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." Rev. 18:4, 5. Thank the Lord, there are yet some of the people of God in these churches. There are yet some Christians there. But they can not remain there much longer without becoming partakers of her sins. They can not stay there much longer and remain Christians. They can not stay there much longer without receiving of her plagues, and of the judgments of God upon her iniquities. Her judgment cometh and hasteth greatly. "Strong is the Lord God that judgeth her." And it is written: "A mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down and shall be found no more at all." Rev. 18:8, 10, 21.

SUCH being the final result to the churches, of this course of evil in which they have even now gone so far; and the churches being one with the State in this course; it is inevitable that the ruin of the churches will be the ruin also of the State. Therefore it is as plain as A B C that this course upon which these churches have entered means the destruction of the State and the ruin of the Nation. What they in their apostasy and bad ambition promise shall save the Nation only proves its speedy and awful ruin. This is certain.

NOT only is this evident from what has already been said, but this same thing has been worked out once in history, for the instruction of

all people and nations, showing clearly enough just what the result must be. In the original apostasy, the Church succeeded in joining herself to the State, promising like this to save the State. The means then employed by Constantine and the bishops, in establishing the "Christian" religion and making that a "Christian State" were the same as now employed here, and were such as to win only hypocrites. This was bad enough in itself, yet the hypocrisy was voluntary; but when through the agency of the Sunday laws the Church then, as now, secured control of the civil power to compel all who were not church-members to act as though they were, hypocrisy was made compulsory; and everybody who was not voluntarily a church-member and a hypocrite, was compelled either to be a hypocrite, anyhow, or a rebel. And as in addition to this, all were required to change or revise their faith according as the majority in the councils changed and decreed; all moral and spiritual integrity was destroyed. Hypocrisy became a habit; dissimulation and fraud became a necessity of life; and the very moral fiber of men and society was vitiated.

THE pagan superstitions, the pagan delusions, and the pagan vices, which had been brought into the Church by the apostasy, and clothed with a form of godliness, had wrought such corruption that the society of which it was a part could no longer exist. From it no more good could possibly come, and it must be swept away. "The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theater-going, intemperance, lewdness; in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman Empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude, but simple and morally vigorous, barbarians." "Nothing but the divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian, but essentially heathen, world, could open the way for the moral regeneration of society. There must be new, fresh nations, if the Christian civilization, prepared in the old Roman Empire, was to take firm root and bear ripe fruit."—*Schaff*.

And onward those barbarians came, swiftly and in multitudes. For a hundred years the dark cloud had been hanging threateningly over the borders of the empire, encroaching slightly upon the west and breaking occasionally upon the east. But at the close of the fourth century the tempest burst in all its fury, and the flood was flowing ruinously. And finally, in 476, when Odoacer, king of the Heruli, became king of Italy, the last vestige of the Western Empire of Rome

was gone, and was divided among the ten nations of barbarians of the North.

Wherever these savages went, they carried fire and slaughter, and whenever they departed, they left desolation and ruin in their track, and carried away multitudes of captives. Thus was the proud empire of Western Rome swept from the earth; and that which Constantine and his ecclesiastical flatterers had promised one another should be the everlasting salvation of the State, proved its speedy and everlasting ruin.

IN that case the Lord made the savage nations of the North the instruments of his judgment in sweeping away the mass of corruption which the union of Church and State had built up there. But in this case where can any such instruments be found? There are none. Civilization has encompassed the earth. Not only that, but in this case "all nations" are involved in the corruption. Where then shall the Lord find a people to execute his judgment and sweep away *this* mass of corruption? For the reasons given they can not be found upon the earth. A people is found, however, and here is the Lord's description of them:

Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand; a day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains: *a great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like*, neither shall be any more after it, even to the years of many generations. A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth: the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them. The appearance of them is as the appearance of horses; and as horsemen, so shall they run. Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap, like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble, as a strong people set in battle array. Before their face the people shall be much pained: all faces shall gather blackness. They shall run like mighty men; they shall climb the wall like men of war; and they shall march every one on his ways, and they shall not break their ranks: neither shall one thrust another; they shall walk every one in his path: and *when they fall upon the sword, they shall not be wounded*. They shall run to and fro in the city; they shall run upon the wall, they shall climb up upon the houses; they shall enter in at the windows like a thief. The earth shall

quake before them; the heavens shall tremble: the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining: and the Lord shall utter his voice before his army: for his camp is very great: for he is strong that executeth his word: for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who can abide it? Joel 2:1-11.

And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. *And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses*, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. Rev. 19:11-16.

"And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." Matt. 24:31. "And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." Rev. 15:2, 3.

"Come out of her my people," and prepare to meet your Lord.

A. T. J.

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 48 , p. 384.**

SIX of the Seventh-day Adventists indicted some weeks since in Henry County, Tenn., for quiet Sunday work, have been arrested and placed under bonds to appear for trial early in February, 1893. Other arrests are to follow, if they have not been already made.

THESE men will doubtless be convicted. They are all members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and as it is already in evidence in the trials held last May that it is the habit of members of that church to



work on Sunday, it is a foregone conclusion that all the accused are guilty of Sunday work.

ALL these men work on Sunday because they feel that it would be wrong to do otherwise. They acknowledge only one Sabbath, namely, the seventh day, and they can not conscientiously observe another day by abstaining from worldly labor and business as the law of Tennessee requires. They believe that the fourth commandment not only requires them to abstain from worldly pursuits on the seventh day, but that it requires them to regard and treat all other days alike, to do on the other six days whatever work or business they have to do. And in this they are not peculiar. In the *Mail and Express* of November 29, 1892, the editor, who is also president of the American Sabbath Union, says:—

The fourth commandment covers not merely the Sabbath day, not merely the one-seventh continuous part of time, but it also covers the other six days in the week. It imparts two obligations upon mankind. The one is to work six days in the week. The other is to rest the seventh.

This is true, not because Mr. Shepard says it, but because it is in accord with the word of God. Some months since the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, the organ of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, argued this matter thus:—

The language of the commandment imparts something more than a mere permission to labor upon six days of the week. It imparts something in the nature of an obligation.

The propriety of its doing so can be readily seen. Six days of the week are left to be devoted to man and his temporal interests, but the seventh day is the Lord's,—the day upon which he rested, and which he blessed and sanctified. This day must therefore be kept distinct and separate from all other days, and of course the means for doing this must not be likewise employed in behalf of other days, or the distinction would be lost. If mankind should regularly refrain from work upon two days of the week—the seventh day and some other day—in the manner prescribed by the commandment for the seventh day, there would be nothing in it to show which day it was that God rested upon, and which he sanctified and blessed,—nothing to signify that God created the heavens and the earth in six days, and rested upon the seventh,—and thus the purpose of the institution would entirely fall. The observance of the commandment by rest upon the seventh day would be nullified by the like rest upon the other day. It is absolutely essential, therefore, that the six working days should be kept distinct in character from that day which God has set apart for himself.

THIS being the view entertained by Adventists, it follows that to obey any Sunday law that forbids them to follow their secular vocations on Sunday, is at the same time to violate their consciences. And in requiring them to do this under penalty, the State of Tennessee abridges their liberty, and violates the Constitution of that State which declares that "no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience."

**December 15, 1892**

**"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 7, 49 , pp. 385, 386.**

THE campaign now in progress over the question of Sunday and the World's Fair, is in fact simply a continuation of the false and unconstitutional steps already taken by Congress.

INSTEAD of insisting without any qualification that the question of opening or closing the Fair on Sunday is entirely beyond the just jurisdiction or even consideration of Congress; instead of demanding [*sic.*] the unconditional repeal of the Sunday-closing provisos adopted by Congress, so as to put the whole question back where it was before Congress touched it, and keep it there; the demand is made that Congress shall legislate to *open* the Fair for the same reasons precisely that it legislated to *close* the Fair.

CONGRESS was required to close the Fair on Sunday because Sunday is the "Christian Sabbath;" because it would promote the "proper" observance of the day as such; because of its benefits to religion in general; and because "this is a Christian Nation." And now Congress is requested to open the Fair on Sunday, because Sunday is the "Christian Sabbath;" because it will set such an example of proper Sabbath observance as nothing else could; because it will be so pre-eminently promotive of religion; and because "this is a Christian Nation."

THE City Council of Chicago, as officially representing that city, sends up its memorial and petition to Congress "that the gates of the World's Columbian Exposition be not closed on Sunday;" but that all machinery be stopped "to the end that quiet may prevail *which is in keeping with the Sabbath;*" and "that suitable accommodations be provided within the Exposition grounds for holding religious services on the Sabbath day, *to the end* that all the denominations may have

worship conducted according to their several customs without obstruction or hindrance."

"IN support of the foregoing petitions" the council cites "considerations," among which the following are prominent:—

We recognize and rejoice in the fact that our country is and always has been a Christian Nation. We believe that the United States, as a Christian country, should open the gates on Sunday as a recognition of the fact that in no branch of human interest or thought has there been more progress during that four hundred years than in the Christian Church.

Another great reason why the Exposition should be open Sunday is to be found in the opportunity that would thus be provided for religious services on a grand scale on that day within the various buildings. The multitudes could worship together according to the dictates of their own consciences and the forms of their religion.

Would it not be a good thing to throw the sanctity of religious worship about the great temple dedicated to the things of use and beauty?

Would not the people of other lands carry with them to their homes more pleasing and fonder recollections of the Exposition on account of the religious services they might here attend?

Finally, would it not be a grand object-lesson, to see people of all phases of religious belief worshipping within the same grounds and often under the same roof? Such a thing would be without precedent.

THE petition and reasons given by President Higinbotham of the Fair Directory, for the opening of the Fair on Sunday are substantially the same as those given by the City Council of Chicago. It is so, likewise, with the petition and reasons of the Sunday opening association of which the Chicago *Herald* is the leader. So that the aim and object and the sum of the whole matter is well expressed by the Chicago *Tribune*, December 3, in reporting the letter of Cardinal Gibbons in favor of Sunday opening. It says:—

The possibilities for a series of religious demonstrations at the park become more and more manifest. With the leading religious and moral teachers of Europe and America to conduct services every Sunday, with sacred music produced by choruses embracing, perhaps, thousands of trained voices, *Sunday at the World's Fair will be one of the grandest recognitions of the Sabbath* known to modern history.

ANOTHER significant phase of the contest is, that while Archbishops Ireland Gross, and Riordan, of the Catholic Church, favor Sunday closing of the Fair, Cardinal Gibbons and other

archbishops favor Sunday opening. While most of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and ministers of other professed Protestant churches demand Sunday closing, Bishop Potter, of the Protestant Episcopal Church and other prominent ministers of that and other so-called Protestant churches, demand Sunday opening. But whether the demand be for Sunday closing or for Sunday opening of the Fair, it is made by all these in the interests of Sunday, to promote its observance and the more to exalt it as the great "Christian" institution.

THEREFORE the conclusion of the whole matter is, that instead of there being a movement to have Congress abandon the usurpation which it has practiced, unconditionally repeal this unconstitutional legislation, and take its position again where alone it belongs; this is a movement to have Congress continue its usurpation, multiply its unconstitutional legislation, and confirm itself in the unlawful position which it has taken. Instead of insisting that Congress can never of right have anything at all to do in any way with the question as to whether Sunday should be observed at all or not, this is only an effort to have Congress decide what will best and most powerfully promote the observance of that day which Congress has already unconstitutionally and irreverently decided is "the Christian Sabbath." This movement and the legislation which it demands is just as much in the interests of the church power, and is just as much to please this power,

386

as was the original legislation of Congress on the subject. And the effect which it will have, the only effect which it can have, is only the more fully to confirm in the hands of the church power, the governmental authority of which that lawless power has already robbed the people.

BECAUSE of all these facts THE AMERICAN SENTINEL takes no part in this Sunday opening campaign. Our position is just what it always has been. We do not, and never did, care the scratch of a pen whether the World's Fair be open or shut on Sundays. We *do* care, and always have cared, more than can be told, whether the question should be decided by legislation; and whether the Government should thus be surrendered into the hands of the church power. Against this we have always protested and worked with all our might: both before and since it was done. Our demand is, that all Sunday legislation of all kinds everywhere be unconditionally repealed. But

there is no possibility of this ever being done anywhere. This we know, consequently our position is one of positive, uncompromising and everlasting *protest* against all that has been done, against all that is being done, and against all that ever shall be done by law in behalf of Sunday; whether to open the Fair, or to close the Fair, or any thing else under the sun.

A. T. J.

**December 22, 1892**

**"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 7, 50 , p. 400.**

WE are told that infidelity was responsible for the French Revolution which a century ago deluged France with blood; but what caused the infidelity? Was it not largely the result of a corrupt union of Church and State, and of the abuses which grew out of it? Infidelity hides its head in the presence of the truth, which is the power of God for the salvation of men, but it flourishes in the atmosphere of a State-bolstered religion which is always a denial of the sufficiency of the gospel of Christ. In nothing is the utter perversity of human nature more fully demonstrated than in its readiness to pervert the truth of God, and by the substitution of human inventions, deny its power to regenerate and save men. There is danger in any union which seeks to exalt men rather than God, no matter by what name it may be called.

<sup>1</sup> Condensed from "Two Republics."

<sup>2</sup> Condensed from "Two Republics."

<sup>3</sup> From a sermon delivered by A. T. Jones, at Battle Creek, Mich., July 9, 1892, as reported and published in the ***Review and Herald***.

<sup>4</sup> From a sermon delivered by A. T. Jones, at Battle Creek, Mich., July 9, 1892, as reported and published in the ***Review and Herald***.

<sup>5</sup> From a sermon delivered by A. T. Jones, at Battle Creek, Mich., July 9, 1892, as reported and published in the ***Review and Herald***.

<sup>6</sup> Condensed from "Two Republics."

<sup>7</sup> From a sermon delivered by A. T. Jones, at Battle Creek, Mich., July 9, 1892, as reported and published in the ***Review and Herald***.

<sup>8</sup> Condensed from "Two Republics."

<sup>9</sup> From a sermon delivered by A. T. Jones, at Battle Creek, Mich., July 9, 1892, as reported and published in the ***Review and Herald***.

<sup>10</sup> Since this sermon was preached, Congress has enacted a Sunday law, closing the World's Fair that day. Thus and now the parallel is complete, and the likeness perfect. [See "Testimony No. 33," p. 240.] All that remains now is for those who have so long been grasping for the power, to go ahead in the use of the power which they now have. All the quotations in this sermon will be found in "The Two Republics."

<sup>11</sup> Condensed from "Two Republics."

<sup>12</sup> Condensed from "Two Republics."

<sup>13</sup> From a sermon delivered by A. T. Jones, at Battle Creek, Mich., July 9, 1892, as reported and published in the ***Review and Herald***.

<sup>14</sup> The principal part of this decision will be found on another page of this paper.

<sup>15</sup> Condensed from "Two Republics."

<sup>16</sup> Hon. Richard W. Thompson, "The Papacy and the Civil Power." Page 45.